

Mount had never been spoken, and only the lower or selfish motives had a rightful claim to exercise dominion in practical affairs.

It is not that action and practice are constantly falling short of the acknowledged and accepted standard of ethical duty. This we should expect to occur in public as in private matters.

The point is that honest and good men do not seem to recognize those standards of ethical judgment which they accept without question in private life, as having the same claim on their allegiance in the arena of politics, or in the relationships of nations. "Blindness in part is happened to Israel."

We turn, for instance, to that sphere which furnishes the most glaring instances of this strange inconsistency, the sphere of international politics.

In these we see how again and again, there is hardly more than a thinly veiled pretence of any appeal to the higher standards of ethical obligation, or to the spirit of Christianity.

The terms in which national or imperial aims and policy are defined and the spirit in which international affairs are conducted are such as to make it only too plain that the whole structure of foreign politics, and also a great part of internal politics, are built upon a foundation of selfishness, jealousy, rivalry, greed of power and wealth and not upon any higher or Christian basis.

Thus twenty-six centuries after the prophet Isaiah, twenty-three centuries after Socrates, and nineteen centuries after the Manifestation of Christ, we see, so to speak, whole continents of life, opinion and practice, still under the dominion of that spirit of selfish greed which St. Paul denounced as *pleonexia*, and held up to view as lying very near to the root of all that is vicious in human life.

By way of illustration reference might be made to many contemporary events or to events within the memory of most of us; but it may suffice to note the impression made by the current phenomena of public affairs on some of the great writers and thinkers.

Mr. Herbert Spencer has forcibly reminded us that men seem to give their allegiance, as it were to two religions, the religion of amity and the religion of enmity, for use in different departments of life and conduct. The real homage is paid in large measure, if not in the larger measure, to the code dictated by enmity.

From the books of the New Testament we take our religion of amity. Greek and Latin epics and histories serve as gospels for our religion of enmity.

In the education of our youth we devote a small portion of time to the one, and a large portion of time to the other.

A priori it might be thought impossible that men should continue through life holding two doctrines which are mutually destructive. But this ability to compromise between conflicting beliefs is very remarkable.

A boy, while growing up, acquires in common with all around him the habit of living by first one and then the other of his creeds, as the occasion may demand; and so great is the power of custom that he does this in ordinary cases without any distinct feeling of inconsistency, and by the time that he reaches maturity the habit has been established in his life. So educated, he will enlarge at one moment on the need of maintaining the national honor, and he thinks it derogatory or unpatriotic or mean to arbitrate about an aggression, trespass, or difference, instead of avenging it by war; at another moment he calls his household together and leads them in the