

# THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—MARCH, 1892.—No. 3.

## REVIEW SECTION.

### I.—THE HEALING OF DIVISIONS.\*

BY THE RIGHT REV. A. CLEVELAND COXE, D.D., BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW YORK,  
BUFFALO, N. Y.

THERE are many who begin to view the actual condition of our country, in its religious and moral aspects, with alarm. A vast increase of territory and of population has made the problem of popular evangelization a very perplexing one. The profligate waste of Christian resources, spiritual and material, implied in the perpetuation of sects, calling for five or six men even in villages where one pastor would suffice, and leaving corresponding destitution in the new States and Territories, where not even one can be had for growing centres soon to be large towns and cities; this of itself is a portent over which believers can no longer sing optimistic hymns of contentment without inviting retribution. We are not fulfilling the conditions of our social life as Christians; and God's holy Word gives us warning, in the messages to the Seven Churches, of what we must expect from the sword of His mouth, "whose eyes are as a flame of fire," when He visits His servants and searches their hearts. We shall find no remedy for the emergency save in the united energies of those who believe in Christ and love Him supremely.

A frightful portent, besides, is that of an immigration which in dark disguise is nothing less than invasion. The overflow of the Goths and Vandals upon Spain and Italy was not more formidable to primitive Christian civilization than that which now rushes, like a Gulf Stream, into our tides of life, menacing and changing all the conditions which have made us a strong nation hitherto. It lends itself immediately, with deadly effect, to every current that breeds pestilence; it makes the air we breathe unwholesome—nay, infectious; it is moral poison. The mongrelized Latin population of Mexico and South America show whitherward all this points and tends. The higher civilization introduced by our forefathers, and which only is capable of sustaining free constitutions and liberty with law, is already perishing. This squalid and ignorant influx is made the arbiter of our destinies, and used by depraved politicians without scruple as the venal balance of power on which their plots and schemes depend. Hitherto there has existed among us a community of fundamental ideas. This great republic grew up accordingly from its colonial seed, like the oak, "whose seed is in itself," and which is invigorated by storm no less than by sunshine. From the days of Alfred, the

\* This article, which was delivered by Bishop Coxe as a sermon from the text Phil. iii. 16, before the De Lancey Divinity School, Geneva, N. Y., November 30, 1891, appears as the first of a series on the general subject of Church union, to be contributed by representative writers from the various denominations in the Christian Church.—Eds.

### The Divine Rule of Enjoyment.

By TRYON EDWARDS, D.D.

*Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment.— Ecclesiastes xi. 9.*

Most commentators and preachers seem to have understood this text as a pointed and solemn challenge, uttered in sarcastic irony by the writer. As if the wise man had said to the young, "Plunge headlong if you dare and will into all the follies and sinful indulgences of the world; seek in them your highest enjoyments, forgetting God and conscience and duty; riot in them to the full, as if this life were all and eternity only a dream; but know that God will soon bring you into judgment and fearfully punish for it all."

So we find good Dr. Watts, like many others, understanding it. In his well-known paraphrase of the passage, so often sung as a hymn, he says:

"Ye sons of Adam, vain and young,  
Indulge your eyes, indulge your tongue,  
Taste the delights your souls desire,  
And give a loose to all your fire.

"Enjoy the pleasures you design,  
And cheer your hearts with songs and wine;  
Enjoy the day of mirth, but know  
There is a day of judgment too!

"God from on high beholds your thoughts;  
His book records your secret faults;  
The deeds of darkness you have done  
Shall all appear before the sun.

"The vengeance to your follies due  
Should strike your hearts with terror through;  
How will you stand before His face  
Or answer for His injured grace!"

All this, however, we believe, is an entire misapprehension of the meaning of the sacred writer. He does not speak in rebuke or in the spirit and tone of solemn challenge and threat. On the contrary, he evidently sympathizes with the young in their natural fondness for enjoyment, knowing and feeling that it is right for them, and that God intends and wishes them to rejoice, and has richly provided for and delights to behold their enjoyment. Take, he would say, all the happiness you can; enjoy to the full all the good things which the world can offer, but in all and as to all bear in mind your accountability, and remember so to enjoy them as not to be led into sin; so to enjoy them, with your final account in view, that you can feel they are not leading you away from God or duty, but rather making you faithful to both and thankful to the great Giver of them all. Enjoy, as your nature craves, all the good things which God has given as sources of enjoyment, but let the thought of your responsibility ever be a check against everything which is forbidden and sinful, and with this and only this limitation enjoy to the full all the blessings which God is bestowing, knowing that He rejoices to see you do it, and that enjoyment in this spirit will ever keep you near to Him.

This meaning seems clearly to be that which the context suggests, the one which is in keeping with the whole spirit of the Bible, which most accords with the wishes and feelings of God as the loving Father of His children, and through which He designs and seeks to prepare us for that blessed world where joy is to reign forever!

## SOCIOLOGICAL SECTION.

### Ethics and Politics.

By PROFESSOR R. E. THOMPSON,  
S.T.D., UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

#### I. *The Ethics of Patriotism.*

SOME two years ago a brilliant West-

ern senator turned from the superficial aspects of politics and entered a field which has been traversed by Hebrew prophets, Greek philosophers, Roman jurists, and the ethical thinkers of every school. These all have been occupied with the relations of ethics to politics;

he frankly avowed his conviction that the two have nothing to do with each other—that the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount furnished no guidance to political action. The sensation his words produced was the greater in that their author by no means stood for the lowest grade of unscrupulous partisanship. But they owed still more of their effect to their putting before us a common maxim of our public life in all its native ugliness. They revealed us to ourselves, for deep moral distinctions like this will generally be found to run through us, not past us. This vicious notion is the monopoly of no party, of no set of men. It clings to all parties, to all movements, to all of us.

Those who take this view consciously, as well as act on it unconsciously, are fond of comparing politics to a state of war, and of claiming for them that suspension of ordinary ethical rules which attends war. It is said that ethics define the relations of men in a state of harmony, while politics belong to a state of contention, and reject all anxiety to avoid injury to other men, and regard such injury as a duty if the other men are "on the other side." Ethics can pervade the whole of human life only by abolishing politics.

But it is a false assumption that war lies outside ethics, even although it suspends some of the obligations which exist in time of peace. The ethics of war contain no justification of personal enmity; they justify no falsehood to those who are entitled to know the truth; they forbid acts of useless slaughter and of cruelty; they require the cessation of hostilities the moment the purpose of the war has been reached.

Politics, like war, belong to a stage of conflict, and therefore to a transitional stage in human development. The conduct of government through the antagonism of parties is as much a makeshift as the redress of international wrongs by bloodshed. But the two are not as parallel as is assumed. In war men stand outside the social bond and renounce ordinary obligations. In poli-

tics the bond is unimpaired. Both parties profess to seek the highest good of all, including their antagonists. Both profess to value national welfare more than party success. Both are embraced in the same national unity, and are under unimpaired ethical obligations to all. The common understanding of a suspension of some of these exists in war, not in politics.

The first thing to be considered is what is involved in this national bond. It is to the growth of a sense of patriotic duty to all that we must look for a check to partisan feeling, which regards only a part as friends and the rest as enemies. The more clearly the nation is brought into view as a higher object of devotion, the less parties will weigh with us, and the less will parties be able to put themselves into the place of the nation, to claim the credit of the nation's achievements, and to intercept the loyalty and enthusiasm which belongs to the nation only.

Fortunately our political literature possesses a book in which the meaning and greatness of the nation has been treated with singular ability. Dr. Elisha Mulford's work, "The Nation: the Foundations of Civil and Political Order in the United States," is already a political classic. He shows us that the nation is a moral personality, with a character as distinct as that of any individual, and like that the outcome of moral growth and discipline; that it possesses a life which is more than the sum total of the lives of its citizens, as every form of organic life embraces more than is to be found in the past. It is invested with an inalienable and indivisible sovereignty, for whose exercise it is responsible only to God; and it possesses the right to determine the form and order of its public life, and to maintain its independence of all other powers. Within it and by it are realized those natural rights and liberties which are necessary to the complete development of our human nature. In return it may make the largest demands on its people, not stopping short of their lives, in its de-

fence. Within the nation lies the process of human history, which is but the biography of the peoples which have attained a true political existence, combining order with freedom. As Burke says: "It is not a partnership in things subservient to the gross animal existence of a temporary and perishable nature. It is a partnership in all science, in all art—a partnership in every virtue and in all perfection."

The worth of national existence was revealed to the American people by the war for the Union. They did not know how much their country was worth to them until it was threatened with disruption and disintegration. The domestic temper, the unmilitary habits, the love of gainful pursuits were all abandoned gladly. On the battle-field or in the hospital two hundred and four thousand of our fellow-citizens died for their country, and so large a share of the younger manhood of America was swept away as seriously to affect the social character of our people. Was the object worthy of the sacrifice? The dead did not begrudge it, nor did the bereaved, who "kissed their cross with lips that quivered." And coming generations will rise up to bless that one which spared no effort and flinched from no pain that it might transmit to the future an undivided American nation. Even from that section which bore its share in the suffering without a share in the victory, there comes, thank God! the expression of profound thankfulness that the war resulted as it did.

So great is the nation that no sacrifice, not even that of life, is too great for it to ask. And it asks the sacrifice of life still; not in the grim holocaust of the field of battle, but in the steadfast, watchful consecration of duty. The nation always is in peril, always demanding the surrender of men's lives to avert the peril. The greatest peril is that its life may decay at the very core, until the coming of enemies for its overthrow is but the gathering of vultures to a carcass. The battle of national defence has but shifted to another field;

but the demand for patriotic devotion, manful resistance, a watchful public spirit is as great as ever. Its enemies are less easy to recognize than when they were certain gray-clad squadrons fighting under a strange flag in open warfare. They are the vices which break up national fellowship and throw each man back upon himself—the love of indulgence, the love of money, partisan bitterness, and a loosened sense of our obligations to God and to men.

How shall we give our lives to-day to the defence of the nation? First of all, by giving our country its full measure of patriotic affection and devotion. The discharge of ethical duty begins in right sentiment, in setting our affections on the right object. Now it is not so easy as it seems to keep this commandment. Much that passes for patriotic feeling has a false ring, as being personal egotism "just a little projected." If our regard for our country is conditioned by the fact that our citizenship in it adds to our self-importance, that regard has no ethical worth. Just as worthless is the patriotism which nourishes itself on statistics and bird's-eye views, and despises other peoples, which bulk less than we. Ethical patriotism does not revel in material immensities. History does not make much of them either. Palestine, Greece, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, England are large only in ethical importance, and are invested with a perennial interest which does not attach to the immense empires of Asia. A true patriotism clings as lovingly to a petty island as a continental area. *Σπαρταν ελαχες τανταν κοσμει!*

Equally worthless is the patriotism which feeds itself on the depreciation of other countries, and which is strong only when it has something to fight. If it were of the right sort it would make us sympathize with the true patriots of other lands, and rejoice in their devotion to their country. The more we see of the worth of our own position the higher we will value theirs.

But in criticising false and unreal exhibitions of patriotic feeling we must

guard ourselves lest the disgust for shallow boastfulness and narrow intolerance may produce in us a languor of national interest or an indifference to the obligations of patriotic attachment. This is our danger at present. The educated American has reacted against the spread-eagle style, and this reaction has been helped by the growing influence of the American humorist, who has managed to fringe our historic sanctities with ridiculous associations. When Professor Tyndall, in one of his American lectures, made an allusion to Plymouth Rock, he was surprised and indignant to find he had provoked a ripple of laughter in his audience. Now humor is a good condiment, but a poor food. It produces a detachment from our convictions which may be useful as enabling us to look at them in an independent way; but such detachment is not wholesome as a permanent condition of mind, as it weakens moral earnestness.

Nor is this the only intellectual obstacle to patriotic feeling. Indeed, the very variety of intellectual interests works the same way. The average American of the seventeenth century had but two interests—politics and religion. By the close of the eighteenth century he had narrowed them to one—politics. Since then religion has resumed its old place, while philosophy, science, invention, literature, the plastic arts, and even music have made their home with us, and not one of them has managed to identify itself with patriotism. Literature comes the nearest to doing so; but while it is largely patriotic in its choice of themes, in neither quantity nor quality does it suffice to furnish the chief intellectual food of our educated classes. Our art is equally inadequate, and is decaying as regards patriotic motive. As a whole our culture lacks the note of devotion to our country, and its various forms divert much of the energy once given to politics. A pale and impotent cosmopolitanism is diffused among our educated men, lowering them politically, as Dr.

Mulford says, to the level of a polite mob, without consciousness of participation in the organic life of the nation. We have indeed some "scholars in politics," but their scholarship never took them thither; rather it tended to unfit them by distaste for public life. You cannot eat your cake and have it. We cannot give our mental energies to pursuits which lie apart from the public interests, and then exhibit the old-fashioned American devotion to those interests.

If this be true of even the higher pursuits which occupy the minds of our people, much more is it true of the lower; of the pursuit of pleasure or excitement and of gain which have attained vastly greater proportions with the increase of opportunity. It is a mistake to confine the former to the limited circle which calls itself "society." The same life in an ethical sense is led in a coarser way by multitudes, who set pleasurable self-indulgence before them as the end of existence. The temperance reformation has done much to check this evil in one direction, by attaching a stigma to one of the means of attaining sensuous excitement. But the craving which in one man tends to alcoholism, in another leads to other vices, to debasing forms of art and literature, to gambling in business and sports, to a thousand means of undermining sobriety of character and public spirit by putting selfish before social ends.

Just as anti-social, anti-national, and utterly selfish is the business life of those who accept gain and not use as the end of business activity. We often hear the demand that politics shall be reformed by introducing into public life the spirit and methods of business life. Unfortunately our politics are debased by the influence of the low ideas which too generally control the business world; and for my part, I see no reason to expect a general reform of the politicians until we have got rid of the immorality of business. It is from this last that the lowest politicians take their tone; and the worst that is said of the worst

among them is that he "is on the make"—*i. e.*, is looking out for his private interests with the singleness of aim and unreserved selfishness which are accepted as all right in business. Before the nation can come by its rights in the sphere of politics, there must be a far higher ideal in the sphere of commerce.

The very existence of the politician grows out of the neglects of duty of those who have given themselves up to making money and similar selfish pursuits. It is nature's effort to fill up the vacuum left by the general diversion from public duties and the decay of public spirit. Our neglect creates the class, and our neglect leaves them free to mismanage as they please. It is said that a wealthy New York merchant declined to take part in the measures for the exposure and overthrow of the Tweed Ring on the ground that he could make more money in the time this would require than the Ring was likely to rob him of! This was but an extreme case of the general indifference to ordinary political duties, which explains that failure to procure a clean and efficient regulation of municipal affairs which Mr. Bryce declares the worst blot on our political system.

Quite as harmful, though less generally diffused, is the cynicism which tells us that politics always must be a dirty business, and politicians always and in all cases will be found to be irredeemably selfish and unscrupulous. This cuts the sinews of reformatory effort, and teaches the despair which is the unpardonable sin. Like all cynicism, it rests on a mere selection of facts and a contempt of the broad lessons of history. Politicians generally are neither much worse nor much better than the people at large. Their profession has its special temptations, as has every other. Their reform can come only from a general quickening of the public conscience and a general elevation of our social standards. And as these have risen in the past, politics have grown cleaner also. My friend, the late Hon. John Welsh, told me of hearing Vice-Presi-

dent Wilson challenge a loose statement made by an Episcopal bishop as to the degeneracy of our public men and of public life. Mr. Wilson said: "I have been an observer of that life for a quarter of a century, and even in that time the change for the better has been wonderful. The scenes which once took place on the floor of Congress and the social life of the capital were such as the country would not tolerate." Certainly the day is past when the President of the United States and the Mayor of Washington could appear as chief pall-bearers at the funeral of the wife of a keeper of a gambling hell!

The task of political reform is no labor of Sisyphus. The past teaches us hope for the future. But the only mainspring of a genuine and lasting reform must be found in the awakened sentiment of duty to the country as superior to all private interests. Love of country must become a social passion—not an emotional enjoyment reserved for the great public festivals of national life, but constant as the household affections. And like them it must be recognized as a duty not in the least affected by the faults of the country or its public men, or, in any case, to be postponed to any intellectual or social pursuit, or any desire for selfish gratification.

#### Shop-Girls.

BY PROFESSOR J. H. HYSLOP, COLUMBIA COLLEGE, NEW YORK CITY.

I HAVE been asked to say a few words on the problem connected with the subject of shop-girls, and on the method of dealing with it. In accepting this invitation, however, I must remind the reader very emphatically that the problem is not a simple one. Otherwise I might encourage the expectation that there is some easy cut-and-dried solution of it, which there is not. The problem is a very complicated one; and whoever studies it or pronounces upon it must reckon with a multitude of moral and economical perplexities. If he does not take these into account, he is cer-

# THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXIV.—JULY, 1892.—NO. 1.

## REVIEW SECTION.

### I.—THE MINISTRY'S DUTY TO THE CHURCH AT THE PRESENT DAY.

BY PROFESSOR FREDERIC GODET, D.D., NEUCHÂTEL, SWITZERLAND.

FIFTY years ago, when I entered the ministry, a revival of religion was bringing life to Christendom in Western Europe ; its powerful breath touched all the churches in succession ; everywhere souls became convicted and came to the knowledge of grace, the enjoyment of peace, and the possession of spiritual life. According to the fine expression of the psalmist, "From the womb of the morning thou hast the dew of thy youth." Like yonder fruit-laden trees which the prophet beholds, rising from the banks of the wonderful river, a number of Christian institutions sprang up from the fertile soil of this new life ; evangelical societies, foreign missions, Bible and religious tract societies, Sunday-schools, and many other kindred departures made their appearance and developed ; philanthropic agencies of different kinds were added to the recent religious creations. Then, on a new Palm Sunday as it were, the disciples testified by word and deed to the Saviour who manifested His presence in the midst of them ; and Jesus Himself could have said, "If in such days of grace these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out."

We are still in many respects under the salutary influence of that revival. Religious and philanthropic work, by which the Church of the present day is distinguished, is partly the offspring of yonder movement. For that reason the prosperity itself of the Church must not deceive us, lest we should bear a judgment on her present state which would be too favorable. The engine may roll for some time on the rails, and the train with it, even after its fire has begun to go out. The all-important point is whether the motive power is properly kept up inside of the motor.

Serious doubts as to its soundness may be held with regard to the present state of the Church. What power was it which gave, at the time of the revival, the memory of which I just now recalled, such a wonderful impulse to the Christian society ? It was a living faith in the Divine facts

heavenly Redeemer of men that our Lord was able to appear before that God who is Spirit and Heaven in the deepest acceptance of these words, and that He was also able to complete our union with Him. Had the effecting of that union been dependent upon a tabernacle "of this world," and upon animal sacrifices such as those of Israel, it could no more have been accomplished now than under the earlier economy. But we have in Christ another tabernacle and another offering, both belong-

ing to "the world to come," to the spiritual, the heavenly, the unchangeable, the everlasting, so that in Him we have "an eternal redemption."

We have examined the exegetical meaning of the passage before us. On the supposition that our exegesis is correct, every one will at once acknowledge the high dogmatic importance of the sacred writer's words. To work that out, however, is the province of the dogmatic theologian, and not of the exegete.

---

## SOCIOLOGICAL SECTION.

### The Ethics of Politics.

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, S.T.D., OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

#### II. *The Ethics of Party.*

THE small minority of the human race which believes in progress has achieved it mostly by antagonism. Human nature, in its present imperfect development, shows a curious affinity for half-truths, which fit the half-minds we are. But each half-truth is sure to be treated with exaggeration as to its scope and reach, which is sure to evoke a reaction toward the opposite and complementary half, while progress comes finally in the reconciliation of the two in a higher view, to the elimination of

"the falsehood of extremes."

It is this process which, in the field of politics, leads to the organization of parties. Generally the line of cleavage is that between conservative and progressive—between those who have fastened attention and affection upon the results already attained, and those who press toward an ideal state of things which lies in the future. Our own country, for instance, has been undergoing for more than a century a great process of naturalization, by which a group of isolated communities, jealous of their political distinctness and their local initia-

tive, has been transformed into a compact nation. Our conservative party, therefore, always has been careful of the local rights of the States and of the restrictions imposed by the Constitution upon national initiative; and our progressives have been those who labored for the consolidation of national power by its development in some specific direction. This, in spite of temporary confusions and obscurations, has been the main drift of our political currents.

There is, therefore, a relative justification for party. It saves us from stagnation on the one hand, and from hasty change on the other. In the present condition of things it serves uses which cannot be attained otherwise; but it is not in harmony with the highest political ethics, because it tends constantly to a breach of national brotherhood. For this reason, while the ethics of patriotism are positive, those of party are negative mainly. Their aim is to keep partisan feeling and activity within the bounds of reason and good morals, and to keep in view that party is but a makeshift means to an end, never an end in itself. While the nation, the family, and the Church are permanent parts of the social order, party is but a temporary phase of social development, which will come to an end with the larger ethical growth of mankind.

From its very nature, the spirit of party is hard to reconcile with the spirit



of truth. Party derives its vitality from just so much of the truth as it confesses, but its individuality and limitations from its denial, or at least its ignoring, of whatever truth does not fall within the party lines. The party habit of reading only those newspapers and hearing only those speakers which belong to the party fosters this. Yet men are made for the whole truth; it is their birthright. Party spirit converts them into Esau, who despise their birthright.

Even more directly evil is the partisan spirit which puts forward falsehood as truth, and thus undermines that mutual confidence which is the very basis of social order in Teutonic society. In Teutonic nations the social instinct is not, as in Romance countries, strong enough of itself to hold society together. We need, besides, the assurance of mutual truth-speaking between man and man, between rulers and ruled. We are kept in the sense of being members of one body, because we speak every man truth to his neighbor. Luther, who committed our Teutonic Protestantism to the principle that the truth is always edifying and a lie always the instrument of moral and social death, has well said:

"We Germans have no repute for any other virtue so high and, I believe, hitherto so well deserved, as for being faithful, truthful and stanch folk, whose yea is yea and whose nay is nay, as is shown by a host of histories and books. We Germans have still a spark (may God keep it alive and blow it into a flame) of this old virtue—namely, that we are still ashamed and will not gladly be called liars, nor laugh at it like the Italians or Greeks, or make a jest of it. And although Italian and Greek fashions are making inroads on us, yet we are still so far unchanged that there is no more serious or more shameful word of reproach among us than to call or be called a liar. And I verily think (if I may call it thinking) that there is no more abusive reproach upon earth than this of lying and unfaithfulness; for

there is none that so breaks up all fellowship among men. For lying and unfaithfulness begin the division of men at the inmost heart, and that once effected, hand parts from hand; and when that happens what can men do or make? Hence come the divisions, the party work and the unhappiness of Italy. When truthfulness and good faith are gone, then must all government come to an end also. God help us Germans."

The partisan spirit, when it reaches a certain intensity, is sure to undermine the habit of veracity. This is true not only of one party, but of all parties; not only of political parties, of all sorts of parties—religious, literary, artistic, educational, and all the rest. First by suppression of fact, then by suggestion of falsehood, and at last by open and shameless lying the party spirit accomplishes the *facilis descensus Averni*, the down-grade march to hell. The effect of this on the political life of a nation is manifested in the want of a manly stability and loyalty to principle in its public men. Apart from truthfulness there is no foundation for manliness.

In republican countries like our own, this foul spirit of lying appears especially in partisan attacks on the characters of public men. Envy is a vice of democracies. The Athenian who asked Aristides to write his own name on the oyster-shell, because he was "tired of hearing the fellow called 'just,'" was not an exceptional Athenian. He was just like any of the crowd that supported Cleon, because the demagogue-butcher bespattered the best in Athens with his abuse, and who thus helped the city to its ruin by driving good men to retirement. As Wendell Phillips said, "The devil's democracy is, 'I'm as good as you are!'" It is impatient of distinction and disbelieves in the supereminence of virtue and ability. It loves to hear dignities evil-spoken of, and to see greatness dragged down to its own level.

In America it seems to be the accepted rule that a candidate for office, and still

more the incumbent of an office, has forfeited what we used to call "the right of reputation." It seems to matter but little to the reading public whether the charges flung are true or false. Nor is this any recent or fresh abuse of our politics. Washington was libelled and abused as bitterly as any modern politician because he signed the Jay Treaty, and tens of thousands of Americans applauded Thomas Paine for addressing him publicly in this style: "As for you, sir, treacherous in private friendship and a hypocrite in public life, the world will be puzzled to decide whether you are an apostate or an impostor; whether you have abandoned good principles or whether you ever had any."

To counteract this partisan tendency we need that a hatred of lies—of the lies that make for our side equally with those against it—should become not only a sentiment, but a passion in our whole society—such a hatred of them as is seen in the strongest characters of history—in Socrates, in Dante, in Savonarola, in Luther, in Knox, in Carlyle, and in every man who was brave enough to refuse to bow to either tyrants or mobs. The Hebrew prophets mourned over their people as having sunk so low that they loved a pleasant lie more than an unpalatable truth, so that no trade throve so well as that of the false prophet, whose business it was to invent such lies. In that base preference they saw a paralysis of heart and conscience. In Christ's view lying and murder are in their root the same. The liar may not strike at the single life, but he does at the collective life of the community, since on speech, and mutual good faith in its use, is based all fellowship between man and man.

To be absorbed into the life of a party, to "belong to" a party—as the phrase is—is, therefore, a moral danger. It is lawful to act for the time with the party we think in possession of what the Puritans called "the present truth"—*i.e.*, the side of the truth the situation of affairs most calls for. But we have

no right to "belong to" a party, because we belong to the truth and to our country. Party, however, loves to put itself into the place of country, and to claim a loyalty due to one's country alone. It exalts party fealty to a level with patriotism. In view of this we need to "make a conscience" of our liberty, and to display a social courage which is only too rare in our free country; for independence of party has its risks. Arthur Tappan, Benjamin Hallowell and other brave men were bankrupted for their anti-slavery opinions before the war. Is the spirit which proscribed them dead now, or less cruel? Would that we all had the courage with which Hallowell replied to an angry Southern correspondent: "My silks are for sale; not my opinions!"

Besides the danger to individual integrity, party spirit is a peril to the nation when it is allowed to pass strict bounds of reason. In this respect the contrast of France and England is instructive to us. In English public life it is assumed of every man that he is, first of all, an Englishman and aims at the greatness of England; and that all English questions are to be settled in a lawful English fashion. As Burns says:

"The kettle o' the Kirk and State,  
What though a clout may fall in't;  
Dell the foreign tinkler loon  
Will ever ca' a nail in't!"

In France, on the contrary, party bitterness goes so far that since 1789 every party in opposition has been in the mood to welcome a foreign invasion, if that would bring it back to power. French politics tend toward the old Greek method of turning the beaten party out of the city, and thus simplifying the next elections. At one time it really seemed as if France and not England was to furnish the type of our own political life. It was the time when the passionate sympathies evoked by the French Revolution and by England's war on France had brought feeling to such a height, that a traveller in Ameri-

ca said he found here many Frenchmen and many Englishmen, but no Americans! It is this that led Washington, in his farewell address, to warn his countrymen against partisan heats, and especially against meddling with European quarrels. The burden of his solemn appeal in behalf of our national integrity rests on this very point; and while experience has abated the fear of this, we still need to remember that this is a precipice along whose edge our national progress moves. Statesmanship like that of Washington will not only discourage the spirit of dissension, but will strive to foresee and to remove the occasion for it.

But what can we expect of our public men, absorbed as they are in the partisan activities of our present system, and obliged by its exactions to "give up to party what was meant for" their country? When President Grant most infelicitously described himself as "the president of the Republican party," he but confirmed the Greek proverb that "the blundering tongue lets out the truth." I well remember how that slip moved the late Henry C. Carey, my dear friend and teacher. "The English," he said, "show more sense than we do. They put at the head of the nation a man whose business it is to get them all to pull together; and if he have a morsel of sense he will so use the immense influence of his position. We put into that place a man whose interest we make it that we should pull in opposite directions."

The spoils system, which has done so much to make the rulers of the nation the servants of party, is not an inevitable evil of our method of government. It had no existence in national politics until Mr. Monroe's second administration, when the law was passed terminating the commissions of officials at the end of four years. For the first quarter century the rule of service for life or good behavior was in force. "Few die; none resign," Jefferson said, when asked to put his friends into the places held by his Federalist unfriends. Presi-

dent Jackson improved on the new law by removing without waiting till commissions expired. It is this power to remove from office without giving a reason which has driven the office-holders to organize themselves into a compact "machine" to keep their party in power. It is this that has given them into the hands of political "bosses," by putting a premium on the qualities required for the control of conventions and the carrying of elections. It is this that has added so much to the fierceness and the unscrupulousness of political contests, since the living of myriads of office-holders is staked on the result. It is both unfair and useless to declaim against the "machines" and their bosses, since both are the inevitable outcome of a situation created by law and acquiesced in by our people generally. What we should do is to repeal the law of seventy years ago, and pass whatever others may be needed to give office-holders security against causeless removal. That will break up the machine as the sun of spring breaks up the ice on our rivers.

What is called civil service reform has not accomplished this, because it has begun at the wrong end. It has tried to take the second step before taking the first. Under the attraction of English example, it has adopted the method of competitive examinations, which can be applied to the candidates for a part only of the civil service, and which is sure to be circumvented by the "machine," if the motive for evading it is left untouched. In Philadelphia examinations were so manipulated in one case as to secure 92 per cent of successful candidates to the party then in power. In New York a professor of national reputation presented himself as a candidate, passed the examinations easily to his own satisfaction, but was scheduled as unsuccessful!

The direct corruption of voters by party-workers is an evil which universal suffrage was expected to remedy; but the value of a few votes in a closely contested district or State makes bribery

as feasible as it ever was ; and the evil of purchasing "floating" votes is a very grave one, although, I think, not so extensive as has been assumed. Not all nor even the greater part of the money paid to voters is in the form of bribes. Most of it goes to laggard or discontented voters to induce them to cast their ballots for their own party. This bad practice grew out of the fact that each party had a number of small election-offices to bestow at each voting place ; and of course for each office there were a score of candidates before it was given, and nearly as many "sore-heads" afterward. To conciliate these a trifle in money was given them for supposed or alleged services in electioneering ; and then other scores of voters, frequently men of some means, acted on the pauper's maxim : "If there is anything to be had, I may as well have it as anybody else." People who boast that they never voted for any but one party will hang round the polls and adorn the neighboring fences for hours, waiting for the trifle that is to reward them for the trouble of voting for that.

It also is to be said that both this kind of payment and that of a directly corrupting kind is the work of local committees, the larger national and State bodies generally having no money for these bad uses. These abuses exist in very different degrees in different parts of the country, being worst generally in "close" States and districts. I am satisfied that the politicians who are directly responsible for them would be glad to abolish the practice, if they only could be sure that both sides would agree to that and abide by it. Just as military men never have offered resistance to any international agreement which would restrict the scope and abate the horrors of war, so, I am convinced, the politicians would be glad of any agreement between parties which would eliminate the paying for votes under any conditions.

I have no such hopes from the introduction of the Australian ballot. It

will not touch the first kind of payments at all ; nor is it certain that it will diminish actual bribery. It is a shallow assumption that the man who is mean enough to take a bribe will not vote as he has been paid to do. Human nature is never so consistent, even in its rascalities, as this assumes, and the politicians know it. The secret ballot may put an obstacle in the way of terrorizing voters by threats of dismissal ; but how far is this a crying evil in our politics. A study of the vote in the last presidential election goes far to show that the American workman votes as he pleases, without the help of the secret ballot, while a Montana case proves that terrorism may exist in connection with it. The true remedy for terrorism must be found in the development of social courage in the workmen individually and in their associations collectively. Without that no method of voting can prevent a bullying employer from dismissing or "black-listing" those of his workmen who do not assure him that they voted as he wished. From that they can escape only by lying ; and *The Spectator* says that the Australian ballot "has sown England broadcast with liars."

The lack of social courage is a crying want of our political life. Only those who have tried to organize any independent movement to resist the domination of the "machine" or the "bosses" can realize how little political pluck the average voter possesses. There are plenty of Nicodemuses, who will come under the cover of the dark to say what they fear to utter in open day ; but there is a sad lack of men who will stand on the public platform and say to their fellow-citizens, "I for one will wear no man's collar and vote no man's 'slated' ticket." It is my own conviction that the ballot method of voting is the cause of this. You cannot train a man to do his shooting from behind a stone wall without tending to make a coward of him. A more open and manly method of voting would make the voter more frank and outspoken in

the weeks and months before the election ; and it thus would advertise public men more exactly of the movement of public opinion. And if "the Sermon on the Mount has anything to do with politics," the kingdom of peace and righteousness is not going to be advanced by the methods of darkness and secrecy it emphatically condemns.

Lastly, we need to guard against the spirit of party because of the check it puts to social sympathy. It teaches us to assume that the baser motive is always uppermost in those who differ from us. There are those who reject the conception of total depravity from their theology, who retain it in their estimate of their political opponents. One politician even improved upon it, by declaring that the sudden elevation of his political enemies to the level of total depravity would be attended with a fearful sense of guiltiness !

This habit of suspicion and dislike has become so deeply settled, that it clings to us in the treatment of social problems which are not party questions. It is rare to find in our newspapers—though not so rare as it once was—a candid and fair-minded treatment of any notable collision between capital and labor. Lord Derby's advice to make a ring in such cases and see fair play, while not the highest, is much above the usual practice. So when the American farmer had borrowed on mortgage-paper money that was worth from fifty-seven to seventy cents on the dollar, and was obliged by the Resumption policy to repay it in gold, with how little sympathy his situ-

ation was discussed on all hands ! Nor has he had much more in recent years, when his exclusion from the credit system of the country obliges him to sell his crop nearly as soon as it is harvested, to the benefit chiefly of the speculators in grain. "Put yourself in his place !" is a wise maxim in such cases. Its use was finely illustrated when the Sheffield outrages in 1867 had horrified the English people, and Parliament was required to find a remedy. Instead of asking what measures of severity would terrorize the authors of these outrages, English statesmen asked what were the wrongs which had made Englishmen fall back on so unEnglish a practice as assassination. By legislation they removed those wrongs, and the outrages ceased forever. So it is safe to assume that when some millions of the American people make a great demonstration of dissatisfaction and discontent, they have a substantial grievance, even although the remedy they propose may be a mistake ; but this is not a lesson that is learned in the school of partisanship.

In fine, the remedies for our political evils are moral remedies. It is not by skilful mechanical contrivances, but by a purer public opinion, that permanent and thorough reforms will be secured. For my own part, I am impressed with the need of a more earnest and sleepless loyalty to the nation, a more passionate love of truth, a nobler personal independence, a finer social courage, and a livelier sympathy with our fellow-citizens as remedies for the present evils of our political life.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

### **My Experience in the Cultivation of the Missionary Spirit.**

BY REV. JAMES MUDGE, D.D., CLINTON, MASS.

I HAVE served two churches in the last seven years—three years at W—and four years at P—. At the former

place the total sum raised for missions the year before my going was \$62, and this was a decided advance on anything previously accomplished. At the close of my first year \$100 was reported ; at the close of the second, \$160 ; and at the close of the third, \$188. On going to P— I found that \$61 had been

# THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXIV.—NOVEMBER, 1892.—No. 5.

## REVIEW SECTION.

### I.—THE CHRISTIAN A TRUSTEE.

By PRESIDENT MERRILL E. GATES, LL.D., OF AMHERST COLLEGE.

WITHIN the last few years it has become clear that the thoughtful men and women of our country are applying a higher standard to the use of wealth. The rapid accumulation of vast fortunes, rendered possible through corporations and the organization of capital, has led society to ask itself very seriously the question, "Is the titanic power conferred by these vast fortunes exempt from that law of unselfish service which governs all other forces in the social life of man?" Past generations of men have seen the tacit assumption on the part of the rich that a man was perfectly free to use his own property as he might choose to use it, merely for his own selfish indulgence if he wished. Even in those periods of the world's history when the moral responsibility for the use of wealth was least clearly felt, the underlying law that the possession of money carried responsibility with it found occasional expression in the demand that the man of wealth spend freely for luxurious living, that he might thus employ much labor, and indirectly make his wealth of service to his fellow-men. Such free spending of wealth for personal luxuries was an evasion of the dimly seen law that a man is morally responsible to God and to society for the full use of all the powers of service at his command. Yet the maxim, "The rich man should spend freely," carried in itself a standing protest against the assumption that a man is free to use his property solely for selfish ends. When the closer study of the principles that underlie political economy had made it evident that the free spending of money for luxuries and in luxurious wastefulness impoverished society as a whole, the obligation attaching to wealth became clearer in men's eyes, and could no longer be considered in any sense discharged by the mere spendthrift squandering of the wealth at one's disposal. Men learned that "consumption" in political economy means not the destruction, but the utilization of the products of labor. Society has come to see clearly that men can no longer be left

tion from the one meaning to the other is perfectly natural. The words of Thayer, in the work formerly referred to, may be taken as an expression of this statement: "Finally must be quoted the amphiboly or twofold use by which the writer to the Hebrews in ix. 16 sq. substitutes for the meaning *covenant*, which *διαθήκη* bears elsewhere in the epistle, the meaning *testament*, and likens Christ to a testator, not only because the author regards eternal blessedness as an inheritance bequeathed by Christ, but also because he is endeavoring to show both that the attainment of eternal salvation is made possible for

the disciples of Christ by His death (ix. 15), and that even the Mosaic covenant had been consecrated by blood (18 sqq.)." Dr. Lightfoot had in like manner said: "The sacred writer, though he starts from the sense of a covenant, glides into that of a testament" (on Gal. iii. 15). Statements such as these can be allowed no weight. The transition from covenant to testament is simply as difficult as the two things are different. So far from the argument being helped by such a transition it becomes hopelessly entangled.

(To be concluded.)

---

## SOCIOLOGICAL SECTION.

### Ethics and Politics—III. International Ethics.

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, S.T.D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

APART from ethics there is no sound basis of international relations. What we call "international law" is found, when we examine it more closely, not to occupy the same plane with "municipal" or national law. It is a law without a legislature to define its terms, or a judiciary to interpret and apply, or an executive to enforce obedience to it. It deals with the large questions which arise between sovereign States which own no superior, and which can be controlled only by considerations of what is right up to the measure of their apprehension of right. Hence the text writers mention as the prolific source of its maxims "right reason and natural equity."

That this so-called international law is not law in the ordinary sense of the word is shown by the efforts of the legal profession to convert it into something generically different from what it is. There is a tendency to harden its elastic traditions into rules as stiff as those of the statute-book. Thus the "three-mile limit" of international jurisdiction is referred to as though it had been en-

acted in so many words by some international legislature, when in truth it means nothing but the line reached for the shore by an ordinary cannon-shot, and has been thrust far out to sea by the modern improvements in ordnance. So again the legal profession strongly favors something like a codification of international law in the interest of greater exactness. But codes are for the few; they are the property of a profession, while ethical principles are the common possession of all men. This is a field in which popular feeling is sure to have a decisive influence on national policy; and it is best that the grounds of decision should be those on which all men can find themselves.

Indeed, it is a signal gain to the development of law generally that this branch of it should be left so much under control of ethical considerations. It is a gain that so much of public life and conduct is left outside the positive prescriptions of the statute book, compelling us always to fall back upon simple considerations of right. Municipal law has been helped into closer conformity with ethical principle by the attraction of international law, which often has outrun it in the direction of justice and humanity.

It is true that democratic peoples thus far have not been remarkable for their open-mindedness to merely ethical considerations, when their passions have been aroused or their interests imperilled by the conduct of a neighbor State. They have lacked that atmosphere of calm in which such questions must be discussed. But they generally have responded in the long run to the equity of strong men at the helm of State, as when Washington signed Jay's treaty, and Lincoln surrendered the Confederate envoys, Messrs. Mason and Slidell. It is hard for Demos to recognize in its true character the just thing that looks like a surrender, but it is one of his indispensable lessons. And when we remember that under monarchical rule wars have been waged for an epigram or a harlot, we consider that we are not the worse off.

1. Of the duties nations owe to each other, I put first that of sympathy with the feeling of nationality, with the sentiment of patriotism. Indeed, this international sympathy is indispensable to right regard for our own country. "If I count it," says Frederick Maurice, "an unspeakable blessing for myself to be the citizen of a nation, I must count it an unspeakable blessing for every man. If I, being an Englishman, desire to be thoroughly an Englishman, I must respect every Frenchman who strives to be thoroughly a Frenchman, every German who strives to be thoroughly a German. I must learn more of the worth and grandeur of his position the more I estimate the worth and grandeur of my own" ("Social Morality," p. 123).

2. This sympathy carries with it the recognition of every sister nation's right to its own life, and the free control of its own national order. Each has the right to be one people apart from all other people; the right to give what shape it pleases to its government; the right to work out its own destiny in whatever fashion it pleases, so long as it does not infringe upon the rights of its neighbors. This principle antago-

nizes the imperial schemes of conquest, which wage war upon national societies, generally on the plea of bringing them under a more perfect order or within the scope of a higher civilization. In our own history imperialism used to present itself as "the gray-eyed man of destiny," under whose lead we were to subdue the continent from pole to pole. Of late this talk has been less noisy than before the war.

But even now we hear of desires to bring our Northern neighbor into the Union, will she, nill she. Has the command "Thou shalt not covet" no validity for nations? Were Canada to ask admission into the Union, even then it might be worth while to hesitate and reflect before adding her problems to our own. In truth the best service she can render us is to develop a strong, vigorous and independent nationality on our northern frontier—if not to balance our own, yet to show us the other way of doing things that we both have to do. Rome was not the stronger and more lasting power for having wiped out Carthage, its only rival. Canada never can destroy our preponderance, since we have an area twice as extensive as the Roman Empire, and a population greater than that of all the rest of the continent.

International respect for the sentiment of nationality has gained and grown with every decade of this century. When "kings crept out again to feel the sun" after Napoleon's fall, and met in Vienna to reconstruct the map of Europe, it was Talleyrand who saved France from penal dismemberment by persuading the monarchs that the only safe principle for them was that of *legitimacy*. That is, they must recognize political power as equally sacred with private property, and put Europe back to where it was in 1789. So Germany and Italy became once more the likenesses of "crazy quilts," the former being divided up among some two score of sovereign princes, each with the right to wage war, coin money, enact laws, and intermarry with the royal caste. A



former neighbor of mine in Philadelphia told me that he used to take his morning walk across the territories of two sovereign principalities ; and at the universities it was said that a reckless fly once effaced one principality from the map by leaving a fly-speck there ! Goods passing up the Rhine in 1816 paid duties at twenty-two custom-house frontiers before they reached Constanz, getting rebates from the States they were leaving. And as for Italy, Metternich said that the name was nothing but " a geographical expression ! "

Legitimacy ruled to the overthrow of Spanish liberty and the suppression of free speech in Germany by the Holy Alliance. But when the Greeks revolted against the Turks, all educated Europe blazed out in sympathy. Yet it was only by a diplomatist's oversight that the allied fleet annihilated that of Turkey at Navarino in 1827 ; and George IV. spoke the sentiments of his fellow-sovereigns when he publicly called that battle " an untoward event. " But the magic word " Nationality " had been spoken, and the dead nations began to " search for swords in their sepulchres. " Poland, Italy, Germany, Belgium, one after another was stirred ; and in 1859 Italy was reunited to an extent it had not been since the time of the Ostrogoths. Germany in 1866 and 1871 became a nation, and Italy in those years completed her process. Whoever looks on the map of Europe to-day sees a very different coloring from that put on it in 1815 ; and whoever lives to see that map in 1915 may find Poland, Bohemia, and Ireland no longer colored with the coloring of neighbor powers, and the Balkan peninsula a federal State of Christian nationalities.

It is indeed in the Balkans that the process of European opinion is best illustrated. At the opening of the century the Christian peoples were held to one another, and to Russia by common religious sympathies. As the century went on, and ethnographical science emphasized the ties and differences of race among them, they began to fall

apart, but the Slavic peoples of Servia, Bulgaria, and Macedonia clung to Russia still. Thanks to the impulse given to the rising generation in Roberts College by American missionaries, these racial sympathies gave place to those of nationality, leaving Russia somewhat in the position of the respectable hen who has hatched out a brood of young ducks and sees them take to the water. So throughout Christendom we find the peoples striving for national unity and distinctness. Their battles are ours, and their victories ours also.

3. The next duty one people owes to its neighbors is respect for their rights of possession. " Thou shalt not steal " is just as much a command for them as " Thou shalt not kill. " " Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark ; and let all the people say amen. " The Monroe Doctrine is an application of that principle to the affairs of this continent. It built a wall of fire around the nascent nationalities of the new world, and commanded the Holy Alliance to confine its lawlessness to the European continent. It would have been well if all our relations with our neighbors had always been on the same level. But we abandoned our own position in the war of aggression we waged upon a sister republic twenty-five years later. It is not hard to see that that war, a concession to the demands of the slave power, led on by moral necessity to the war for the Union, in which our sin against Mexico as well as against the slave was so fearfully avenged. But it was the Monroe Doctrine, fearlessly applied by Secretary Seward, which set the soil of Mexico free from French invasion ; and it is the same doctrine which shuts this continent against the schemes of partition and colonization, in whose interest Africa has just been divided among the leading powers of Europe.

It is objected that our occupation of our own territory rests on an unjust foundation, if this principle be true. Were not the red race the rightful owners, and we the unrighteous intruders ?

But in what sense could the little handful of red men—some 250,000 in all, according to the best authorities—be said to possess the territory now occupied and yet not filled by 65,000,000? And while there are many stains upon the dealings of the white man with the red, it is not true that the story is one of mere plunder and violence. In the commonwealth of Massachusetts, for instance, his title to the land was extinguished by fair purchase; and in one case, where the settlers of a new town had driven a hard bargain with him, the general court of its own motion set that aside, and ordered that just compensation be given. In truth the Indian always has been ready to sell, because his own savagery made his land worth far less to him than were the things he obtained in exchange. His condition altogether has been improved by his contact with American civilization. It is a pity we have not done more for him, and that we have not absorbed him entirely into our civilized life.

4. It may sound strange when I say that war is at times an international duty. But this is exactly what must be said of a just war in defence of national rights or in vindication of oppressed peoples. There are many good people who hold war to be the worst of international evils, one indeed which embraces all others, and is therefore to be avoided at any sacrifice. They speak of it as a source of hatred and bitterness between men and nations. It is not necessarily so. It is certain that such feelings seldom exist between the actual combatants, and there is no need that they should exist at all. And on the same ground we might act for the suppression of suits at law, which certainly have this evil tendency in an eminent degree. Equally weak is the argument against war from the suffering and death it occasions. Some reason on this point as though the slain in battle would have lived forever if war had not been, while, in fact, most of them probably would have found more painful deaths in their beds. To our hedonist age mere

physical suffering seems the worst of evils; but this is to confound nerves with conscience, when we make pain an evidence of moral evil.

I shall not linger on the objection that war occasions the destruction of property, for often as this Mammonite argument is pressed upon us, it is safe to say that the conscience rejects it whenever any moral principle is seen to be at stake. Indeed, among the uses of war is this, that it serves as a corrective to the worship of Mammon and to the individual selfishness which threatens to overthrow modern society. It awakens men to the sense of something greater than possessions, or than life itself. It emphasizes the ethical principle that in everything but conscience the individual is at the service of the community in which he lives. If the human world has been constructed for moral ends, war will not cease until we attain to its uses without it. When selfish pleasure and the love of ease cease to be controlling motives in life, when heroism is as attainable without as with the touchstone of peril, and when public spirit makes all sensual good seem a lesser boon than social well-being, then we will disband the armies and melt the cannon.

But it is war in *international* relations that we are to discuss; and I do not hesitate to say that the greatest service that one nation can render to another may be to thresh it into a sense of its duty to its own people and the world. The duty is still plainer when war means the emancipation of subject peoples from the rule of "the unspeakable Turk" or any similar despotism. All the wars that have been waged for the emancipation of the Balkan peninsula, from that rule, stand for less misery and wrong-doing than a single decade of the rule under which the Christian peoples of that region have dwelt for centuries. It is to such wars that I allude in denying that war is wrong in principle.

It is argued that between civilized nations, at least, there should be a recog-

nized method of arbitration. To me, as to Professor Sedgwick, of Cambridge, this seems to be one of the many cases in which good people seek a mechanical substitute for the ethical growth, which alone can put a final end to such evils as the conflict of international interests. And it is a device which is sure to break down disastrously as soon as a case arises in which the feeling is intense on the side against which the arbitrators decide. It will avail only for the settlement of petty disputes.

It is argued more specifically that arbitration should be established between the two great English-speaking powers, so that peace may reign uninterrupted throughout the Anglo-Saxon world. It is well to remember in this connection that England has waged more wars since 1815 than all the rest of the civilized world, and that these generally have been wars suggested by the mean motives of trade or conquest, or both, only that with Russia being a collision with a great power. It certainly would be convenient for her to have a nation which no other dare attack single-handed, tie its hands by a pledge that under no circumstances will it fight her. But the oppressed peoples, whose corpses she has built into the fabric of her empire, would have reason to mourn that we had set her hands free for farther aggression.

5. While international ethics condemns all unjust and aggressive wars as wholesale murders, it also exerts upon all kinds of warfare a steady pressure in the interest of humanity and of peace. It has effected the exemption of non-combatants from the hardships of military operations, so far as this is possible. It has enlarged the exemptions of private property from seizure. It has imposed just and effective restrictions upon the means used to destroy hostile armies, and has placed its ban upon all measures of needless and useless slaughter. In the future it will extend these restrictions more widely.

6. In the same spirit, international ethics has tended to remove restrictions

from the intercourse between the nations, and to facilitate the migration of individuals and families from the more densely settled parts of the world to those which offer them better openings for self-maintenance. It is now asked whether national self-preservation does not require in our own case that severe restrictions be placed on immigration. We already have the just restrictions which forbid the importation of labor under contracts which debar it from demanding the highest rate of wages that is paid. But it is said that this is insufficient, and that, in the interests both of American nationality and of American labor, immigration should be placed under restrictions, which would reduce it to very small dimensions.

As to the fear of swamping nationality, that is not new. It was first awakened when the great Scotch-Irish immigration poured into the northern tier of the New England States, and flowed into Massachusetts, and next flooded Pennsylvania, deposing the Quakers from the control of the commonwealth, and setting aside Penn's humane Indian policy. Professor A. L. Perry tells me that in Worcester, Mass., the immigrants began to build themselves a Presbyterian church, but the solid men of the town came in the night and tore down the framework, saying, "We will have no Irish church here!" So it has been with every successive flood of immigrants, and yet the American nationality has shown itself strong and attractive enough to assimilate all those varied elements, and has grown richer and more varied by the process. Today, in our public school and college system, we have the means of carrying forward this assimilation as never before; and the largest free immigration is relatively smaller, as compared with the whole nation, than it was in the past.

As to the American workingman, he is helped and not hindered by the coming of free, self-respecting immigrants, who will take nothing less than American wages. Each immigrant is a competitor for employment with the men in

his own line of work, but a customer for those in every other line, and it is to be remembered that we have not yet entirely recovered from the harm done by the importation of contract labor before the peasant law was strictly enforced.

It is argued that the coming of so many Roman Catholics must endanger our liberties and imperil our educational system. Then, why have the American people strengthened the hands of that Church by the annexation of so many Roman Catholics in Louisiana, Florida, and the annexed districts of Mexico? My own interest in the struggle for Ireland's emancipation from alien rule has brought me into very close and friendly relations with a great many adherents of that Church; and I am persuaded that the fear of its disastrous influence on American liberties is baseless. Its members love and prize the freedom of our land, and for the most part have a righteous jealousy of any encroachment upon those liberties which are the heritage of us all. They would join one and all in the prayer of their own poet-bishop, Spalding, of Peoria:

"And thou, O God, of whom we hold  
Our country and our freedom fair,  
Within Thy tender love enfold  
This land; for all Thy people care.  
Teach us that only they are free  
Who walk obedient to Thy will;  
And slaves are they who follow ill,  
Which is the foe of Liberty.

"Lift up our hearts above our fortunes high,  
Let not the good we have make us forget  
The better things that in Thy heaven lie!  
Keep still, amid the fever and the fret  
Of all this eager life, our thoughts on Thee,  
The hope, the strength, the God of all the free."

7. The last duty of international ethics I shall discuss is that of peaceful influence through example and opinion. How much more potent this is than military force may be seen from the story of our own relations to the State system of Europe. It was, for instance, the example of a democratic people maintaining their national unity by the most splendid sacrifices, and tak-

ing up with honor and honesty the burdens that war had entailed, which changed the drift of public opinion in Europe from imperialism to democracy, and thus made the overthrow of the second empire inevitable. The same grand example strengthened the nationalist sentiment in Italy and Germany, and helped to their unification. The weight of American opinion is admitted by Mr. Gladstone to be a great help to him in the policy of justice to Ireland. Let us hope that American example and opinion will avail also for the overthrow of the militarism which is crushing Europe, by giving fuller scope to the principle of nationality, and thus reconstructing the lines between Germany and its neighbors on lines of justice and peace.

I cannot agree with Mr. Gladstone and Lord Tennyson that trade between the nations has had a similar influence for good. The poet's "fair, white-winged peace-maker" has been too often a "swamp angel." The great trading nations have been the great fighting nations, not excepting Rome, which engaged in the last Punic war at the instigation of her bankers, who were underbid in the money market by their Punic rivals. Venice, Genoa, Holland, England, these have been no promoters of peace. As General Napier wrote to Mr. Gurney, the traders mostly began the wars, and the soldiers put an end to them. In truth, trade as at present managed is so purely a matter of selfishness that it cannot be expected to serve ethical uses in the regulation of international intercourse. It is noteworthy that the trading class in China and Japan is generally out of sympathy with the unselfish labors of the missionaries, while the military class in India, on the contrary, generally sympathizes with and supports them.

Our own influence has been greatest and most beneficial in countries with which we have not much trade. The grand work done by the missionary colleges at Constantinople and Beyrout is an instance of the highest service one

nationality can render to another. It has been all the stronger because the American in Turkey is not known as a trader seeking private ends, but as a teacher giving his life for the welfare of an alien people. On those lines, in

diplomacy and in missions, by the contact of public opinion with opinion, and by the inspiration of example, let us who have freely received of the best things God has to bestow freely give to our fellow-men !

---

## MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

### **How to See Something of Europe, Egypt and Palestine on Two Dollars a Day.**

BY REV. CAMDEN M. COBERN, PH.D.,  
ANN ARBOR, MICH.

*"The scholar who cherishes the love of comfort is not fit to be deemed a scholar."*

—CONFUCIUS.

IF the Parisian papers are to be trusted, it has not been many months since the *Potsdamer Zeitung* was prosecuted by the Emperor of Germany for libel because of a paragraph which stated that His Majesty occasionally travelled in a second-class coach !

For Americans of such royal sensitiveness the following practical and homely suggestions were not intended. It is the writer's conviction that there are many young students and ministers who would not fail to take a year for foreign travel if they knew how cheaply it could be done. Such a man is willing to endure some discomfort for the sake of economy. He wants to see the country, the people, the museums, the art galleries. Little does it matter to him whether he sits down to the elaborate *table d'hôte* at The Central or stands by the counter and helps himself in the Workingman's Restaurant. He has a good appetite, and can eat what is set before him, asking no questions for conscience' sake. His sister might notice the table linen or peep into the back kitchen, but this young Petruccio sees only the small balance at his banker's and grows healthier and heavier on rough diet. To such an one these hints may be of some value.

If any reader who possesses the un-

comfortable gift of a fastidious palate desires also to profit by them, let him multiply the living expenses accordingly. If this same brother has a wife who must also see the sights with him, let him multiply the entire expense account several times more.

Let it be added, further, that no attempt is here made to do more than estimate the actual necessary outlay for travelling, lodging, and board. Personal expenses for clothing, baggage, books, pictures, souvenirs, tips and fees at museums and palaces, stationery, etc., are too arbitrary and indefinite to be calculated. My note-book tells me that I spent a dollar a week for paper and stamps alone !

It may be said in the beginning that the prudent man will travel alone or with one or two carefully chosen companions. He will take with him no trunk, but a solid valise, in which he can carry one change of clothing, various weights of underwear, a few staple medicines, some soap and a towel, and whatever else he needs. A light pillow and stool may be strapped to the valise. A kodak and large shawl can be carried by hand. The married man will also leave a good life and accident insurance policy behind him, although it has been said that he is less liable to be killed abroad than if he had stayed at home. Certainly if he lives to return, his increased vitality will be his best investment for years to come. Now for some figures.

The actual expenses of transit on an extended tour are surprisingly low. Second cabin from New York to Liver-