
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE III.

THE HIGHER ALLEGIANCE.

BY BERNARD C. STEINER, PH.D.,
BALTIMORE, MD.

No saying of Jesus Christ's was more true than that a man cannot serve two masters; for, at some time, there must come the necessity for a decision as to which of two opposing courses of action shall be taken. By every one the choice must be made, and to every one the clarion call of duty comes, as it did to Israel, when Joshua summoned the tribes: "Choose ye this day whom ye shall serve." Happy is the man who does not then hesitate; but, promptly and gladly, responds: "As for me and my house, we shall serve the Lord Jehovah." Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, carries out the same thought. Men cannot be independent. No man liveth to himself. He must serve some master; and, in sharp contrast, these early Christians were given the choice to serve sin or to serve the Lord. One must be a δουλός, a bondservant, a slave of some master; and, strangely enough, one had given him the choice of the master whom he preferred. Paul's argument went on to say that those who were redeemed, that is, brought back from the power of sin by Christ's death, as Hosea had redeemed his wife from bondage, were then given the high privilege of being adopted into the family of God and made joint heirs of the Lord Jesus Christ. That change, however, did not make them independent, but superadded to the obligation of obeying a master, the duty of so acting as to please a

loving Father. In the East, with the strong family organization, or in Rome, where the *patria potestas* extended to the *jus vitæ necisque* and allowed the father to inflict capital punishment on the son, this duty meant a great deal. This is the highest allegiance of all, and a man ought, leaving all others, to cleave to it always. Seward and Lincoln had such an idea as this in mind in their "higher law" speeches; and, in another and earlier age, the noble army of martyrs exemplified this allegiance, when they refused to sacrifice to the Roman emperor and were thrown to the lions in the arena. In the early Jewish times, when there was a theocratic government, there was no other power than Jehovah to claim such allegiance from men; and, even when the monarchy was established, the choice was usually that which Elijah set before the people at Mount Carmel, and the decision was whether one would worship Jehovah or some such false God as Baal.

Religion and patriotism usually coalesced; and, when they were severed, it was because some ruler like Ahab was guilty of a sort of malfeasance in office which released the Hebrew from any obligation to follow the king in his evil courses, and made the way plain to seven thousand men who never bowed the knee to Baal. Patriotism then was one of the greatest of virtues; for only by devotion to the state could the devout Israelite preserve the due and fitting worship of Jehovah. The very imprecatory Psalms, which Dr. Watts rightly thought not fitting for Christians to sing as a part of their worship and so did not versify, lose a large part of their repellent characteristics when we realize that the enemies against whom they were directed were, in general, not personal but national enemies, and so enemies of Jehovah. They were men who owed allegiance and paid worship to Astarte, Moloch, or some similar deity.

When Jesus came into the world, conditions had changed. A decree went forth from the Roman emperor that all the civilized world should be taxed; and Joseph, of the tribe of Judah, went up to his ancestral town of Bethlehem, in obedience to that order. Palestine was a subordinate member of the Roman Empire. The Jews, bitter patriots as they were, could not endure this condition of things; and, when they heard that Jesus claimed kingship, they tested him, to see whether he was willing to advise a breaking of the ties that bound the Jews to the imperium of Rome. Christ's answer was, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." In other words, he distinguished between the religious and governmental duties which men owed, and between the highest allegiance owed God and a service owed the state. Although the Old Testament is very patriotic, it is remarkable that the New Testament teaches almost no duties to the state in which a man is a subject, but only to men at large as human beings. The one striking exception is that of obedience to the powers that be, as ordained of God, who is a God abhorring anarchy. "Fear God, honor the king," is the Pauline injunction, and the king was Nero.

One's thought is irresistibly led to look forward to the time when the consummation of all things shall come, when men see the

> **"One far-off divine event**
> **To which the whole creation moves,"**

when the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, who reigns over all, having put all enemies under his feet. Old things shall pass away; and, in this fulfillment of the law, patriotism shall disappear with the other old things, being lost in love for God the Maker and for all men whom He hath made out of one blood. In the parable

of the Good Samaritan, Christ taught the lesson that one should pass narrow national bounds to help the man to whom one could show himself neighborly. The decision of the early church not to require circumcision of converts, also pointed towards the establishment of a universal religion. The New Testament teaching was not that men should cease at once to be patriotic, that they should try at once to become cosmopolitan; but that the ultimate goal was a universal recognition of the truth uttered by that universally minded man, Goethe: "Above the nations is humanity." In his presidential address before the American Historical Association in 1915, Professor H. Morse Stephens quoted this "magnificent sentiment of Goethe," and expressed the hope that future historians "may seek to explain the nations of the world to each other, in their various contributions to the progress of civilisation." This is a fine ideal; but the Christian one is higher, namely, the recognition of the essential unity of mankind, and obedience to the law which commands that one love all men as one's self. Long will it be, however, until this ideal is realized; and it is now a time when it is difficult to see that progress is being made towards realizing it. We see the most stupendous conflict of all history in progress; and massacre, lawlessness, and flagrant wickedness are far too apparent. The dark places of the earth are full of cruelty, whether the guilty persons are Mexican bandits, Turkish soldiers, or the crew in a German submarine. Yet a glance back through history makes us feel that there is much hope. If I awake on a winter's morning at six A.M., the light of the street lamp shines in my room. Shortly thereafter, the light is extinguished and the room is darker than it was at any time throughout the night. Yet if I waken and find the room in gloom, because of the extinguishment of the street light, I say to myself at once, "It is the

darkest hour which comes before the dawn. I must now arise, 'the night is far spent, the day is at hand.'"

Most of us live under several jurisdictions; we are citizens of a municipality, which is in a certain State, which is a part of the United States. We feel a pride in our town, a devotion to our State, a loyalty to the Nation. Usually those obligations go side by side without friction, and we pay fealty to each jurisdiction in which we live, finding no difficulty to do so. It may happen that there comes a clash between two of them, as between State and Nation, and then we must determine to which we owe allegiance; for it is ever true that a man can pay allegiance to only one power, although he may give fealty, or fidelity, to many. A little over fifty years ago, that problem presented itself to many a man in this country in a distressing form. States passed ordinances of secession from the federal union. Should their citizens go with the States? High-minded, earnest, conscientious men considered this question carefully and decided it in different ways. There were two notable Virginian officers in the United States army in 1861, men possessing high probity of character. One of them, Robert E. Lee, decided that it was his duty to place his State above the Nation; and the other, George H. Thomas, decided that he must place the Nation above the State. It was simply a different answer to the question, To whom does one owe allegiance, to his State or to the Nation?

We find the same struggle throughout history. In feudal times, striking instances of it occur. The whole quarrel of investitures between Emperor and Pope was, in its essence, a contention as to whether the person invested with an ecclesiastical fief owed allegiance to one or the other of these high rulers. English feudalism took a different course from French feudalism, and England became a strong state long before

France, largely because William the Conqueror established the principle in his conquered kingdom that allegiance was due to the overlord, and that the mesne lord, who stood between the king and the vassal, was entitled to exact from his tenant no more than fealty. In France the opposite principle had prevailed, and William himself, as Duke of Normandy, when in contention with his sovereign, had called on his Norman tenants, by the allegiance they owed him, to follow him against the royal overlord, who could claim from them only fealty. The great struggle between the feudal nobility and the king was to establish the principle that allegiance was due from the subject to the king directly, and to secure the enforcement of this principle. This process was aided by the force of external pressure. On a winter's day, one takes up a handful of light snow and tosses it into the air, and the flakes, having little cohesion, fall in many directions. The same snow, after undergoing some pressure in one's hands, forms a ball which, thrown at a target, remains in one mass while passing through the air, and when it reaches its goal, breaks into fragments, each much larger than the flakes gathered together into the ball. If more pressure is given the snow, the ball undergoes a change of constitution and becomes ice, which separates when melted by the sun. The ice may preserve within its mass the form of objects lying in the snow, as the sea sand, when subjected to pressure, in prehistoric times, preserved the fossil footprints of animals, or as the coal preserved the fronds of the ferns, forming part of that dense vegetation of the period, which extreme pressure turned into anthracite. So may external political pressure drive men in several states to form a union. Such a union may have three stages: there is first formed an alliance; secondly, a confederation, a *Staatenbund;* and, finally, a federated nation, a *Bundesstaat* — or an empire. The Roman Em-

pire showed such a development in its relation to such kingdoms as those of Asia Minor. First we see a monarch allying himself with Rome, in fear of a powerful neighbor, then his kingdom becomes a dependent one, as Herod's was; and, finally, it is turned into a province of the empire. It will thus be seen that the confederation need not be one of equal states, but may consist of one great State and its dependents. The Achæan League, in the last days of Greece, furnished an example of a group of states, fairly equal in importance, forming themselves into an alliance and turning the alliance into a close confederation, which the conquest by Rome prevented from going further. The Swiss forest cantons leagued themselves together against the Austrian archdukes, and other city or mountain states joined the league, which gradually became a confederation, and, after the war of the Sonderbund, emerged as the present federal State. The states of Holland were first allied, then confederate, and, for the past century, they have constituted one consolidated State, or nation.

It may be interesting to see how this development of allegiance comes to any given area. Fleeing from the repression of their religious worship as nonconformists, a little body of men were led by the Rev. Henry Whitfield, from Great Britain to New England in 1639. They settled on the north shore of Long Island Sound, bought land from the Indians, and called their settlement Guilford. While nominally subject to the English crown and inhabiting territory claimed thereby, the settlers were, to all intents, independent in their government for four years. Sixteen miles to the west, a larger settlement had been made, almost contemporaneously, at New Haven. There was danger to both settlements from the claims of the Dutch settlers at New Amsterdam; there was also danger from the tomahawk of the Indian; there was the geographically re-

mote, but none the less real, danger that Charles I. might overthrow Parliament. An alliance of New England colonies was being formed. Guilford was too small to be considered as a member. New Haven was hardly large enough; but could it associate with itself other settlements, it could successfully claim admission to this New England Confederation. So the people of Guilford, with several other towns, entered the Jurisdiction of New Haven, and, in order to do so, accepted the New Haven principles that a church must be formed in the town and that only church members should possess the suffrage. In 1662, the restored king of England gave a charter to the Colony of Connecticut, and included in its territory that of the jurisdiction of New Haven. Great was the aversion of the stricter New Haven citizens to form a part of Connecticut, where non-church members enjoyed the suffrage; but, when two years later, the king granted the Province of New York to his brother, with the Connecticut River as its eastern boundary, the people of New Haven jurisdiction realized that they were too weak to stand alone, and that they must submit to absorption by Connecticut, or by the less congenial government of New York. So the people of Guilford assumed duties to a larger area. Over a century passed, and then the people of Connecticut rose in revolt against the British Crown. An alliance was formed with eleven other colonies, and still another, Georgia, was soon added to the allies. Independence was declared, and the people of Guilford denounced allegiance to Great Britain, declaring that they owed it only to Connecticut. Soon the exigencies of war made it manifest that no alliance was sufficient to win freedom from British rule, and Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union were framed and adopted by the States, by which adoption, the people of Guilford owed fealty to the new government of the United

States of America. This Confederation was a rope of sand. "We are one nation to-day, and thirteen to-morrow," bitterly cried one of the leading statesmen of the day. Jealousies developed among the States, they were discordant, they were becoming dissevered, there was danger that they would become belligerent toward each other. Shays's Rebellion, in Massachusetts, showed that the several States could hardly preserve internal order; the failure of Great Britain to surrender the Western posts showed that the Confederation could not secure respect abroad. The Constitution, making the Union more perfect, was wrung from the "grinding necessity of a reluctant people." With its adoption, the people of Guilford owed allegiance to the United States, and only fealty to the State of Connecticut. It took four years of the Civil War to prove this to everyone, yet to-day this is universally admitted to be the case. We see how the narrow patriotism of the citizen of Guilford has broadened, through allegiance to the State to allegiance to the Nation.

The sense of the importance of the Nation has steadily grown. The old writers universally spoke of the United States in the plural, modern writers are apt to use the term in the singular. Old diplomas of Yale College spoke of *Federatarum Rerum publicarum,* but the diplomas of 1860 had quietly recognized the progress of events, and spoke of *federatæ republicæ.* The nineteenth century was a period characterized by the rise of a number of other federal States. Germany altered her constitution from a congeries of independent States to the North German Confederation, and then to the German Empire. Canada was created out of diverse provinces in 1867. The fear of the yellow peril drew Australia together in the end of the century, and recognition of common interests created the federal State of South Africa, in the first year of the

twentieth century. In all of these federal States, except Germany, internal war had no effect upon the organization and, in no other federation, did any smaller State lose its unity in a larger one during the process of unification.

The world has grown wondrously smaller. There are no longer any great unexplored areas. There are no longer any unknown tongues spoken by any considerable number of people. There are no longer any great stretches of country occupied by independent savage peoples. The family of nations invited to The Hague Conference included non-Christian States, and representatives from every continent except Africa, unless we consider Australia a continent and it was virtually represented as part of the British Empire. Men think in world terms. Nicholas Murray Butler writes a book and calls it "The International Mind." Viscount Grey, a great statesman, with a vision, induces such diverse nations as Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy, and Japan to sign an agreement that "they undertake to conclude no separate peace during the present war; the Five Powers have come to the understanding that, when the time arrives for discussing terms of Peace, no single Power shall treat for these terms separately, without previously obtaining the consent of the other allies." One would look into the future with hopeful vision and find in this agreement the germ whence shall grow in the future years, "Articles of Confederation and perpetual union" between the signatory powers. Chancellor David Starr Jordan, in the *Independent* of January 24, 1916, is no false prophet, when he states that: "Sooner or later the peace of mutual trust and international confidence must come; for, as sure as the day follows night, the principle of federation must succeed unbalanced nationalism in the development of the civilized world."

Years earlier than this, however, with prophetic eye, the great poet Tennyson looked into the future and

"Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew,
From the nations' airy navies, grappling in the central blue,
Far along the world-wide whisper of the south wind, rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunderstorm.
'Till the war drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furled,
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

To-day we hear the whirlwind and we see the fire as Elijah experienced them at Mount Horeb; but afterwards will come, as of old time, the still small voice of the Lord God Almighty. It may not be listened to by all men for a time; but, inevitably, the process of unification of mankind will progress. The allegiance to a State, occupying a narrow area, will be gradually superseded by allegiance to federal States occupying larger areas. The narrow attitude towards men of another people, shown when the ancient Romans used the one word to mean both foreigner and enemy, will be succeeded by that broader attitude, which the Roman poet took, when he wrote:—

"Homo sum, humani mihi nihil alienum esse puto."

The patriotism which leads men to do wrong to men of another country will be succeeded by a healthy emulation, which shall lead men to vie with each other along honorable lines. Progress is never continuous, and setbacks must be expected; but the forward-looking man must also expect the eventual coming of the time when allegiance to any nation shall have been succeeded by allegiance to mankind. To further the attainment of this ideal is the duty of all men; for above the nations is humanity, and only by serving all men can one serve aright the God who created and who loves all men.