

not merely of rightly relating the individual and the community, but also of relating rightly to one another these various form of living social organisation in which the life of the community resides.

Further, the supposition that the demands of the State, both general and particular, (since the State itself is held to be a divine institute), define the moral obligation of the individual involves at last a denial of the freedom of the Spirit. "The wind bloweth where it listeth," and the Spirit may express Himself through the State. But it is surely a very arbitrary assumption that He always does so. It is very hard to reconcile this view with many passages in history. On this showing the State can never do wrong. When Church and State have been in conflict, are we to assume that the Spirit is speaking with two contradictory voices? The truth is simply that, like every other natural institution, the State is intrinsically neutral from the moral point of view. It has just as much moral authority as its own practical and active righteousness entitles it to have. In a democratic State, moreover, it is questionable whether the State ever embodies anything higher than the average moral level of the community; and if the frontiers of State requirement are to represent the precise boundaries of the moral practice of individuals, then there is an end for good and all to the independent mind and to original and creative goodness. We are condemned in perpetuity to a dull moral mediocrity. Adventurous

virtu
tiona
that
mum
upon
his n
only
State
or h
prog
in s

I
Stat
obe
logi
was
dep
ing
aga
elb
as
Ch
has
on
lib
the
wh
we
lit
its