

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE IV.

A CENTURY OF WAR AND ITS LESSON.

BY REV. SAMUEL OSGOOD, D.D., LL.D., NEW YORK CITY.

GRATEFUL as was our last years' review of the first century of our national life, and hopeful as was our anticipation of the new century now opening upon us, it is plain that we do not yet belong to the happy family of nations that shall not learn war any more.

“Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God,” we are all ready to say; but these words of our Lord in his Sermon on the Mount come to us with the rising blessing of ages to deepen their rebuke of the present warfare of nations. Between men as individuals, and in social, literary, commercial, and religious relations there has been a constant and memorable progress in good neighborhood. The civilized world now has very much the same music which is the voice of sentiment, and the same arithmetic which is the tongue of trade; it employs the same engine to carry its freight and passengers, and the same lightning to carry its news; and it is getting to read the same books, to wear the same clothes, to like the same dishes, and to have very much the same code of polite manners; perhaps even to enjoy the same great moralists and preachers. Men, as mankind, have gained wonderfully in peace, and they who fight each other with fists or weapons are branded as ruffians and locked up as criminals. But the nations, what are they doing for peace? Alas, anything but peacemaking; and never was what they call their peace footing so warlike as now. It is best for us to treat the subject for ourselves, and from our own point of view, as we cannot be everybody, and look out for everything. We are American Christians, just at the close of the first century of our nation,

and trying to make up our mind and purpose as to the new century now opening before us. Let us ask what we are to think of the war-making of the last hundred years, and what we are to do for the peace-making of the hundred years to come.

I. What a time among the nations that century has been—the hundred years from 1776 to 1876! The new life was stirring in the Old World and the New at the outset, and there was a vague and restless feeling abroad among the people that startling changes were at hand. Voltaire led the protest against the old despotism among scholars and nobles, whilst Rousseau was stirring among the plainer people the great crusade for nature and man against artifice and tyranny,—marvellous prophet as he was of the new literature and society. Kings caught the contagion; and Frederick the Great of Prussia was ambitious with his pen as his sword, the disciple and the rival of Voltaire, the admirer of Washington, and the helper of Franklin and Adams in international law; whilst Joseph II., then on the throne of Austria, made the simplicity of Marcus Aurelius his model, and had as little liking as that imperial sage could have had for the Jesuits and their ways; in fact, anticipating Bismarck in his raid upon Rome. With the new ideas and movements there went a great hopefulness; and if theologians spoke less than usual of their millennium, illuminists, full of the rising free-thinking, saw a new age of light and liberty at hand; and such enthusiasts as Rousseau and St. Pierre were revelling in their visions of universal peace.

What a strange and fearful awakening from those dreams! Three great groups of wars cover the ground of that century since 1776. Wars from the uprising of the people against arbitrary kings; the American Revolution beginning the fray in triumph, and the French Revolution closing it in defeat; then wars between the new military autocrat, whom his nephew, Louis Napoleon, called the testamentary executor of the French Revolution, and the old monarchies whom he defied, ending in the triumph of the old kings, and the reign

of the Holy Alliance ; then, last of all, the wars of the nations for their life, ending with the uprising of Italy, and the consolidation of Germany and of the United States of America. It is useless to try to present these gigantic conflicts rhetorically, even in the most general descriptions ; and the picture, even if successful, would more distract our nerves than edify our spirit. Such names as Washington and Lord Howe, Napoleon and Wellington, King William and MacMahon, Grant and Lee, suggest enough for our purpose, and may tempt us to love war itself for the splendor of its triumphs and the fascination of its heroes.

But, without any slur upon the men or the nations who have taken up arms against invasion, we ask for the moral of all this carnage, and we would bring the wisdom of history to urge the justice and mercy of God and humanity upon the nations. It has been, and is, taken for granted that war belongs to our civilization, and that no important progress can be made without the appeal to arms. For an act which is in itself an essential immorality, — the repudiation for the time being of moral principle, and the resort to physical force, — what possible justification for this act can there be, except the bare assertion that it cannot be helped, and because the war spirit exists it must continue to exist ? The same argument can be used to justify all the brutal quarrels that have cursed our race ; and all that is said in defence of war between nations has been said in behalf of encounters between individuals. All the arguments against the old fist and club law between persons hold good against the present sword and bayonet law between nations, and bear against it with manifold force. We have, to a great extent, the law of right to keep men from assailing each other ; and we need the appeal to that same law to keep nations from assailing each other. The nations are, as belligerents, still to a great extent barbarians, and war, with all its recent reforms, is essentially barbarous. It is the sway of might over right, the domination of the strong and the oppression of the weak, organized destruction and wholesale murder.

Look a little in detail at the war record of the last century — the chronicles of slaughter that followed the inauguration of the reign of humanity and the jubilee of equal rights. The memorable work of Süssmilch, the father of statistic science, upon "The Divine Order in the Changes of the Human Race," of which the fourth edition was published at Berlin, in 1775, opened the way for the searching and comprehensive method of moral statistics which is now interpreting history and life in a light so new and startling, and bringing war, with all other vices and crimes, to the bar of judgment. He thus spoke of war: "It is hurtful, not only because it robs the nation of many, but also of the best men who are in their best years, — yes, generally in the bloom of life, — from whom a numerous and strong posterity might be expected. Not only battles, but the consequences of camp life, destroy many men. Finally, war is also in the highest degree terrible and destructive, because it not seldom brings with it as companions those two other enemies of the human race, pestilence and famine." No man has brought together more facts bearing upon the enormities of war than Dr. Alexander von Oettingen, in his great work on Moral Statistics and Christian Ethics. He asks, "Upon whom are we to lay the responsibility, when we consider that in the wars of the French Republic and the Empire (1792-1815) more than five millions and a half of men, or about two hundred and forty thousand every year, were more or less sacrificed, and that in the Seven Years' War six hundred and forty-two thousand were devoted to death for their country? Are Napoleon and Frederick the Great the hangman and executioner whom we have to accuse? Is it not rather the case that the collective persons whom we call states and nations have waged those wars for the promotion of their own interests, as if to manure the field of their political life with blood?" So, also, he adds, "it is a collective guilt which images itself in the loss of life since 1815. They call this period of fifty years comparatively peaceful. But at least two millions of men have within that time, on

European soil alone, been obliged to learn that the individual must expose his life and die for the passionate ends of the community. A more bloody proof for the truth of the social, ethical view can hardly be alleged. Every dying soldier is a document for the position maintained by us, that the death of the individual has at the same time a representative relation to the race." This was written in 1868, before the last war between Germany and France.

If we add to the number of the wounded, the disabled, and the slain by war, the destruction of useful commodities, the loss of productive labor, and the immense cost of armies in peace as well as in war, we have a fearful reckoning before us as the penalty of the fighting dispositions of men. Oettingen estimates the number of men absorbed by the military power of Europe as about five millions, at a cost in peace, apart from the expenses of war, of two and a half milliards of francs for standing armies (1863), while the yearly budget for popular education was only one hundred and fifty millions, or six per cent of that sum. In the work of Henry Merlin upon the Civil Budget, it is shown that France appropriated to the army and navy, not including Algiers and the colonies, from 1853 to 1866, not less than nine thousand three hundred and eleven milliards of francs; whilst for public instruction only three hundred and twenty-five millions, or three and four tenths per cent of that sum, were appropriated.

Add to the costs of war the disease, intemperance, and crime that go on its track, and haunt its marches and its halts, and the catalogue of its ills is more than it is wholesome for the imagination to contemplate. I will not go into the account of the costs of our recent war; for we know enough about them without such painful reckoning. It is enough to say that those of us who have not believed in war as the right adjustment of wrongs, who did all that we justly could for peace, and who reluctantly, but loyally accepted the war forced upon us by a demented sectionalism, have had all our scruples justified by the result. Such monstrous destruction of property and life, such waste of the best blood

of the nation, such corruption of private and public morals, such bloated wealth and such widespread embarrassment, such frauds in private business and such rings of public corruption, such demoralization of trade and utter repudiation of the first principles of finance, such premature admission of ignorance and animalism to the functions of election, such inauguration of military force and such perversion of the courts of justice, such unsettling of the morals of trade and the principles of religion, as we have seen for the last fifteen years — who that studies these facts wisely will be the eulogist of war, however loyally he may have accepted the fatal necessity?

But no enumeration of particulars can duly present the enormity of the evil. As already hinted, the state of war is to a large extent the repeal of law, the abolition of justice, the resort to violence, and rule of force. The practice is essentially inhuman and ungodly. It sets man against man in mutual hatred and injury, and offends the justice and mercy of God. I know very well that war has its apologists, and even its eulogists; that Cousin regards it as the consequence of the necessary conflict of ideas and the condition of progress; that Dr. Leo calls it not only the necessary symptom of the unconquered egoism of nations, but an indispensable scourge for depraved times and corrupt masses; that Proudhon, who calls property theft, calls war the deepest and finest phenomenon of our moral life. "No other can be compared with it — neither the imposing festivals of worship, nor the acts of royalty, nor the gigantic creations of industry. It is war that makes the mightiest notes in the harmonies of nature and humanity; it acts on the soul like the clap of thunder, like the peal of the organ. A mingling of intellect and courage, of poetry and passion, of the highest justice and of bravest heroism, makes its majesty astonish us; and the more we reflect upon it the more it commands the enthusiasm of our heart. War — in which a false philosophy and a yet more false philanthropy show to us only a monstrous evil, an outbreak of inborn

weakness, and the manifestation of divine wrath—war is the most incorrupt utterance of our conscience—an act which positively, and notwithstanding the impure influence mingling with it, honors us highly before creation and before eternity.”

What stuff this is; and well worthy of the man who called property theft, and who understands ethics and political economy equally well. In both capacities we may say of him what a recent writer has said of the war doctrine: “We believe we are listening to a lunatic.” More wisely writes Vacherot: “In the eyes of the philosopher war is wholly like the duel, an act of barbarism which tends therein to limit civilization, and finally to suppress it.”

It is not true that no hatred remains after combat, and that public combatants easily forget their quarrels, and become personal friends. Our sectional animosities teach otherwise; and Germany and France, now at peace, are eyeing each other in a way that bodes no good for them or for the world. Whilst nominally at peace, with the exception of Russia and Turkey, Europe is paying the expenses of war and supporting at least three millions of men as her peace establishment. The figures from this last new year's court almanac of Gotha are not festive, as they gave us with Christmas the census of the standing armies of the world in round numbers, England 228,000, Italy 205,000, Austria 257,000, Germany 401,000, France 490,000, Russia in Europe, 540,000 combatants, besides 82,000 non-combatants, and the whole account foots not far from 4,000,000 of men as the present peace establishment of the civilized world.

According to Emile de Girardin, in his recent essay on “The Question of Money,” it appears as if all existing governments, excepting those of England and America, were fast hastening to a bankrupt condition; a state of things which he ascribes to the mutual suspicion which compels all the powers of Europe to maintain fleets and armies to keep their neighbors in check. His figures are not precisely according to our estimates, but we give them as they are in his pam-

phlet. The result according to him is that Europe is one vast camp; the soldiers of England, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, and Russia costing those governments about \$500,000,000 annually. England's army of 106,000 men costs \$53,250,160; France's 480,000 men, \$112,913,298; Russia's 575,000 men, \$137,034,925; Germany's 412,000 men, \$92,764,603; Italy's 205,000 men, \$37,176,086; and Austria's 273,000 men, \$47,705,914. The support of the various navies also costs \$135,000,000 a year; of which England expends \$60,000,000, France, \$35,000,000, Russia, \$24,000,000, Germany and Italy, \$7,500,000 each, and Austria, \$5,000,000. M. de Girardin concludes from the estimate of naval expenses that the danger of universal insolvency will never be removed until rulers shall cease to prosecute their search for an armament which no projectile can pierce, and a projectile which no armament can withstand.

What perversion of wealth and men, what loss of production to a race as yet, on the whole, poorly fed, clothed, housed, schooled, and churchéd! What a comment on the passions and selfishness, which are quoted in justification of war establishments! What a proof that the race, that has learned so many things, has not yet learned to treat each other with justice and kindness in the most dignified of relations—that of nation with nation—under the providence of God! What virtual denial of the kingdom of God, this constant expectation of violence and glorification of force! The gospel of Christ is wholly against the usage of war, not only by expressly forbidding the resort to force in extending religion, but by calling the nations to live together within the kingdom of God, and to enlarge and consecrate the old Hebrew nationality by Christian comprehensiveness and humanity. “From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts?” They who are God's children are not war-makers; and from the deeps of the eternal Godhead they draw that Holy Spirit, whose essence is the love that unites the Father with the Son, and calls all souls and all nations to the unity of all differences in the harmony of peace.

It is said, indeed, that wars inspire devotion ; and that the hymns and litanies of nations have been born in the anguish and conflict of battle. If so, not among the war makers, but among the war victims ; not among the violent men who have tried to submit nations to their rule, but among the patriots who have stood up against aggression, or the martyrs who have died for the right. At present the war spirit is not religious, as it tends to strengthen the rising materialism that ascribes the universe to matter and force, and regards society as the resultant of material forces. The strife of the nations that begun a century ago with optimism, and dreamed of universal liberty and equality, threatens to end with pessimism and its nightmare of universal cursedness, that looks upon love as madness, marriage as treason, birth as damnation, and death as the only salvation from this life of strife and disappointment and this world of tyranny and despair. In triumphant Germany pessimism is the rising philosophy ; and its wails of despair are heard in the pause of the trumpets of jubilee. Not only philosophy, but art catches the contagion, and a peerless composer like Richard Wagner makes music for the age, not to remove, but to solace the general gloom, as the nightingale sang of old in the grove of the furies. We surely are, in some respects, an accursed race, and we waste our blood and substance in riotous living. We drink ourselves into blindness and want, and we fight ourselves into wounds, disease, and death, in a sweep of folly and dominion of madness, that bring the innocent and the guilty into the same ruin. War and whiskey are the prime movers of the mischief ; and they are opening ever the gates of hell against the kingdom of God and the prayers of his children.

II. This is our view of war-making and war-makers for the last hundred years. Now what are we to say and do for the hundred years now opening upon our nation and the world ? Is the same old story to be told over again, and the history of civilization to be always written in blood ? Many seem to think so, and probably some cool heads who

now read these pages, and who do not like at all the war-spirit, are ready to ask what we can do to change it. Human nature, they say, is very much the same old Adam that it always has been, and men and nations will fight as they have ever done. War is not an opinion that depends upon argument, but a fact that goes with force. When forces of numbers or nations conflict, the issue is war, and conflict they must so long as rivalry exists, and wealth and power are in question. In modern society wars, moreover, continue among the most civilized people, and they who are too thoughtful to follow the madness of passion, cannot resist the policy that studies the balance of power. Professing to look at men and events, not as a sentimentalist, in mere feeling, or as a theorist, in mere abstractions, but as a calm student of history, and a friend of reason and conscience, I have a few words of a positive kind to say for peace-making as we face the new times.

1. Begin with the true principle, that there is justice between nations as between men, and that this justice ought to be embodied in a code of international law. We are not to wait for the powers of the world to balance their interest and passions by the old game of war, but to meet the question of the balance of power by the balance of principle. We do this in our personal relations under civil law. Why not do it between nations? When rival interests and ambition clash among us, as neighbors and citizens, we do not bring clubs and guns to bear upon each other, and fight until it is decided who is the strongest, and forces adjust themselves to their own equilibrium, but we start with certain principles of justice and law, and, as far as we can, we make them hold unruly violence in check, and keep the due balance of power. The human body is a good illustration of the normal state of the body politic in this respect, and the heavens illustrate the just order of the earth. We keep our standing on our feet, and we walk safely among trees and men, not by leaving our hands and feet and shoulders and head to struggle together for the mastery, but by acting from

the royal brain and vision. Man is balanced on his feet and walks well when he sees well, and without his eyes he stumbles, and makes chaos of his limbs and movements. So society should have its vision, and the nations should be guided by leading principles that save them from chaos and collision. The order of the universe is from central law, and not from the resultant of lawless forces; so that every planet and star rebukes the jumble of conflicting nations.

Many, indeed, who allow that just laws should balance conflicting powers, say that it is a Utopian dream to think of bringing this about; and even if the law could be made it could not be carried out without a central authority, that cannot be established, and might be dangerous to liberty if it could be established. The sufficient reply is given alike by the course of civilization and the truth of our religion. Civilization has been constantly bringing law to bear upon the passions of individuals and the barbarism of tribes, and the idea of international justice is not a new thing, but simply an extension of the sober experience of history. A peaceful, organized nation is as much an advance upon the wild tribes that were assimilated by its laws as a fellowship of nations under law would be an advance upon the present belligerent state of nations. The logic of history needs only to go on with its work to lead the sober statesman to join in the blessing of the peacemaker, and to welcome the commonwealth of man. There has been a certain progress towards the result in our time; and from Franklin to Gladstone, from John Adams's great treaty to Professor Bluntschli's noble work on Universal Civil Right, we have seen cheering steps forward in the reform of wrong courses between nations. It was something that the Holy Alliance of 1815 rebuked the monstrous policy of papal Rome by taking the Greek and the Protestant church into its fellowship in Russia and Prussia; something, that in the Congress of 1856, at Paris, Turkey was allowed to represent herself, and a Mahometan nation was reckoned as having part in the rights of men and the hopes of civilization; something, that America and

England have been willing to refer an exciting and delicate question to the arbitration of the Council of Jurists at Geneva, and repeated congresses have been held to deliberate upon a code of international law. Our country has no mean place in this movement, and Bluntschli gives to Dr. Francis Lieber the honorable name of being first among jurists to draw up a code for the conduct of armies within the country of enemies, and to do all in his power to take from war its horrors.

Let us not be afraid to accept international justice with the highest of all sanctions, and to urge it upon the nations with the power of conscience and the authority of religion. Why shrink from saying boldly in the pulpit that the nation is a divine institution, a historical life, a moral personality, and not merely a business partnership or a convenient economy. No nobler book upon this subject has been written than that on the Nation, by Rev. E. Mulford, an honored clergyman of the Episcopal church, and I think it a part of my duty to commend it to favor in this Essay. Make conscience of the nation, or we betray our trust; and if the ministers of religion ignore or disparage the national life, and fail to enlighten and strengthen the public conscience, they will find their place occupied by other friends, and in new America, as in old Rome, the wolf in sheep's clothing will take possession of the neglected fold. We need the wisdom of the children of God to keep peace among the nations by holding up the justice which brings the balance of principle to bear upon the conflict of powers. They surely are blessed as peacemakers who see the eternal right and interpret it into law.

2. With this balancing rule of principle we need moral and active force—the exalted force that belongs to the children of God. It is a great mistake, either in regard to the order of nature or the order of human life, to try to annihilate power. The true method is to transform and to exalt it. The soldier himself is not to be destroyed, but to be transformed, and the military spirit, or what is best in its composition, is to be carried up into a higher plane of life—

a doctrine not hard for us to accept who read the word "soldier" in our baptismal office, and who as such are all enlisted in the militant church. In this respect many censors of warfare make a great mistake, and in condemning battle they forget the virtues that are often trained in its school. Even so wise and generous a thinker as Dr. Channing fails to appreciate the military character, and he does not fully recognize the intellectual and moral qualities that make the great soldier, and bring such comprehensiveness, combination, and spirit to bear upon the strategy and the tactics that raise and move armies and marshal them for battle. There is mind in the great soldier, and a rare force of will, which closet philosophers are slow to appreciate. Perhaps the kind of original force in a heroic will partakes as much of the character of genius as originality of reason and imagination. Surely, all manly virtue is an inspiration, and the great things that have been done in peace, as well as in war, have been done by its power. Add will to ideas, and they are forces, and they carry originality into action. Such original force dwelt in the primitive Christians, and as a militant church they carried all before them by their exalted force, and shaped the world anew according to the patterns seen by them in the mount of God.

This force we need in our modern life, to rob war of its fascination by transforming its strength and by making the carnage of war mean and odious by contrast with the valor and the victories of peace. We have neglected too much this view of the subject; and our schools and colleges, our professional, and especially our theological, training has lacked the muscular vigor and the nervous force that give military life its charm and strength. Our scholars are too much a lily-livered, pale-faced, timid class of men, and hosts of our theological students cannot stand the fire of a thousand eyes without hiding behind a manuscript. We need to change all this, and give tonic force to all the offices of peace, more chivalry to society, more vigor to enterprise, more daring to well-doing, more dash against evil, more

originality in mission work; nay, more energy in prayer itself—the prayer that lifts the might of the filial will to the eternal throne, and brings the Eternal Spirit to bear upon the affairs of men. Criticise the Caesars and Napoleons as we may; but do not forget that from Paul to Wesley, from Latimer to Patteson, the militant children of God have had much of their material, and were not less, but more, brave than they.

We need the elevation of force, the ennobling of the will-power in our education and art, our business and pleasure, our politics and our society, as well as in our religion. We must make peace more manly, and even more martial, than war, and not even allow war to have the best use of the drum and trumpet and cymbal. In my native town, not long ago, when the horse malady prevailed, the men of a great furniture factory dragged the carts of furniture into the neighboring city, and were spurred on, not by whips or curses, but by a band of martial music that went before them; and this seemed a better prophecy of the future of labor than any of the wild visions of internationals. Bring out this idea of the elevation of force in every way, in schools and workshops and on our farms, but do not forget to base the movement upon the highest principle, and to maintain that the supreme force comes from God himself, and that his children, as such, are peace-makers, because they draw from the purest fountains of power, and by their faith and baptism they live from the Spirit, who is the Lord and Giver of life, and have the fulness of the Eternal Father and Son, and the might of the whole fellowship of blessed souls. In this very point of the suppression of war we need the help of exalted force; and until a regular international tribunal is established, moral strength must hold the umpireship, and keep the nations from madness and death. If the pope can do this, let him do it; but he needs better help than he has had heretofore, and better ideas of his duty as peace-maker. Let him repent of his crusades and his inquisitions, and, like a good Christian, which we hope he is, join with all the children of God in bringing about the reign of peace.

3. Last of all we need not only the balance of principle and the elevation of force, but also the organization of peace, alike between classes and nations. Strange that there is often more order in war than in peace, and the chaos of society compels the fearful discipline of the field. Here the especial problem of our age opens upon us; the problem of social science and social art, the true philosophy of society, the adjustment of its ways, and the guidance of its walks. The problem will bring in its answer the practical settlement of the war question; for when men and nations live together in any sort of reasonable order and co-operation, war will be stigmatized as robbery and murder; and they who try to kindle its fires will be brought to judgment as enemies of the human race. The nations are made for each other, and are bound to bless each other by mutual trade, culture, and fellowship; and when this is seen, standing armies will vanish, and the gold that has been the sinew of war will be the strength and beauty of peace. I am not dreaming of any speedy regeneration of society, or sudden perfection of the institutions of the earth, but only waiting upon such moderate advance in social economy and good neighborhood as will keep nations from taking each other by the throat and spoiling each others goods. It must come; and why not within the opening century? A hundred years ago Priestley and Lavoisier began a new order in the science of nature by interpreting the chemical constitution of the material world and the principles of definite proportion. Why may not we begin or continue the true interpretation of the elements of society and its proportions and combinations of peace?

It is as unwise to deny the solidarity of society as to deny the solidity of nature; and if war, with its call to sacrifice, and its heritage of want and wretchedness and hatred, proves that truth of social liability which the church so urges, why not peace? Why should not peace call us to share its blessing together, and to leave its heritage of mercy to generations unborn?

Many and magnificent powers are at our command, and,

with all the tremendous engineering of war, the armament of peace can laugh it to scorn; for peace creates, whilst war destroys. They that follow the divine order shall have the divine help; and the meek — they who submit will to justice, and have the gentle majesty of obedience — the meek shall inherit the earth.

Take this subject home to ourselves, and do what we can for peace between nations and in nations. We have some influence to give to the recent movement in favor of international arbitration, and some of us have done what we could in its behalf. Let us all try to help it, and especially try to keep and strengthen good feeling between America and England, the two great powers who have led the way in this peace policy, and who are likely to have so much to do with the future international history of the race. In our intercourse with men of other sections of our own country let us be kind and true, at once loyal to the national order, and strenuous for the rights of every community and every citizen as for our own, and as jealous of the aggressions of military power over them as over ourselves.

As citizens and as men we have something to do with guiding the thought of our people at this interesting season of our history; and we are to do our part to give a high tone, a wise aim, and a generous spirit to our centennial rejoicing and its historical record; to endeavor to make it a memorial of national brotherhood, as well as of patriotic pride. Perhaps every association of clergymen has its especial work to do, and its word to say. Those brethren have had an especial part to do who were in the Church Congress that lately met in Philadelphia and Boston, and was to meet in New York in October; and they will make a great mistake if they do not make that congress tell upon the mind and heart of the nation at large, and prove that they have not been so perverted by Latin superstitions and assumptions as to forget that George Washington and William White were members of the same church a century ago, and that their example calls the good Christian to be the true patriot. Clergy and

laity are called to work together in all of our great Christian assemblies as never before, for humanity as well as piety, and for the living gospel which is both human and divine.

We are to do what we can for a sound statesmanship in all things, and a public rule that shall make our republic to be peace. We are to bring the wholesome freedom and solid conservatism of religion to the defence of law and the nurture of virtue. We are to strive for such charity among all Christians as shall make Christianity one with true humanity, and show that our church is the school of life and the home of love, not a debating society or a metaphysical club. We are to favor the more comprehensive and generous interchange of thought and feeling between all earnest minds, and do what we can towards a pure and powerful public opinion that shall make the people and the press of America a power among the nations. Sometimes we may properly be a little sanguine, and take bold and far-reaching views of things to come. Indeed, it is sober wisdom for us to give high importance to the attitude of our country now; and the century past, in its sober history, is a startling prophecy of the century now opening. Take the broadest generalization that presents itself to us now, and remember that we are on the threshold of the twentieth century of the Augustan age and the Christian era, and that the empire of the Caesars — which preceded by about thirty years the birth of Christ, as this time precedes the twentieth century — began what we may fitly call our own peculiar history, and still prosecutes its claims in connection with the gospel of Christ in the pontiff who asks to be recognized as head of the church and king of the nations. The state and the church! How those ideas and powers came together, and still work together or fight together, — the Augustan culture and the Christian church, — the temporal power and the papal crosier, — sometimes united, sometimes divided, how their contact and conflict run through the ages, and are before us still!

We acknowledge the justice that is often recognized in the Roman law, which Justinian solemnly dedicated, in his

Institutes, to Almighty God; and we do not deny the right of the Roman bishop to minister to his people, nor do we wish to let down, in any respect, his spiritual functions; but we acknowledge powers which neither Caesar or Pope have ever recognized — even the great and free nations which have been raised up in the order of providence. They are positive facts that history cannot ignore, moral powers that conscience cannot neglect, and they present divine lessons that faith cannot reject. Dante, father of modern literature, and foremost of the new patriots, wrote in his essay on the rising Italian language that he heard the word of God breathing from the heavens in the new tongues of the nations; and he dared to put his great poem into Italian, although the papal Latin tried to laugh it to scorn. The Italian stands; so does the French, the German, the English; and the tongues, like the litanies of nations, came not only from the heart of nations, but from the Spirit of God. Let the nations live together, and love and serve each other to the end of time.

It is not easy, nor is it wise, to leave this subject without a closing word upon the aspect of the war question at the present time, when we as a nation are entering upon the second century of our history, and considering our political and moral relations with each other and with the people of the Old World. It is cheering to be able to say that peace prevails now throughout our land and our hemisphere. It is wonderful that our great army has disappeared, and that our standing army, which was rated last year at twenty-five thousand men, now falls even below that estimate. This fact is one of the most encouraging aspects of our situation as compared with that of European nations; and, monstrous as our present burden of taxation is in the nation, — the states and the municipal governments, according to the statement of the President of the New York Chamber of Commerce, burdened with seven hundred million dollars yearly, — we have no reason to despair of seeing prosperity return, if we introduce just economy into the public service and private

life, and strive wisely and bravely to bring out all the resources of our soil and our industry. We must remember that peace, like war, and in some respects more than war, needs sagacity and generalship and combination. We are, in a certain sense, not merely a nation, but a family of states; and although we have no present fear of a new rupture between the states, we are not to forget that the war spirit may exist wherever hatred exists, and that it is the part of good citizens and good men to reconstruct the good temper and the good neighborhood of the states, as well as to keep the peace outwardly.

Perhaps we may call our own true peace policy a part of the international code that the world is looking for; and surely, if we are judicious in so adapting our laws,—as, for example, our laws of electing Presidents and distributing the civil service, and regulating the industry of the country in such a way as to secure the tranquillity and prosperity of our republic,—we can with a good face say our word of reconciliation to the belligerent nations of Europe. If we are one nation from many states, we may make our national motto a text for preaching to them the need of making less account of the old boundary lines, and carrying on the good work that has already been begun of constructing or reconstructing the United States of Europe. There probably has never been seen such an example of the spirit of conciliation in the victorious power as in this country within the last twelve years; and the heart of our people goes with the President in removing the last traces of the strife by recalling the national troops from the states most suspected of insubordination. There is good hope, certainly, of taking out the old roots of bitterness; and what we need more than anything else, to this end, is the bringing of the most judicious and patriotic men of all places and parties together to work for the common welfare. It will be well if positive Christian sentiment can be made to join in this service, especially that sentiment which feels that all men need to forgive as they need to be forgiven, and that our very frailty, self-conceit,

and self-will should further the very unity which they at first threaten, by teaching us that we are all very much alike in our perversity, and we ought all to agree in our sense of sin and our prayer for God's grace before the mercy-seat of the Eternal Judge. It is not necessary to advocate the union of church with the state in order to maintain the idea of being Christian in all relations, and to rebuke the folly and the wrong of so separating religion from civil life as to leave the affairs of government and the relations of rulers and parties wholly to worldly policy and human passion and selfishness. May God keep us and our America in his Spirit.

The outlook towards Europe is not at present very auspicious of peace; yet it is not well to accept the darkest prophecy as the wisest. It is not wise to take it for granted that we are on the eve of a great religious war, whether the belligerent parties are held to be the champions of the Romish church and the Protestant nations, or the Greek-Russian church and the combined powers of Turkey and Islam. As to the imagined war in behalf of Ultramontaniam, there is no nation that is willing to march under that banner; and France, which could not keep the pope's temporal crown on his head when it was there, can have no motive to fight to put it back in a war which would endanger the pope's spiritual authority—that power which no nation now ventures to assail by arms in this age of general toleration.

As to the Russian war with Turkey, there is no assurance that it will bring all Europe into the fray—little prospect of its being a war of all Christendom with Islam. Christendom is not inclined to elect Russia as her champion, or to make the Czar her commander of the faithful. The most civilized nations of Europe know too well the oppression of Poland and the genius of the Russian church and state to expect the millennium of peace and virtue from the conquest of Constantinople by Russia. It is probable, indeed, that the Turk must quit Europe before our century closes, and that his departure will come from other forces than bayonets and cannon, torpedoes and ironclads. If the *Ter Sanctus*,

as we hope and pray, is to be heard again in the church of Santa Sophia which Justinian erected, it must be under the influence of laws not less mighty and sacred than those which Justinian dedicated to the Christian God in his Institutes. If the Christian is to take the place of the Turk, it must be by restoring the manhood which was lost by the superstition and monkery that opened the way of Mohammed the Second to the city of Constantine. We must wait and watch for the new civilization that is to restore the Byzantine empire to Christendom.

We may justly add in conclusion, that these views of the wrong and the madness of war and the wisdom and duty of peace have received new confirmation from the events of the past year in both hemispheres. * What an opportunity the great powers of Europe lost in not compelling Turkey to stop her misrule by peaceful arbitration, and what a frightful tragedy is the war-record which chronicles wounds, death, and demoralization in both contending nations, with little prospect of relief.

Brighter is the promise of our America. God bless our wise and worthy President, and his principle and his policy of peace.