---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

# In the Study.

## Virginibus Puerisque.

### Windows.

'I am the light of the world.'—Jn $8^{12}$.

I WANT to speak to you about windows, because they play such a big part in our lives.

There are, as you know, front windows, back windows, and 'skylights,' and each of these gives us a different outlook. In the country front and back windows are pretty much alike; but in towns or villages to have a front window means seeing life. There are the passers-by, shops, school-children, message boys, carts—why, you could all write down long lists of things that are to be seen from a front window. And there may be a garden in front of your house; what would life be without gardens?

To have a back window and no other may mean a very dull life, especially if one is kept indoors by work that is monotonous. There was an old woman—a dear, honest soul—who eked out a living by doing odd jobs for her neighbours. She wove carpets, sewed bed-quilts, made rugs, or mended house-linen. One evening she brought home two bags full of calico patches which two neighbours had given her with orders to stitch them into quilts. She was delighted at getting the work; but it had always been a great cross to her that the window at which she constantly sat sewing was a back one; for she liked to see everything that was going on outside. 'It's a great divarsion,' she used to say—'a very great divarsion to see Mr. Peters' cows goin' in and out of the byre, day after day; an' that's about all I do see—never git a sight of the folks goin' to meetin' or nothin'. When the minister's prayin' for the widders an' orphans, he'd better make mention of one more,' she once said to a neighbour, 'an' that's women without front windows.' How eagerly she seized upon the few objects of interest that could be seen in the course of the day! Some school-children made a short cut through her yard; she watched for them every day; if they did not appear at the usual time she eyed the clock and muttered, 'I wonder where they can be?' When at last they came, and passed out of sight again, she would think of them for an hour afterwards. Not even a bird escaped her notice. She paused as she stitched away at a quilt to gaze at one on a young tree opposite. 'That's the same yaller bird I saw yesterday, I believe,' she said; 'I reckon he's goin' to build a nest in that elm.' There was one spot where the grass grew much greener than elsewhere. 'I can't make that out,' she said another day, 'whether that spot is greener than the rest because the sun shines brightly there, or because something's buried there.'

It was thinking about a lonely little girl that brought skylights to my mind. She had no sisters, and her mother had set her love upon her four boys; poor wee Jessie had little attention paid to her. But she had a bedroom with a 'skylight' in it, and when she felt unhappy she used to go and put her head out at it. Then she could see beyond her native town, and she thought of many things. She knew very little poetry; Tennyson's 'May Queen' was about the only poem she could repeat. But there were, of course, hymns she had learnt, and which she could sing in her own way. If you had been in the house with me one night you would have heard Jessie's voice in a hymn nearly every one knows. 'Glory, glory dwelleth in Imanuel's land' were the words that reached me. 'You were making plenty of noise, Jessie,' her mother said when she came downstairs. 'I never thought you would hear me,' she answered; 'my head was out at the skylight.'

Once I happened to be in a Quakers' meeting. It was held in a very plain and simple room. The walls were not painted; they were whitewashed. The forms on which the worshippers sat were plain and uncushioned, and the windows were high up—as far as looking out was concerned they were more impossible than a skylight. There was no stained glass. But when a shaft of pure sunlight struck across the room, it made one think of the 'Better World' of which you children sing. There was no preaching; the worshippers just sat quite silent and waited. It might have been for half an hour or longer. The silence was very impressive, for they were waiting for a message from God. There was a 'skylight' in that Quakers' meeting-house.

Beginning life as you boys and girls are doing is like setting about to build a house. It is right

—it is necessary—that you should have front windows in it; God means you to take your place in the world. Back windows mean the grey days of hard work we have to put in all by ourselves. You must have both. And skylights! Life would be poor indeed without the light that comes down from heaven. If you have your skylights and keep them open it will be but the beginning of life everlasting, for the light that comes down from heaven comes from God Himself.

Is the light for ever failing?
God's in His heaven!
Is the faint heart ever quailing?
God's in His heaven!
God's strong arms are all around you,
In the dark he sought and found you.
All's well! All's well!
All's . . . well![1]

---

### A Bit of Soap.

'Fullers' soap.'—Mal 3[2].

Our text to-day is one you all know. You made acquaintance with it when you were a very tiny baby and you have met it every day since. But although a bit of soap is such an old friend some of us are not so very fond of it. When we were quite small Nurse or Mother sometimes let it get into our eyes and mouth, and when we grew a bit older we often thought it would be so much nicer to stay grubby than to have to bother washing.

Once a Sunday-school teacher was speaking to some very small boys and girls about the advantages of cleanliness. She was just a little too old to remember what it felt like to be nice and dirty, so she remarked, 'We all like to have clean hands.' But she got no further, for at this point a little voice piped indignantly, 'Well, my big brother doesn't.'

I think that teacher must have been some relation of the lady of whom I once read. One winter morning she was trying to induce her little niece to rise and endure her usual tepid bath. She described in glowing terms the pleasures and privileges of cleanliness; and at last the little maiden remarked cheerfully, 'All right, Auntie, you do as you like; and I'll do as I like. *You* like to be clean and cold; but *I* like to be warm and dirty!'

[1] John Oxenham, *All's Well.*

But though some of us object to soap, I wonder if we should care to be without it altogether. Should we really like everything to be grubby—clothes and beds, curtains and tablecloths and towels? Should we like—not stopping at being ordinarily grubby, but going on getting grubbier and grubbier? For that is how things would be if we had no soap and nothing to take its place. After all, a bit of soap is not such a bad thing.

Now there is a kind of soap I want you all to carry with you. It is the soap of good humour and of charitableness that helps to wash out the little stains that would soil and spoil our lives. Has anybody hurt your feelings or played you a shabby trick? Then get out your bit of soap quickly and wash it from your mind. Don't rub in the stain deeper or add to its size by foolish broodings and exaggerations of your own. Laugh at yourself and get rid of it as fast as you can. Is anybody saying unkind or untrue things about some one you know? Out with your bit of soap and clean up your friend's character. Don't—however much you may feel tempted to do so—don't add to the stains that are being put upon it. Don't put stains on your own heart and conscience by making your friend appear any blacker.

One thing more I should like you to remember. It is that there are stains which no bit of soap of ours can wash out—the stains of our own sins. Only God can wash these away, and He will do it if we ask Him.

A missionary to India tells the story of how one of his converts became a Christian. The man was a Hindu, and the thought of his sins lay like a great weight upon him. He believed that if he could only bathe in the waters of the Ganges at the sacred city of Benares he would be cleansed from his sin. So for many weary miles he dragged himself to the river upon his elbows and knees. At last, weak and worn to a shadow, he reached the waters, and uttering a prayer to Gunga he crept in. But when he came out again he felt no better. The ache was still in his heart, and he lay down on the river bank utterly weary and hopeless. Presently from the shade of a banyan tree near by came a voice. It was the voice of the missionary, and he was telling the story of the Cross. And the poor, sick man sprang up in great excitement. 'That's what I want!' he cried. 'That's what I

want!' So he found the cleansing that he had sought in vain from his heathen god.

And, boys and girls, that is what we all want, and what God alone, for Christ's sake, can give us.

## The Christian Year.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

### Unrealities.

'Keep yourselves from idols.'—1 Jn $5^{21}$.

It is not possible that John can have meant 'graven images.' There is no such allusion in all the epistle. It is pitched in too high a tone. Neither in his other epistles, nor in his gospel, is there a kindred hint. This, too, is the last word of Revelation. How, then, are we to understand it? Paul says, 'An idol is *nothing in the world*' (R.V. 'We know that no idol is anything in the world,' 1 Co $7^{4}$). And this within touch of the statue of Jove himself. So an idol stands with Paul and John for something *unreal*. We may read, 'Keep yourselves from unrealities,' or, as Carlyle would have it, 'from shams.' Moreover, this meaning is confirmed by another word—'genuine,' or 'real,' or 'true,' which John has just been using. 'We are in Him who is *real*—Jesus Christ the reality.' 'True' does not quite translate the idea. A proposition is true. A thing or person is real. True is the opposite of false. Real is opposed to the unreal—the sham.

What are the unrealities of which we are in danger, and from which we should keep ourselves? The whole epistle has been treating of them. They gather round two centres—Christ and Christianity. The Apostle labours to show when our conception of Christ is unreal and protests against it; and when our conception of Christianity is unreal and warns us against that. Let us consider his teaching on both points.

1. When is our conception of Christ unreal? When it leaves out either of two things—His humanity or divinity. Let us listen to what John says on the first: 'He who denies that Jesus Christ came in the flesh.' We are urged to confess *Jesus*. It is a remarkable thing about the epistles, the bold way in which they speak of the humanity of Jesus. Remember that the Christ risen was worshipped and recognized as Lord. Yet, as we read the story of His life, we are told, in the most lucid style, of the babe in swaddling clothes; that He sleeps; that He is weary at the well; that He confesses His ignorance of some things. Now, the first unreality about Christ from which we are to flee is that which omits all this. There is a danger. He is our blessed Lord—yes; He is Christ—risen, glorified, omnipotent. But He has been man—like me—with my limitations, infirmities, sympathies. He was the son of Mary, a brother, one of the family, perfectly human. Miss this, and how much you miss! How unreal Christ becomes! You miss His representativeship. You miss His sympathy with weakness. You miss His example. Christ, as *He* was, so am *I* to be *in this world*.

But there is another unreal way of thinking of Christ on which the Apostle dwells, and to which he alludes when he says, 'Flee from unrealities'—that which leaves out or obscures His divinity. Let us listen to John on this point—that *Jesus is the Son of God*. 'Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him and he in God' (1 Jn $4^{15}$). And he is very insistent on the fact that he means Son in no accommodated sense. Not as delegate; not becoming a Son by incarnation; not son in any sense as we are sons. He is very clear, very strong, very incisive. He speaks of the Son as 'from the beginning' of the 'Eternal Life which was with the Father'—He is 'the only begotten Son'—'The Father sent the Son'—'This is the true God and Eternal Life.' And in these very Gospels which tell us of His humanity most explicitly—Matthew, Mark, and Luke—in all of them they speak of a pre-existing Son of God, who, as a babe, comes into His humanity.

Yes, just as a Christ not perfectly man is unreal, so a Christ not a pre-existent Eternal Son is unreal. And what danger lies in all this! 'A Christ as an unique exemplar of sinless humanity, an unapproachable teacher of morals, a perfect ideal of humanity, King of the kingdom of God! This is the essence of Royalty'—says the great popular teacher Harnack in his book in many languages. *No*, it is the play of *Hamlet* without Hamlet. It is an unreality. There is no existent Christ behind such a representation.

Flee from this unreality, leave out the Divinity, and there is no connexion between Jesus and the love of God—there is no key to human history. There would be no primal ideal Son according to whom man was created—no Father of whom all

families are created. God would be a mathematical unity, not a warm, living, loving, intro-active unity in plurality. No Son, then no Father. Leave out Divinity, and there is no living glorified King. There is no Mediator between God and man. There is no infinite expiation.

2. But as the Apostle has in view an unreal Christ, so also he has in view an unreal Christianity. And when, according to the Apostle, is our conception of it unreal?

There are three effects of belief in a true Christ necessary to make our Christianity true. Let us look at them.

*First.* If I know Christ as the Son of Man—God in humanity—then I know Him as my Master, my Lord and Exemplar. His word is law to me: His life is my pattern; in His steps I plant mine. That follows by logical consequence. What astounding knowledge, what wondrous belief is this of a God-Man who lived thirty-three years here to set the perfect example and share my temptations!

*Next.* If I know Christ as *the Son of God*, then I love *God* and *Him*, and my *fellow-men*. How can it be otherwise? What knowledge is this of a Divine Son who became Man and went to the Cross, which does not make me *love* also! Herein we know love.

*Lastly.* If I know Christ as the Son of God and Son of Man, I have fellowship of Life Eternal. For I know that my sins have been borne, expiated. I am reconciled in Him to God. Thus I have contact with the fullness of life which is in Him. It overflows and communicates itself to me. What knowledge is this of the Divine Redeemer, of Eternal Life, which was with the Father, and manifested to us, which does not thus overflow to me!

This, then, is real Christianity. But to know, or rather, say I know Him, and not realize these effects, is to have a sham Christianity, and, in fact, shows that my knowledge of Christ is a sham knowledge.[1]

---

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

**Brotherhood.**

'Ye are my brethren.'—2 S 19[12].

The Gospel on its practical side is brotherhood. The content of this idea is large, but it cannot be supposed to mean less than these four things: equal rights for all, the supremacy of the common good, mutual dependence and service, and active goodwill to all.

1. *Equal rights for all.*—The Gospel of Jesus is pure democracy. Jesus trusted the people as completely as the greater part of those who teach in His name distrust them. Many fancy themselves democrats because, as they say, they believe in 'the rule of the people'; but these are half-hearted democrats who, on cross-examination, avow their belief in the rule of the people, not by the people themselves, but 'by a representative part of the people,' wiser and better fitted to rule than the whole people. A genuine democrat is one who believes heartily in the whole people and rejoices that he is one of them. If there was a 'lower class' in the day of Jesus, He belonged to it; if there were any 'common people,' He was one of them. The true disciple of Jesus offers the Pharisee's prayer, with the negative omitted: 'O God, I thank thee that I am as other men are.' He gladly shares the common lot.

One of Abraham Lincoln's truest sayings was: 'No man is good enough to govern another man without that man's consent.' It is easier, as all human experience shows, to educate a democracy to govern itself than to train a 'better class' to rule the rest of the people. Power is corrupting except when diffused. When everybody has as much power as anybody, tyranny and corruption vanish together. It is no question of a vicious aristocracy—every class is vicious. The working class is no more righteous, no more worthy to bear rule, than any other, and only flatterers and deceivers tell the working class otherwise. The three-cornered struggle now in progress between organizations, each claiming to represent the true interests of the workers, is testimony irrefutable that the workers yield to the temptations of class selfishness as quickly as any other class. The trades unions of the American Federation of Labour are a labour aristocracy that looks with disdain on the interests of the unskilled labour of the Industrial Workers of the World, while the Socialist Party claims to have at heart the interests of both, but is in imminent danger of failing to gain the confidence of either. There is no way out of the labyrinth but the way of Jesus: the Gospel of brotherhood and equal rights.

2. *The supremacy of the common good.*—This

[1] H. J. Piggott, *Life and Letters*.

negatives all selfish striving, all merely personal ambition. It strikes at the root of all modern business enterprise, the end of which is personal profit without regard to the common good. Jesus called the concentrated wealth of His time Mammon, and said plainly to those who would be His disciples, 'You cannot serve God and Mammon.' But His Church to-day knows better; it serves both—God with the lip, Mammon with the heart. It cannot be denied: that bastard, cringing, sycophantic thing that our age calls Christianity is nothing else than the organized worship of Mammon. Mammon is the god of this present world, and all who desire to increase their material possessions rather than their spiritual, all who are actuated by ambition rather than by love, all who would be greatest rather than least, rule rather than serve, are his willing worshippers and slaves. Righteousness, truth, and love are foolishness to Mammon; they are an unpractical ideal; there is no profit in them. But in the sight of Jesus they are the whole of life, all that makes life worth living. Mammon urges men to multiply their possessions; Jesus urges men to enrich their souls. Mammon is property, and that the world may move forward and upward Mammon must fall. For Mammon is the parent of typhoid and tuberculosis; Mammon drives our daughters into prostitution and our sons into prison; Mammon builds the slum and populates it; Mammon permits some to feast sumptuously and to play, while it compels others to toil and sweat and gnaw crusts; Mammon creates the conflict of classes and prepares revolutions; Mammon is the arch-enemy of God and man.

How futile, in view of this teaching of Jesus, is most of what passes for religion. 'To such a pass has the Church come that it fights under the banner of Jesus against His Gospel. It wields the sword of the Spirit—to quench all that is spiritual. It uses the word of God—in order to falsify the divine. It is pious, but its piety is godlessness.'[1] The man who piously trusts in the blood of Jesus to save him,[2] but owns a tenement on which there is no fire escape, will find that the blood of Jesus was shed in vain, so far as he is concerned, if that house burns and destroys the lives of its inmates. For that man is nothing less than a murderer, and a far greater criminal than the man who in passion takes the life of his fellow, for he slays in cold blood and for mere sordidness. That sort of faith without works is the deadest of all things that profess to be spiritual. The Christianity of our day is mainly of that type; it is a Christianity of ostentatious orthodoxy, of large professions, that scorns the real Gospel of Jesus. The hard self-righteousness of the Christian world rules it out of the kingdom of brotherhood. Now, as of old, it is easier to bring the Prodigal home than to soften the proud elder son and make him a true child of his gracious Father.

3. *Mutual dependence and service.*—Jesus could not grant their mother's prayer for the sons of Zebedee, and place them on His right hand and His left in the kingdom, because these seats were not to be given away as a favour, being reserved as a reward for service. The high places are for those who seek the good of others, not their own—for those who drink their Master's cup of sacrifice, for those who are baptized with the baptism of His vicarious suffering.

This is what Jesus meant by His teaching regarding stewardship. He taught men that they do not own, but owe; that their rights are far less important than their duties. Power, wealth, learning are not means of ministering to one's selfishness, but opportunities for the service of one's fellows. Those who have most must serve most. The greatest in the kingdom is he that makes fullest and wisest use of his opportunities and rises to eminence as servant of all. Stewardship is the exact opposite of exploitation, the selfish using of one's fellows to advance one's own interest and increase one's own wealth. Stewardship is as exactly opposed also to the selfishness of the idle rich, who devote all their energies to 'pleasure'—and secure only their own boredom.

Brotherhood does not imply that all men shall serve in the same way, or that the service of all is equally valuable; but brotherhood does imply that all shall serve. The man who refuses to

[1] Kutter, *They Must*, p. 53.

[2] The late J. Pierpont Morgan inserted in his will the following profession of faith: 'I commit my soul into the hands of my Saviour, in full confidence that, having redeemed it and washed it in His most precious blood, He will present it faultless before the throne of my Heavenly Father; and I entreat my children to maintain and defend, at all hazard, and at any cost of personal sacrifice, the blessed doctrine of complete atonement of sin through the blood of Jesus Christ once offered, and through that alone.' This was hailed by the orthodox religious press as 'a wonderful testimony.' It was.

serve denies his brotherhood and puts himself outside the pale of human society. There is no place for such a man in a rightly ordered world. He is the true outlaw, and by his own act. This is the teaching of Jesus. His disciples must proclaim and exemplify it, and let Nietzsche rage and Bernard Shaw imagine a vain thing.

4. *Active goodwill to all.*—This is the 'altruism' of which Comte and all whom he has influenced have had so much to say. But Paul long anticipated Comte when he said, 'Let every man look not upon his own things, but also upon the things of others.' And Jesus was before Paul, declaring, as the highest ideal of men in their social relations, 'Whatsoever things ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.' The ideal of brotherhood is not merely to abstain from doing evil to men, but actively to do them good. And the Gospel of Jesus inflexibly maintains this as the practical side of religion, without which no piety is of least avail. 'For if a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?' The principle is as sweeping as it obviously is true. And here is one application of it that every man should heed: If a man does not realize, abominate, repent, and forsake his sins against his brother whom he has seen, how can he have any genuine realization of sin against a God whom he has not seen; and how can he repent sin unrealized?[1]

---

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

**The Law of the Spirit of Life.**

'There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death.'—Ro $8^{1.2}$.

Deliverance came through life. Christ our Lord specifically defined His reason for coming into the world. In Jn $10^{10}$ He says: 'I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly.' In Lk $19^{10}$ He says: 'For the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost.' There is one remarkable passage that unites the two. The Father pleading for the Prodigal Son says: 'For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost and is found' (Lk $15^{24}$). He was dead and lost, and is alive and found! He was dead before he was lost, and he was alive again before he was found; he was found when he was again alive.

The gift of God in Christ Jesus is the gift of Life. To this all the New Testament Scriptures bear witness. 'And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son hath not the life' (1 Jn $5^{11.12}$). Jesus never used the words 'Life' and 'Death' for mere existence and physical dissolution, except under the constraint of necessity. The words had for Him a far deeper content. He regarded men apart from Him as destitute of life. They were 'dead.' 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgement; but hath passed out of death into life' (Jn $5^{24}$). Of those who heard His voice some were dead, others had passed out of death into life. The aim of Evangelism is to bring people to Jesus that they may receive the gift of Life; abundant, eternal Life.

What is Eternal Life? Our Lord interpreted it to be the knowledge of God through His Son, 'And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send' (Jn $17^{3}$). St. John in his Epistle explains that saying: 'We know that we are of God . . . and we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life' (1 Jn $5^{19.20}$). Eternal Life is an experimental knowledge of God in Christ; an assurance of sonship with God in Christ; and a conscious fellowship with God in Christ.

The religion of the New Testament is the experience of Eternal Life in Jesus Christ. It is not a form of doctrine, not a routine of ritual, not an ethic, not a cult, not even a system of religion. It is an experience of Life. 'He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son hath not the life.' This teaching is not peculiar to St. John. It is the witness of the New Testament. 'No one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him' (Mt $11^{27}$). 'And in none other is there salvation: neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved' (Ac $4^{12}$). 'The free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord' (Ro $6^{23}$).

[1] H. C. Vedder, *The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Democracy.*

All life is subject to law, and all life is subject to its own law. The Life that is of the Spirit is subject to the law of the Spirit of Life. All life is a gift. It can neither be bought nor won. All life comes by birth. It cannot be either organized or evolved. Spiritual Life is no exception to these universal laws. It is not of works, neither can it be evolved out of the natural man. Evangelical truth concludes all men under condemnation of death, and all alike equally helpless to attain or acquire eternal life. Jesus Christ bases the universal necessity for regeneration upon this universal law of life and death: 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again.'[1]

---

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

**War no more.**

'Neither shall they learn war any more.'—Is $2^4$.

We are confronted at the outset with the incontestable fact that war has been a constant and well-nigh universal feature of human history. Among many primitive peoples it has been regarded as almost the only fit occupation for a full-grown man. In the empires of antiquity it was the one great enterprise of the nation and the chief glory of its kings, and those empires which forgot it perished. In Europe, by means of an empire established through war and guarded at all points by arms, Rome for a time preserved an uncertain peace. But on the collapse of Rome Europe was again given over to conflict, and, for centuries, no power rose strong enough to maintain order. With the rise of the modern states and of strong centralized governments, warfare has become more circumscribed, but never a decade has passed in Europe without some part being engaged in war. If Christendom had copied the Roman institution of the Temple of Janus, it could scarcely ever have been closed throughout the nineteen centuries of the Christian era. The history of Asia and Africa is an even blacker record of bloodshed. The honour paid to the warrior has in most countries exceeded that of any other class of men, as the literature of all ages bears witness. 'Saul hath slain his thousands and David his ten thousands'—this is the standard by which men have been accounted great. It is true that there has been at all times an undercurrent of protest and disgust; but the normal attitude of men, at least towards successful war, has been one of approbation and of pride. Victories in battle have been the events which nations have commemorated as their greatest national glories.

This prevalence of war in human history is but one aspect of the universal struggle for existence which held sway ages before man appeared on the earth, and which so far as we can tell has always been a dominating factor in physical life. 'Strife is the father of all things,' said a Greek philosopher; and a section of modern thinkers maintains that the struggle for existence is an essential element in human life, that war can never be eliminated, and that all attempts to do away with it are but ludicrous efforts on the part of man to fight against the inevitable laws of his existence. Any adequate attempt to deal with the scientific and philosophical basis of this view would carry us far from our proper subject, but a few points having a direct bearing on our subject must be mentioned.

1. The 'biological necessity of war' has been maintained by several distinct lines of argument.

(1) First it is said that war by killing off the weak and inefficient individuals of both sides, and leaving the strongest to survive, definitely improves the human race. This argument need not detain us. It is, at any rate in modern times, the reverse of the truth. Those who are most likely to be killed are in fact the fittest and best, while the weak and unfit are left at home to become the parents of the next generation.

(2) A stronger argument is that based on national or racial grounds. It is said that certain nations or races are by nature superior and others inferior, and that it will be for the general advancement of mankind if the former live and multiply, and, where their interests conflict, even exterminate the latter. Now, as regards nations, it can hardly be denied that at any particular era some are in advance of others, but history will not bear out the contention that this superiority is maintained. It would rather seem that there is constant rise and fall. Consequently the blotting out of one

[1] S. Chadwick, in *Evangelism*, ed. E. Aldom French.

by another might merely destroy the prospect of future advance. It is, however, held by some that racial (as distinct from national) characteristics are permanent, and that it is all important to preserve the finer racial stocks. This is a matter of acute controversy among specialists on the subject, and one on which only a specialist has a right to offer an opinion. Even if it be granted, however, that some racial stocks remain permanently superior, that does not show that the best or the necessary way to preserve them is by war. Here again the tendency of war, successful or otherwise, seems rather to destroy the finer stocks. The decadence of Greece has been traced to the destruction of her best elements in the Peloponnesian and other wars; the decadence of Spain to her using up her best in the effort to maintain an overgrown Empire. Moreover, where there is no extermination but merely subjugation of a conquered race, the result is a tyranny which is often enervating and finally destructive to the conquerors, as apparently happened with the Romans and other dominant races.

(3) But the strongest argument for the necessity of war is based simply on the actual growth of population and its need of food. Under favourable conditions the human race multiplies with great rapidity. The population of England and Wales, for example, increased from about nine millions in 1801 to thirty-seven millions in 1914; that of Java under Dutch rule 'from five millions in 1825 to twenty-eight and a half millions in the first decade of this century.' Famine and the general pressure of want, and to a lesser extent disease and war, are the usual factors which keep population in check; but, it is said, a world where there was security against war and where famine and disease were increasingly rare would rapidly become over-populated, and the only recourse would be to wars of extermination. Even without looking so far ahead, at the present day certain countries are congested and seeking an outlet. Can this be secured except through war?

Now, as regards the prospect of an over-populated world, it may at any rate be said that this is still a long way off. Immense tracts of the earth's surface, Canada, South America, Australia, for example, are as yet very sparsely populated; and in the more densely inhabited countries the possibilities of increasing food supply are in many cases immense. Over large parts of Russia, for example, even elementary crop-rotation is scarcely understood, and the immense gains which accrue from more scientific methods of agriculture even in highly developed countries were demonstrated in Germany in the years preceding the war. Vast sources of supplies still remain untapped. Nitrates (as fertilizers) from the air is one recent example; while the food supplies of the oceans have been no more than touched. The world can thus maintain a vastly larger population than at present, and though over-population is theoretically possible it is likely that before that stage is reached checks will have come into play. The more advanced countries show a constant slackening of the rate of increase. In France the population is well-nigh stationary, and the same tendency is seen in other countries.

2. But if we repudiate the theory that war is a biological necessity, the fact of its prevalence throughout human history cannot be gainsaid. Is it really possible, or conceivable, that an activity of men so widespread and so far-reaching in its results can ever be eliminated? Does not history go to prove that man is a fighting animal, and can we alter that fact?

Now, admitting the wide prevalence of war, there are many facts to show that the general development of mankind has been not towards but away from it. Taking a long view over past history, we can see that the area of conflict has become more circumscribed. Larger and larger groups have abrogated the custom of war among their members. As families of men have merged into tribes, tribes or cities into nations, nations into empires, in each case there has been a wider area within which men lived in peace. Irregular conflicts—once prevalent inside the state—have tended to disappear. The duel has practically gone; the right of private war, as exercised, for example, by mediæval nobles, has disappeared; privateering at sea has gone; civil war, once not uncommon, is now regarded as a thing to be avoided at all costs. This advance has been due to several factors. One has been the growth of strong central governments, and the establishment of such institutions as law-courts and legislatures, by which justice is established and the necessity for the forcible settlement of differences removed. But more important, and indeed the basis upon which such institutions rest, is the growth of

popular sentiment against internal war, the sense that it is disastrous to the well-being of the state and its members, and in fact disruptive of the state itself. How far we have travelled in this direction is shown by the loathing with which civilized men look on civil war. It seems an unnatural thing, portending a return to barbarism.

These various types of conflict having been left behind, there appears to be a strong pre-supposition that international war may eventually follow them. The very fact that states have often found it possible to unite and thereby to do away with hostility among their members, seems to show that conflict is not a necessity. Is there any fundamental reason why, at some future date, men may not come to loathe the very thought of war between England and Germany as much as they would now loathe the thought of it between different parts of England, among which wars were frequent in Anglo-Saxon times? Men of French, German, and Italian blood now live peaceably together in Switzerland. Why should it be impossible for the French, German, and Italian nations as a whole to learn to live in peace?

3. Such a society is already in process of building. The supposition of the independence and rivalry of states, upon which so much of our international policy is based, does not in reality correspond with facts. It is not true that nations are self-contained entities whose interests touch only to conflict. It is much more true to say that they are interdependent, each needing much from and supplying much to others, and each gaining or suffering through the prosperity or adversity of its neighbours. This may not always have been the case in the past; at the present day it is one of the outstanding facts to be reckoned with in any correct outlook on the world.

The scientists and inventors of the last century and a half set in motion forces which have changed the face of the world, making it radically different from any preceding stage in its history, and of the changes the greatest is this, that the nations have been linked and welded and even pounded together, so that whether they will or no their destinies are interlinked, for good or evil. For us who live in the scientific and mechanical era it is almost impossible by any stretch of the imagination to realize how vast the change has been, but some appreciation of it is a necessity, and neglect to pay sufficient attention to its results is one of the causes of the disasters of the present day.

(1) First and most fundamental has been the development of communications and transport. If one was asked what was the most notable change in the appearance of the earth's surface during the last hundred years the answer should probably be railway lines. Railways, steamships, motor transport, the telegraph and telephone have linked the ends of the earth together, and the aeroplane will carry the process yet further. The freedom of movement which they have made possible has opened up every continent. Less than a century ago the interior of Africa was a blank on the map, China and Japan were closed countries, a European in most parts of Asia was a strange phenomenon, as was an Indian in England. Now the exploration of the globe is practically complete, as is symbolized by the reaching of both Poles: with minor exceptions there are no new lands to be visited or new peoples dragged into the light. One stage of the world's development is done. All nations can now know one another.

(2) So far as the things of the mind are concerned the world is one. Science is plainly international. Investigations started in France may be developed or verified in America or Japan. Literature and art overstep national boundaries. An important book written in any country is translated into half a dozen or more languages. In London dramas from Russia or Norway or Spain occupy the theatres; there are exhibitions of the art of Persia or Japan. Meanwhile Shakespeare is acted by Indian companies in Calcutta or Bombay; and in the picture-houses of Yokohama and Baghdad the spirit of white civilization is interpreted by wild west dramas or Charlie Chaplin. As regards systematic education, we find schools and colleges of western learning spread through Africa and the East, and, though less conspicuous, schools for oriental studies in most western countries; we find migrations of students from India, China, and Japan to Europe and America; from the Slav countries to Western Europe; from South America to France and Spain; and many similar movements.

(3) The opportunities of personal contact between members of various nations have been immensely increased. There are many more people in Great Britain to-day who can claim to

have seen Russia or Japan than a century ago would have travelled as far as France. The mere amusement of travel (in earlier days not an amusement but a risk), curiosity, sport, business, take into foreign lands all manner of people who a century ago would have thought it an adventure to move to a different county. For each of them travel means contact with foreigners and the establishing of some kind of relationship with them. There is at least acquaintance; there is an opportunity for friendship and for some understanding of them and their country.

(4) The mutual dependence of nations in regard to the primary necessities of life has made them, whether they will or no, concerned in one another's interests. This is partially recognized in matters of organization. Commercial or manufacturing companies, shipping companies, banks, have tended recently to become international in character, operating in several countries, and having men of several countries as shareholders and directors. And if there has been a drawing together of those who control industry or trade, the same is true of the workers. Men employed in a certain industry in Great Britain may be vitally affected by the wages paid and the hours worked in the same industry in Italy or Japan. A sudden influx of cheap goods produced by cheap labour in the Far East might throw thousands of British workmen out of employment; the same result would follow more surely from the degrading of sections of European labour to Asiatic standards of living—a possibility not altogether remote at present. So labour organizations in various countries have come to feel that their aims and objects are common, and have united to further those aims, both in political organizations such as the Socialist Internationals, and in federations of men employed in some particular industry, such as the International Conference of Miners.[1]

[1] B. C. Waller, *Towards the Brotherhood of Nations.*

# The Central Problems of Faith.

By the Reverend F. R. Tennant, D.D., Lecturer on Theology and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

'Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.'—He 11[1].

The familiar chapter which opens with these words dwells upon certain aspects of faith such as do not receive emphasis elsewhere in the New Testament. For instance, it is not the faith of the Christian, as distinguished from other people, that is there discussed: it is faith in its widest or most general sense—faith in the abstract. The examples of the faithful life which follow upon the description of faith which I have just quoted are indeed all taken from the Old Testament, and therefore from times previous to the Christian age; and among them we observe the harlot Rahab, one of 'them that believed not' in the God of Israel. Again, the object of faith, as it is here described, is not restricted, as it usually is, to Christ or even to God. In the writings of the Apostle Paul, faith is treated as possessing efficacy in so far as it is due to being trust in Christ or in God: in the Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, it is the efficacy of the instrument, of faith in itself as an attitude of mind issuing in the higher life, that is maintained with all the writer's wealth of illustration. And the object to which faith directs itself is asserted to be the whole region of the future and the unseen. Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen, whatsoever these may be: perhaps the eternal archetypes, the 'intelligible realities,' of which the things that are seen and are temporal, are, in the writer's habitual phrase, the patterns, examples, or shadows; just as for Plato time was the moving shadow of eternity.

It is these invisible and eternal realities, then, of which faith is said to be the substance, or to which faith gives substantiality, and for which it is, or supplies, evidence. So runs the definition contained in our text. But what are we to understand by its unwonted and somewhat surprising terms? Certainly we cannot take the author of the Epistle to mean that our faith constitutes the existence of