

to promote Peace on earth, and god will among men. For, whatever interpretation may be given, in new versions, or old versions, to particular passages, it will not be, for one moment, denied that the whole spirit of the New Testament makes the *Peace*, and is utterly condemnatory of *War*. And in this respect there is no difference made between offensive and defensive wars. Either and both alike are wholly subversive of the great principles of Christianity. How, then, can we still continue the practices of war, and claim the name of Christian? How can Christian ministers serve as chaplains in the army, and pray for the victory of their own armies, and the rout and destruction of those of the enemy? Can we possibly imagine such a thing as Jesus Christ, in his day, serving as a chaplain in the army? And if not, how can His professed ministers to-day occupy such a position? Is it not because we do not consider that the example which Jesus has left us is one which humanity, in its imperfect state, can safely follow? We fear the consequences of a state of passive non-resistance. We have not faith, a real, living, and abiding faith, in the principles of peace which our Saviour taught.

We do not sufficiently realize that the precepts: "If any man sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, forbid him not to take thy cloak also;" "whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain;" "If any man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also;" "Return good for evil." We do not, I say, sufficiently realize that these sublime precepts, the *words* of which are so familiar to our ears, have any practical application in our own case. We do not have real faith in the efficacy of peace principles for self-protection. The natural, animal man gains the victory over the spiritual. This is indeed by no means surprising. But the truly surprising, and the almost inexplicable thing seems to be, how

men who profess to be the faithful followers of him, who when he was reviled, reviled not again; who, in his hour of trial said of his cruel persecutors, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," whose whole career was one constant exemplification of the principles of Peace, should not only, in their actual practice violate those principles, but should *defend* such violation, and maintain that wars and fightings can, under any circumstances, be *right*.

There is one thought which may help explain this great apparent inconsistency of professing Christians. It is one which it seems proper to introduce in this connection; but it is a thought which I present with hesitation here, among those of varying religious beliefs; for I would not, knowingly, wound the feelings of any one, and would specially avoid saying what might give pain to any true and earnest believer, whatever may be the form of faith which he has adopted. But I believe it right for me to present here this thought, aiding, as it does in my judgment, in the explanation of what would otherwise seem an insoluble problem.

I refer to the efficacy of the example of Jesus of Nazareth as a pattern for us, and the reason why, even among earnest professing Christians, he is so frequently accepted only in *words*, as a real pattern, after all. Why, I say, should this be so? May it not be that, in *deifying* him, in removing him so far away from our own *humanity*, we unconsciously reject his example as applicable to our own case? If we looked upon him more as a *man*, as one affected by like feelings and passions as ourselves; only sent as a pattern for us, ever obedient to his Father's and our Father's divine will; and hence without sin; if, I say, we could look thus upon him, I believe that we should feel his life and example as touching us more closely; and as being not only *worthy* of our constant imitation, but as not at