

and his teachings of love and duty than of hair-splitting theological discussions? I recall, many years ago, while visiting a watering-place in Wisconsin, that when the Sabbath came round I went with some friends to a little Methodist church in an adjoining village. The preacher undertook to overturn my Presbyterianism. An irreverent friend who sat beside me, as the young man delivered his telling blows against Calvinism, was constantly emphasizing the points by nudging me with his elbow. Now, I am glad to know that very often since then I have worshipped in Methodist churches, and that is the last experience of that kind I have had.

You have to-day as the theme of discussion the subject of International Arbitration, and this being a public, or in a large sense of the word a political, question, perhaps makes my presence here as an officer of the United States especially appropriate. . . . It is known to you all that in the recent conference of the American states at Washington the proposition was distinctly made and adopted by the adherents of all, or nearly all, of the governments represented, that, as applied to this hemisphere, all international disputes should be settled by arbitration. Of course, there are limitations as yet in the nature of things to the complete assumption and general adoption of such a scheme. It is quite possible to apply arbitration to a dispute about state boundaries; it is quite impossible, it seems to me, to apply it in a case of international feud. If there is no other subject of dispute, no other prompter of war, than a disposition to subjugate, an aggressive spirit to seize territory, a spirit of national aggrandizement that does not stop to consider the rights of other people—to such a case and such a spirit the subject of arbitration has no application. It is for a Christian sentiment to emphasize itself in the nation to remove forever such causes of dispute, and thus what remains will be an easy subject for adjustment by free international arbitration. . . .

There is one unity of the church and but one of humanity. 'One in Him' is the only oneness possible to church or man; and it is as this great Christian sentiment, characterized not only by a high sense of justice, but by a spirit of love and forbearance, masters the civil institutions and civil governments of

the world, that we shall approach peace and arbitration methods of settling disputes.

Let me thank you for the privilege of standing before you for a moment, and for this most cordial welcome which you have given to me. I beg to express again my high appreciation of the character of these delegates, and of the membership of the great church from which they come, and to wish that in your remaining deliberations and in your journeys to far distant homes you may have the guidance and care of that God whom we all revere."

---

Dear Mr. Editor,—Queer things are happening about Queen's nowadays. What is it all about? Why is everybody talking about "the Moral Law" and "the Golden Rule," and "man's civil rights," and "man's personal liberty," and "arbitrary contracts"? Then again I read in a city paper: "The concursus has never been, and in the nature of the case can never be, in organic relation to our university life." This reminds me of a statement made by the philosophic valedictorian of '90: "We are the mere potentialities of what we might have been," and I am more lost than ever. I used to hear about individual liberty" and "natural equality" and those things, when I was studying Hobbes in the Political Economy Class, but they have not bothered me very much since. I want to know what brings them up now. Do a few cranks around here think they can invent an individualistic theory of society which will be better than the theories of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau? If so, haven't they considerable nerve? When I took Junior Philosophy three or four years ago, I wrote an essay which completely demolished all individualistic theories. I think I will have to hunt it up again and read it to the Alma Mater.

But seriously, Mr. Editor, don't we hear a good deal too much individualism preached around here nowadays? And does it do us any good? Don't we all think *too much* of *our* rights and too little of other people's? I don't think it does me any good to be told continually that I have my rights. Moreover, I do not see what good it does to tell students, when they first come here, that they have the same rights as other people. They know that. Nobody denies it. They have the