

to all of the vital issues in the domain of politics and economics, and a consideration of not only our duty as citizens of a country, but our effective influence as citizens of the world.

W. G. BROWN.

Toronto, 1st mo. 17th, 1895.

SELF-DEFENSE FROM A CHRISTIAN STANDPOINT.

"My kingdom is not of this world else would my servants fight," was the emphatic declaration of the Master on a memorable occasion, and for more than two hundred years his disciples and followers bore a no less emphatic testimony, and sealed it with their blood, "I am a Christian and therefore cannot fight." Many professors of the present day look upon offensive warfare between nations and communities as both needless and cruel, though not prepared to look upon defensive warfare in the same light. What is true of nations is true of individuals, for are not the former but aggregations of the latter. What command is more explicit than to "Resist not evil," and this taken with the context I infer to mean to resist not evil with evil, but to overcome evil with good, for love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is the fulfillment of the law. In endeavoring to make myself understood, I shall make no apology for quoting largely from the lucid essays of Jonathan Dymond as being most likely to accomplish my object, merely preceding it with the Christian axiom, "If God be for us who can be against us."

"The instinct of self preservation, it is said, is an instinct of nature, and since this instinct is implanted by God, whatever is necessary to self-preservation is accordant with His will. This is specious, but like many other specious arguments, it is sound in its premises, but as I think, fallacious in its conclusions. That the instinct of self-preservation is an instinct of nature, is clear; that because it is an instinct

of nature, we have a right to kill other men is not clear. The fallacy appears to consist in this—that it assumes that an instinct of nature is a law of paramount authority. God has implanted in the human system various propensities of instincts, of which the purposes are wise. These propensities tend, in their own nature, to abuse, and when gratified or followed to excess, they become subversive of the purposes of the wisdom which implanted them, and destructive of the welfare of mankind. He has therefore instituted a superior law, sanctioned by His immediate authority; by this law, we are required to regulate these propensities. Now he who will be at the trouble of making the inquiry, will find that a regulation of the instincts of nature and a restriction of their exercise is a prominent object of Christian morality. I do not maintain that any natural instinct is to be eradicated, but that all of them are to be regulated and restrained; and I maintain this of the instinct of self-preservation. What are the dispositions and actions to which the instinct of self-preservation prompts, but actions and dispositions which Christianity forbids? They are non-forbearance, resistance, retaliation of injuries. The truth is that it is to defense that the peaceable precepts of Christianity are directed. Offence appears not to have even suggested itself. It is "resist not evil," it is "overcome evil with good," it is "do good to them that hate you," it is "love your enemies," it is "render not evil for evil," it is "whoso smiteth thee on one cheek." All this supposes previous offence, or injury or violence, and it is then that forbearance is enjoined. I shall be asked—Suppose a ruffian breaks into your house and rushes into your room with his arm lifted to murder you do you not believe that Christianity allows you to kill him? My answer to it is explicit—I do not believe it. The mode of proving, or of stating, the right to kill an assassin is this: "There