

special significance. We were the first to reform our code of honour by the abolition of duelling. This was not prompted by want of manliness—our courage has been proved on hundreds of battlefields, but to our self-effacement in the presence of the law which brought us very close to the distinctively Christian virtue of humility, and exposed us to the same feelings of dislike and impatience which are inspired in self-assertive natures by the sight of that virtue. Self-effacement in mundane affairs becomes self-abasement in our relations with the Almighty.

We may now proceed to consider the German ideal or mission. And first we may rule out a subject which, judging from the space which the newspapers allot to it, must be of great interest to the public—that is, who is responsible for the war? who was the aggressor? We need not begin a general disquisition on the causes of war, but, confining ourselves to the present case, we may state our opinion that one nation is as responsible as the other, or rather, that neither is responsible. Responsibility is not incurred except when there is a free choice, and the act may be declined. When personal ambition is the cause, the aggressor is no doubt responsible, and is deserving of censure; but when it is a matter of life and death, there is no blame, for every living being, from the highest to the lowest, must fight for existence, and there can be no reasonable objection to his choosing his own time. In the present case, the recent victories of the Slavs threatened the Teutonic races with their own favourite movement of envelopment. They are no more to be blamed for struggling for escape than a wasp is, when one of its legs has been entangled in a spider's web. But, since we deny the right of Germany to secure herself at the