

study the history of this kind of progress to see how in the ages past, and down to our own times, public opinion has been first gradually evolved, and then slowly elevated, and made to become a spiritual force of sufficient energy to destroy old abuses and brutalities which were indescribably vulgar and vicious.

Some of these abuses are just now dying, and some remain to be rooted out, all legalized traffic in bodies and souls, all war lust glorified into national policy, and doubtless some other matters of universal interest. In these things the Church represents, or has at least been set to represent, the ideals of Jesus, and it is undoubtedly discharging this mission, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, but all the same moulding, in its way, that spiritual force in the world which for want of a better name we call public opinion. It may not just now seem so, but the scarlet ages are ending. The nations will never again permit an international war. This unspeakable barbarity was once the occupation of savage tribes. It then became the sport of stronger nations. Later it was the privilege of civilization. Now a universal sentiment of irresistible force is arising that it can no longer be tolerated in any aspect whatsoever. It has been a long and tedious process and progress, but the fact is obvious enough, and the Church in its two eras has laid the foundation for it.

An earlier and clearer conception of this part of the mission of the church in the world would doubtless have hastened the end so greatly desired by all good men in all ages, but it seemed to be so slow, so ineffectual. And there was so little of the idea of cumulative righteousness, especially social righteousness, that the interpreters of Church thought were tempted again and again to regard a quickly realized individual salvation in a better world as the whole mission of the Church in this.

Possibly this might not have mattered so much had not its segregating effect so limited the influence of the Church upon the world concerning its two greater functions of personal salvation on the one hand, and social redemption on the other. We bewail the wide indifference both of the world and the Church in matters of religion, and perhaps fail to inquire into the causes of this indifference.

I will venture to name one of its root causes, hoping that it will at least provoke inquiry and discussion. It is the segregation of the church, the pew, the pulpit, the seminary, based upon a narrow, inefficient, and unscriptural conception of the mission of the Church in the world.

There are strong forces of the most influential citizenry represented in the several Church bodies, whose drive in the direction of social righteousness, including all the house cleaning and national rescue which this implies, is discouraged by their own literature and leadership in so far as that influence is sought to be concentrated upon definite ends and purposes, and made effective by such concentration. Here may be vision, the inspiration of a great and noble cause, and of a mighty effort, but all this is practically dissipated by the obsession of a tradition which has come down from times, practically dissipated by the obsession of a when any effort toward social redemption seemed to be totally useless and hopeless, and the whole mission of the Church appeared to be to get a few men and women out of a hopeless world as safely as possible.

Since no political or partisan coloring can be given to these ideas except in the inability to understand, or the effort to misconstrue them, we will only say that first discouragement, and then indifference, is the logical effect of a policy, or of a theory, of non-service which

has no rational foundation either in reason or revelation.

Barber, Va.

THE ANSWER.

(From Asheville Citizen)

(The Mothers of America to President Wilson.)

We give our sons!
By the splendor of America,
Born and nurtured amid the crash
And thunder of the arms of war
That stained and tore the western sky;
And by the stalwart souls that blazed
With blood the path to liberty;
And by the green graves of our dead
We send them forth!

Forward they go!
Not bending under weary weight
Of years, but in auroral dawn,
Of manhood glorying in strength,
Fierce with youth's adventurous fire
And flushed with life's red wine.

We send them forth!—To what?
To vast embattled hosts of men,
Writhing in titanic throes;
To guns that blast the human form,
To carnage and to belching fire:
To hell made visible! Our boys,
The children we have borne, the sons
Who lisped their prayer in baby tones
Around our knees!

We send them forth! For what?
To battle for the flag whose stars
Sang in creation's dawn a note,
A bold, wild chant of liberty,
A deathless lyric prophecy!
For this they go!

(And if in the distant field of war
A dart winged by the hand of death,
Shall touch the boys we love,
The "Great White Comrade" to their side
O Father send! Mid the fierce crash
And scream of elemental strife
May he, august, serene, appear!
To hold the hands that used to clasp
Our hands in by-gone days, the hands
That we no more may touch or press!)

We give our sons!
They now go from us to the shore
Drenched with heroes' blood, to war
For Truth, who rears above the storm
A banner blazing with God's light,
A crest resplendent with His love.
For this they go!
The helpless wail of infancy,
The broken heart of widowhood,
The liberties of men unborn,
The cry of vast humanity
These summons our strong sons! And we?
We weep—and bid them go!

—Mary Jasper Willis.

Montreat, N. C.

GOD'S OPINION OF THIS WAR.

In the heat of strife and when self-interest is aroused, it requires a Herculean sense and love of justice to form an unbiased judgment. The calls of self are so loud and, after the strife has begun, the desire to win becomes so intense that to think sanely demands almost "a miracle of grace." But to be right on any question is always the summum bonum for the time. The pacifists among us are now largely driven to their holes, but no doubt their opinions are about the same. Many Christians are not exactly able to reconcile this or any war with certain words of Christ; and, like Alexander being unable to untie this Gordian knot, they cut it in twain with the keen sword of necessity. Orators, at patriotic meetings, call out never-failing applause by the fervent cry, "My country, right or wrong—I am for my country." A lady lecturer not long ago said with eloquence and tender pathos, "I don't know what to think of this war. Jesus

said, 'My kingdom is not of this world; else would my servants fight' and 'Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.' It seems to me the Bible does not justify any kind of war. But I am for my country and my boy may soon be a soldier." Now what is all this but von Bethmann-Hollweg's "necessity knows no law"? Is not this worse in one sense than the great German's position? He acted without consulting the Bible. This marshals the Scriptures against us and then says the thing must be done anyway. We must, as a nation—composed chiefly of Christians or adherents of that glorious faith—find a real solution; or as a nation we shall come out of this war with conscience blunted by supposed sin and our faith weakened by a conviction more or less clear that our Bible religion is unfitted for practical life—at least in some vast respects.

Jesus is Not Against Us

in this war. When he said, "My kingdom," he was not discussing the things proper for earthly governments, but the rules that should obtain in his own, and be used for the promotion of his own. His language renders two facts clear: (1) His kingdom was to be founded upon his death, not on the protection of his life by bullets, bayonets and showering shrapnel, "else would his servants fight that he should not be delivered to the Jews." The way of dying was his way to world empire. If he had lived on the world would have perished. The redeeming love of Christ and certain kindred truths, carried to others in the heart of a believer, constitute the only instrumentalities to bring in the day when "they shall not hurt nor destroy." Hence in this kingdom "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal." (2) But until that happy time earthly governments must exist for the protection of human life and property; and they must rest partly on force righteously exercised to restrain wicked men and defectively sanctified men. Otherwise conditions would be unsafe and unhappy and life often impossible. When he said if his kingdom were "of this world" his "servants would fight," it was logically implied that such procedure is indispensable. There is not a hint of disapproval. And when Paul three times used his Roman citizenship for protection (Acts 16:37, 22:25, 25:10), and even sought the guard of four hundred and seventy soldiers on the journey to Cesarea—which implied fighting if necessary to shield the innocent—it is clear they rested partly on the sword for safety while they employed the weapons of love. Jesus, in giving that golden instruction about "the other cheek"—instructions that have been practiced by really red-blooded men—did not say, "Whosoever shall smite thy wife or daughter or sister on the right cheek, tell her to turn the other also, or whosoever shall shoot or drown the women and children as well as men of your country, tell him to come and shoot and drown some more." The Bible is a practical book—a book that men can live by always if they only understand it.

John the Baptist

in his teachings tallies exactly with this view. When soldiers, among his converts, asked, "What shall we do?" he did not have their swords beaten into plowshares. Such a procedure would have been disastrous because wild beasts in human shape were still abroad. He simply said, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely and be content with your wages." Luke 3:14.

Cornelius, When Filled With the Holy Ghost, did not think his position as centurion in the Roman army must be abandoned. Peter, who