

all beyond the reach of our humanity, with all of its imperfections and limitations.

If we could but realize the differences between "*Jesus, the man*, approved of God by miracles and wonders, and signs, which God did by him," and "*Christ, the Power of God and the wisdom of God*;" "The only begotten Son of God"—if, I say, we could only realize the difference between the *man* Jesus and Christ, the *Spirit*, we should not still be groping, in his nineteenth century of the Christian Era, for light upon the question whether consistent Christians could ever, under any circumstance, take up arms and fight. But I do not press this point to-day, lest I may unconsciously wound some tender and earhest soul, who may fear that I am denying the Divinity of Christ; which, I must say in passing, is the very farthest from my intention, for I am a firm believer in the Divinity of Christ—and in the Divine nature of Jesus Christ, through implicit obedience to his Father's will.

How shall correct views upon the subject of Peace, and the settlement of international disputes by arbitration, be most effectually inculcated? The obvious answer is: by giving the proper instruction and training to the rising generation. They should be taught early the beauty and the perfect efficacy of the principles of peace—of non-resistance—and the necessarily brutal and demoralizing nature of all force, whether employed by the individual, in righting his own wrongs, or by the state, in what is called self-defense. But in this teaching we must beware of text-books on morals and on International Law that are generally placed in the hands of the young. Paul Janet, a recent writer on morals, and one whose views upon most points are sound, and most clearly and forcibly expressed, when coming to speak of the subject of war, use these words, "War is the most serious and the most solemn exception to the law which forbids homicide.

Not only does it permit homicide, but it commands it. The means thereto are prepared in public. The art of practicing them is a branch of education, and it is glorious to destroy as many enemies as possible." It would almost seem that these words must be intended as sarcasm, and not the expression of his own views, as a moralist. The whole course of his argument, however, forbids this interpretation. And this doctrine is set forth in a volume prepared for the instruction of the young in the laws of morality! And the *rightfulness* or *wrongfulness* of war is summarily dismissed in these words: "The problem of war, in itself, belongs rather to the law of nations, than to *morality*, properly so called." And our writers upon International Law, (as well as moralists), accept the rightfulness of war and self-defense, and merely treat of the proper methods of conducting it, as it actually exists. In our works on International Law nearly one-half of their pages are taken up by the question of war. But without one word of condemnation they assume it as a necessary condition of things in our present imperfect state; and the student is merely taught under what conditions wars are proclaimed, how they are conducted, and how terminated; and sometimes how they may be so conducted as to be consistent with the principles of justice, mercy, and humanity! In his volume on International Law, of a little more than 400 pages, President Woolsey devotes more than 200 of these to "The Rights of Self-Defense," "The Redress of Injuries," "The Relations between Belligerents and Neutrals."

What wonder that with such instruction to the young, for generation after generation, the present low standard of morality in this respect should so generally prevail!

In introducing a new order of things in our instruction, it is exceedingly important, then, to take especial pains in the selecting of the proper text-books, and where these are not to be found, to