

ask him?" I am glad to bear witness to this much of truth in our brother's description of the position of the Universalist Church. We *do* represent God as all Love. We *do* "concentrate thought upon his Fatherhood." We teach that his government is altogether paternal, and we think that we are loyal to the Lord Jesus Christ in taking this ground. But it is not, therefore, fair to say that the Universalist estimate takes away from God the element of Justice. On the contrary, we contend that *because* he is just our estimate must be the true one; and one of the plainest inconsistencies in our brother's argument the other night was in saying that we "take away" justice from God, while at the same time he admitted that we reject the notion of eternal punishment as unjust, because disproportionate to human guilt. If we take this ground, surely we assume God's Justice instead of denying or ignoring it.

And we *do* take this ground. In the most positive terms we declare that all God's ways are just. But we think that men make a most disastrous and uncalled for mistake in assuming that the Justice of God is something separate from, and antagonistic to, Love. Where got they this idea? Not from the Gospel surely! It is said not that God gave his Son because he is just, but because he *loved* the world. Was the gift, therefore, contrary to Justice? "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us ALL, how shall he not with him also give us all things?" Paul said—"Neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Why say that Justice does what Paul declared could not be done? Love is the Christian synonyme for God, the word chosen to express his whole nature. Justice is that Love doing its work—ruling the universe. To be just must one be unloving? Can God be just only by hating those who transgress his laws? This seems to be the estimate men have made, the principle according to which they think he rules. Beyond question it is the principle upon which society has sought to dispense justice. We have seemed to feel that our only duty to criminals is to make them suffer. But how abortive have been our attempts to administer justice on this basis?

See how our criminal classes keep their ranks full—how our penal laws create the crimes they were intended to suppress—how our prisons are but schools of felony, from which boys graduate fitted for a life of guilt! How has this come about? Clearly by our failure to see that the ends of justice are not answered by the suffering and confinement merely of the criminal, but only by his reformation.

Thank God we are at last learning this, as the movements for prison reform throughout the Christian world bear witness! Can

we n
than
ing?
refra
beca
Ce
—"v
that
is we
Justi
Love
I a
pledg
ness
be fe
of wi
TH
sum
And
for t
earth
besid
suffe
peris
stake
whic
indiv
of th
reck
since
all in
to th
Ou
cann
frank
is ne
blas
nite
law-
crim
Di
who
curs
not t
that
sinn