

notice that the Divine Founder of our religion and His apostles deliberately confined their teaching to personal morals.

Living as they did under a heathen imperial government, which would have crushed them without mercy had they been suspected of any political or revolutionary aim, they left the political world severely alone, content to sow the seeds of new principles and a new spirit in individual hearts.

And this attitude of the Saviour and His immediate followers towards all that concerned the corporate or political life of the community, while they rendered to Caesar without question or criticism the things that were recognized as Caesar's, has doubtless exercised a continuous influence on succeeding generations, tending to deter men from bringing the higher moral standards of the Gospel teaching directly and unreservedly to bear upon the conduct of public or state affairs, and so leaving a great portion of our public opinion and activities in these departments of life still outside the pale of Christian ethics.

Following upon this, and in some degree as a consequence of it, we may note the prevalent lack of any systematic training the young in the right application of moral principles to the details of their public life.

We are indeed so far from adequately recognizing the duty of giving such training that there still survives in ordinary society a very general prejudice to the effect that a religious teacher should confine himself to what are called religious matters, and abstain from all political teaching, as if political morality might safely be left to grow of itself.

Thus, throughout our whole educational system we find very little systematic training in the morals of citizenship.

In other subjects it is recognized that the young must be trained and disciplined for the work of their practical life by systematic daily lessons, repeated and learnt again and again—decies repetita docent; but we act as if our social and political morals were expected to grow without any such daily watering and tending; and the result is an attenuated or arrested moral growth such as may be constantly observed in political action, temper and opinion; and remembering how deep-rooted and tenacious of life are selfish motives and traditional, conventional and old-world ideas, we must acknowledge that we have no right to expect a very different result until we take more pains to secure it.

But the most fundamental reason why a late or slow growth in corporate morality was to be expected is, that all real moral progress is from the individual heart outwards, and consequently corporate advance has to wait upon individual advance.

Thus the tide of moral advancement first of all uplifts the individual, and then the family, and after that the tribal, the national and the international conscience.

National and international morality are thus seen to lie on the outermost fringe of moral influence, and they rise in consequence very slowly.

In this slow uprising, amid the struggle of contending forces, we find, as we have seen in the instances already quoted, compromise and lax judgments prevailing in public affairs with regard to matters in which no compromise and no such judgments would be tolerated in private personal relationships.

So it comes to pass that after all our centuries of moral and religious teaching, with all the treasures of ancient and modern thought in our hands, all the great examples before our eyes, and all the spiritual teaching of the ages in our ears, what