

who seem to be most useful and the sparing of those who are a burden to society. In these cases, if I am right in my judgment, the Infinite Power that is controlling this universe, is wrong.

I need not stop here to set forth the reasons why I have more faith in the wisdom of that Infinite Power than I have in my own. I will only say that I believe that Power never makes mistakes and that I very often do, and that therefore I prefer to be guided by the eternal principles underlying the operations of that Power rather than by my own warped judgment, when the two conflict. Or, to put it another way: It has been pretty well agreed, from the time when Cain slew Abel to the present, that it is wrong to take another's life—and I unite.

But have not men also agreed pretty generally that there are circumstances under which it is not wrong to kill?

Yes, but there has been no sort of agreement as to what circumstances justify murder. Some have said, a difference of opinion as to religion or the possession of property is sufficient excuse; some say that a difference in uniforms and flags is enough; some make no exceptions but such as has been urged in this paper. Now, the point is that it is better and safer to abide by what all agree upon as right than to undertake to make exceptions, knowing that we are fallible, and having blind emotion for a guide. And among those who have been faithful to the principle, even unto death, making no exceptions whatever, are the greatest moral exemplars of the race.

But the instincts of self-preservation and of defence of one's family, are divinely given and are as fundamental to the development of the race as is the ethical law against murder.

That is true, but as the race develops there come newer and higher instincts to supplement the old. The difference between a man and a brute is just this: the one has only the brute instinct for

the preservation of himself, his mate and his cubs, while the other has—in varying degree, to be sure—the instinct of righteousness. And just in proportion as this last is stronger than the first, is its possessor more of a man and less of a brute. The instinct of self-preservation is still efficient and still good although there may be with it a higher one that leads some animals to sacrifice their own lives in defence of their dependent young. And both of these instincts are good and will always be powerful in man although he recognize—as no lower animal can—the still higher law of righteousness by which he must sacrifice his life and everything else he holds dear in order to be true to a principle.

But shall we then drop our hands and let the evil-disposed walk over us and possess the land?

By no means. Jesus taught and practiced non-resistance, but Jesus said, "Be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good." He tried it. Did he fail? The good of his life and death has been one of the most powerful agencies in the overcoming of evil ever since.

That will do for an occasional individual, but suppose we all did as he did. Well, if everyone did as he did the millenium would be here. If most did as he did, the rest would soon be converted.

Do I believe the wrong-doers of the world could be kept from stamping out the saints if the saints did not forcibly restrain them and even put them to death.

Yes, I do. People are learning that the best way of dealing with evil-doers is not to burn them or cut off their ears, or shut them up in foul dungeons, or to inflict any pain by way of penalty. We are learning that the only effective ways of dealing with them are those suggested by love and sympathy and the sincere desire to benefit not the person sinned against as much as the sinner himself.