

beautiful prayer in which he asks God to forgive his trespasses as he forgives those that trespass against him. That spirit which he prays for as a virtue on Sunday, or in his home, he will repudiate as a vice or a weakness on Monday, in his club, or in Parliament, or on the Stock Exchange.

Such is the blunt conclusion of our greatest writer on sociology, and we should find it hard to confute his testimony.

Another distinguished writer has said that the key to all rational estimate of European politics is to recognize that the dominant factor in them to-day is the passion of national self-assertion, the struggle for national primacy. For right or wrong the great nations are resolved to make themselves as big, as formidable, as extensive, as rich as science and energy can make them, or at least to tolerate no other nation bigger than themselves.

For this they are ready to sacrifice almost everything at home or abroad, their traditions, their safety, their credit and almost their honor.

And we might add to this testimony that it is this same principle of selfish greed which is mainly responsible for that degrading and mischievous influence in English life commonly described as jingoism, that spurious or bastard patriotism which it should be the aim of every ethical teacher to eradicate and destroy, planting in its stead the true progressive Christian patriotism, whose aim is righteousness and goodwill.

Again, the most distinguished man of letters now engaged in English political life is reported to have said only the other day, when referring to the prevalent sentiment on our South African policy, that the language of England hardly affects to be moral language; it is the language of pride, of mastery, of force, of violence, of revenge. And as we read

the sentiments that pervade a great portion of the newspaper press, and the language used by some leading and representative men it is not possible for us to deny the essential truth of such criticism.

But the specially noticeable point about it in our consideration of the ethical question is that all this language seems to be used in good faith by men who, while recognizing, accepting and even helping to propagate pride and self-interest as the dominant motives in public life, are all the time professing obedience to the moral standards of the Gospel, and joining in the customary and special worship of the Christian Church, and this, to all appearance, without any distinct feeling of inconsistency.

Even an excellent church dignitary has been known to hold that our recent experiences in South Africa furnish a warning lesson to remind us that we should carefully avoid all sentiment in politics; and yet the Book of Common Prayer and the Gospel of Christ are that good churchman's daily companions in his private life, and he would probably have agreed with Mr. Froude when he said that every generous and living relation between man and man, or between men and their country, is sentiment and nothing else.

The subject being so fundamentally important, and the perversions and contradictions of conventional public sentiment being so instructive when analyzed, it may not be a work of supererogation to cite one more witness.

Mr. Lecky, in his "Map of Life," in order to bring out clearly the comparatively low standards of conduct which men are still content to follow in public affairs, has set graphically before us two recent illustrations, which deserve to be pondered very carefully and dispassionately.

Referring to what may fairly be described as the meanest incident in