

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Rev. W. M. CLOW, D.D., Professor of Ethics in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, has written a book on *The Christian Message in the Light of the War* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d.). We pass at once to the chapter entitled 'The Eternal Destiny of the Fallen.' All the other chapters are interesting, but this is urgent. If Professor CLOW can tell us what the eternal destiny of the fallen is—if he can tell us in such a way that we shall be able to tell others, and set their mind at rest, our own conscience remaining at rest also—there is no greater service that he can do for us.

Now it is encouraging to find that he begins with three undeniable facts. There are three truths about the destiny of the fallen, he says, of which there is no doubt. And they are fundamental. The first is the immortality of the soul. The second is judgment to come. The third is that we are saved, not by works, but by faith in God, our Redeemer.

Professor CLOW does not mean to say that nobody denies these facts. He means that no one denies them who has hope in Christ. And he has written his book for those who have that hope. No one, he says, who knows Christ denies the immortality of the soul. Surely not. It is the very minimum of Christian faith. Is it

Christian at all? Is it of faith? The immortality of the soul!—the Christian belief is much more than immortality. It is eternal life. And it is much more than the eternal life of the soul. It is the eternal life of the whole personality.

Here is one fact then with which we can enter the house of mourning. The next fact is that there is 'a judgment to come.' Is Professor CLOW as sure of that? He is just as sure, though he admits that mankind was longer in securing it. He goes back to Daniel for it: 'Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' That is its first clear expression in the Bible. From Daniel he goes to Christ, with whom judgment to come is ever the inevitable issue. He goes from Christ to St. Paul: 'We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.' He goes to the Pauline atmosphere of the Epistle to the Hebrews: 'It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment.' Wherever he goes he finds the revelation, once gained, firmly held. He is content with that.

Are we all content? Can we go with the same confidence to the mourner and say, 'Your son who has fallen is before the judgment seat of God

that he may receive the things done in his body, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad'? If we are sure of the fact, are we sure of the consolation?

We are sure that there is no consolation whatever in it. There is no comfort in it for one in ten of the fathers and mothers whose sons have fallen in the war. There is no consolation for one in fifty. There is no consolation for a single father or a single mother of all the young men who have fallen. For they know their sons.

It is not that they know their sons were bad. No mother will say that, or allow another to say it. There is a pertinent passage in *The Ring and the Book*. Pompilia tells the story of her treatment at the hands of a brutal and hideous husband. She tells it with gentleness and an unconquerable charity. And she brings the story to an end with the simple words, 'I could not love him, but his mother did.'

No mother will say that her son was bad. But the judgment of God! The things done in the body! Before the judgment of the living God what mother will be confident that the things done by her son in the body deserve the promise of everlasting life?

There is a popular way of meeting the difficulty. It seems to be popular in the pulpit; it is very popular with the poets. The evil of a life, be it little or great, is cancelled by the one supreme act of sacrifice at the end of it.

Can we use it? Can we conscientiously carry that comfort to the mourner? Do we believe it? Professor CLOW does not believe it, though he says very little about it. But Principal FORSYTH does not believe it and says so most emphatically.

At the same time as Professor CLOW's book appeared there was published a volume by the Rev. P. T. FORSYTH, D.D., Principal of Hackney

College, Hampstead, with the title of *This Life and the Next* (Macmillan; 4s. net). In that book, in the chapter entitled 'De Mortuis,' Principal FORSYTH says: 'At a time like the present the interest of countless bereaved hearts is not in immortality for themselves, but for those who have been caught away either unfulfilled, or unprepared, or worse than unprepared, by the wickedness of war. What do our ideas of the unseen warrant us to say to the bleeding hearts and fearful minds of those left upon earth? May we say in consolation to the bereaved that every martyr patriot goes straight from the field of death to the side of the Saviour? May we say that in the way of comfort; as if a death for a great cause, to whose side the man sprang at a patriotic call, wiped out the vices of a lifetime, or the betrayal of innocent hearts? We could say no such thing.'

But Professor CLOW had three foundation truths to build on. What was the third? 'The third truth is that we are saved, not by our works, but by faith in God, our Redeemer. No human sanctity earns the right to enter in through the gates into the city. In the white light of God's holiness every man's life stands out flawed and spotted. Before God's throne we must all take our stand with that poor castaway, of whom it was written:

Owning her weakness,
Her evil behaviour,
And leaving with meekness
Her sins to her Saviour.'

That seems to alter the situation. It seems to introduce us into a different world. So then we are *not* judged according to the deeds done in the body. We are judged according to our faith in Christ. Professor CLOW seems to say so. For, from this point, without a word about the contradiction between the second truth and the third, he speaks of the men who have fallen only in their relation to Christ.

First, he says, there are 'those who have died

with a confessed faith in Christ. One of the outstanding facts has been the spontaneous rally made by members of all Christian communions. Every Church has its Roll of Honour, upon which are to be found the names of the flower of the flock. These had publicly confessed their faith, maintained their fellowship, and were growing in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ. They went forth as defenders of the kingdom of heaven. We are sure that as they yielded up their lives, they were persuaded that He was able to keep that which was committed to Him. They were faithful unto death, and we number them among those blessed dead who have died in the Lord, who now rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.'

Next, there are those 'who have died *with a latent faith in God.* There are some who have never made a profession of faith. They have been worshippers in the house of prayer, and have given some support to the objects of the Christian Church. But they have never identified themselves with its fellowship. They have sometimes been critical, and even careless, about the things that belong to their peace. Yet many of them have had a latent faith. They have had a deep conviction of the being and wisdom and love of God. They have cherished a silent and yet constraining reverence for Christ. That was born within them in their early years, when they repeated their simple prayers and sang the hymns of their childhood.'

'There is a record in Indian annals of two English officers, who were taken prisoners in a Mohammedan raid. They were not distinctively religious men. The Bible was a neglected book, and they lived without sharing the offices of Christian fellowship, and without the practice of prayer. They were offered their lives on the usual Mohammedan terms, that they would disown Christ and repeat the creed of Mahomet: "Great is Allah, and Mahomet is his prophet." As they faced this keen temptation their latent faith rose

up in power, and they met the demand with a clear denial. They bowed their heads to the stroke of death with the sheen of a new joy in that Lord whose Name was seldom upon their lips in life, but to whom they were witnesses in the hour of death.'

Then there are men who have '*an imperfect faith in God.* We all remember many who not only refused to confess Christ, but never had much concern as to what He could be to them. They spoke of the fellowship and worship of the Church with indifference, if not with scorn. The great thoughts of the Gospel which stir our souls to penitence and desire were nothing to them. But they cared with a deep interest for the things which Christ honoured and proclaimed. They revered righteousness and truth. They had a true sense of honour, and were filled with compassion for those in need. They were chivalrous in their help for the outcast and the man who is down. They were filled with a moral indignation at the wrongs of the poor. So when the deeds of hate and greed were done, when a merciless brutality wrought havoc among the defenceless, and a coarse and bestial sensuality ravaged the helpless of Flanders and of France, they rose up and left house, and parents, and wife and child for the kingdom of heaven's sake.'

The example is found in the Old Testament. It is the example of a woman. 'When the Israelites sent their two spies across Jordan they found a lodging in the house of Rahab the harlot. She was a woman of Canaan, and her life was dark with shame. Her knowledge of the God of Israel was dim and shadowy. Her conception of the mission of His people was dark and uncertain. Her ideal of life faltered at the very thought of purity. But she had faith enough to risk her all, and to hazard her life for the cause of the God of Israel. We find her name written in the great roll of honour of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as one whose faith, imperfect indeed, was counted to her for righteousness.'

Again, of those who have fallen there are men who 'died *with a freshly born faith in God*. They have been wilfully and openly defiant. They have never prayed. We need not uncover too rudely and barely the dark secrets of their lives, or describe the wild mutinies of their reckless years. Yet many of these men were wondrously pitiful in the hour of another's need, were strangely gentle in word and deed as they bore the wounded, were unselfish and loyal in their comradeship, and were nobly heroic in the saving of the lives of others at the cost of their own. In the last hour many of these men stepped out steadfastly to certain death in the power of a faith which was freshly born within their souls.'

'An American poet, John Hay, has told the story of Jim Bludso, the engineer of the *Prairie Belle*, a steamboat on the Mississippi River. He was a man of evil life, utterly careless of the obediences of purity. The *Prairie Belle* was an old worn-out vessel, and newer boats easily passed her in the race on the river. One night she was being driven at high pressure, not to be left too far behind. Fire broke out from under her boilers, and the whole vessel was enveloped in flame. Her head was turned toward the river bank, and the terrified passengers crowded into her bows. Bludso stood by his engines in the midst of the fire, and held her against the river bank until every other on board was saved. The poet closes his story with these lines:

He weren't no saint—but at judgment
I'd run my chance with Jim,
'Longside of some pious gentleman
That wouldn't shook hands with him.
He seen his duty, a dead sure thing—
And went for it thar and then;
And Christ ain't going to be too hard
On a man who died for men.'

What does Professor CLOW say to that? He questions the poet's theology. He denies that a man's evil can be 'atoned for or blotted out by a single heroic deed at the close of life.' But the

poet does not read deeply enough into the significance of this sacrifice of Jim Bludso. He does not discern that the man who stood by his engine while the flames wrapped him round as a winding sheet was a believer, dying for a faith which had been born within. He was a crude-minded, sin-laden, dim-visioned man; but he was moved and motived by Him who had died for men, and in that faith he followed in Christ's steps.

Are these all? No, there is still another class. There are those—but all that Professor CLOW says about them is: 'We leave them to the judgment of Him who knoweth all.'

The judgment of Him who knoweth all—who is that? It is *the Lord Jesus Christ*. In *The Record* for Thursday, 11th April 1918, there is a sermon by the Dean of Canterbury. It was preached in Canterbury Cathedral on Easter Day. Dr. Wace says that there is 'one certain thing' about those who have passed into the next world. It is certain about *all* of them. They remain in the gracious and living hands of Christ. They are subject to His power. They receive their ultimate destiny at His hands.

When, says the Dean of Canterbury, 'we pass into the unseen portion of life we, too, pass into a world in great measure unknown and obscure, but we do know one cardinal certainty. We need not be content with saying, as good men even without the Christian faith may say, that they are passing into the hands of God. They are going, we shall ourselves go, into the presence of One who is well known to us, into the presence of that Lord Jesus whose whole character and nature are familiar to us through the records of His life on earth, and through His final words as He passed from it. We and they are passing into the nearer presence of the gracious Master, Who said in His last hours, "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would

have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." What need any Christian be concerned with beyond this, either for himself or for the beloved ones who pass from him? If we ourselves, or a friend of ours, were going into an unknown country, would not the best thing we could know about it be that we should be received by a friend whom we knew to be a man of all goodness and abundant power? That is what we know of *all who fall in this great battle day by day.*

Is there anything that we can do for those who have fallen? Is there anything that we can do for them now that they are dead? Yes, we can pray for them.

So says Dr. P. T. FORSYTH. And Dr. P. T. FORSYTH is the Principal of a Congregational College. He says that we can pray for the dead. He is very well aware that congregationalists have not been in the habit of praying for the dead. But he traces its discontinuance to ecclesiastical abuse. 'It would never have been lost but for the abuses of purgatory, masses, and the commerce which the Church made of a magical influence on another world. But we threw away too much when we made a clean sweep.'

What will the advantage be? We shall retain our hold on the unseen. Prayer, says Dr. FORSYTH, 'is our supreme link with the unseen—with which otherwise we have no practical relations. We should resume prayer for the dead, were it only to realize the unity of the Church and our fellowship with its invisible part. In Christ we cannot be cut off from our dead nor they from us wherever they be. And the contact is in prayer.'

Then we should find it easier to maintain our belief in immortality if we prayed for the dead. 'It would give us a practical relation with the other side, and to other immortality than our own. As

it is, we have little direct and practical contact with immortality so far as the day's life goes. No act of that life brings us into direct and practical connexion with the world of the dead. It is a dream; it is a world not realized. It does not belong to the strong and active side of our life. There is always about a life that works outward on another a certain note of distinction which is not made up for by any enthusiasm of Humanity. I knew an agnostic of a very fine kind who shortened his life by his devoted service to the very poor in a low part of London. There was to me a certain halo about him. And yet it is a different kind of spell that invests a life lived in the power of an endless life, a life that dwells with immortality daily.'

There is a third reason. Dr. FORSYTH believes that we have been commanded to pray for the dead. For 'we are bidden to pray for everything that is not trivial, "*in everything* making your requests known," and to cast every real care on God. There is nothing serious that we may not bring to the Father. A widow praying who does not know where her next shilling is to come from means more to the Father than a full choral service, and more engages His heart. And it is serious enough that half our heart, and all its treasure, should be snatched into the unseen. With that unseen our only sure link is the God to whom we pray. But He is as much the God of our dead as of us; and He is a God from whom they cannot be severed as they are from us. May our prayer to our common Father not put into petition what is always in our thoughts, and put into words what is always in our heart? If we name them before God, what are we doing in our way but what He does in His, and calling things that are not as though they were.'

It is often said that the Lord's Prayer, like the Ten Commandments, is divided into two parts. One part applies to God, and one part applies to man. Professor John OMAN, of Westminster

College, Cambridge, holds that that is a complete and disastrous misunderstanding. Professor OMAN's interpretation of the Lord's Prayer will be found in a volume entitled *Grace and Personality*, recently published in Cambridge at the University Press (6s. net).

It is impossible, he says, that the Prayer can be divided into two parts, a part for God and a part for man. For there is nothing in the world which applies to God and is not of practical moment for man. And there is nothing which applies to man and is not of immediate interest to God. 'Our relation to God is personal after such a fashion that our religion is necessarily an ethic and our ethic necessarily a religion.'

The Lord's Prayer begins with 'Our Father.' But 'Our Father' is not merely its introduction. It is not merely the address to God with which every prayer is understood to open. 'Our Father' is the ruling thought of the Prayer. It begins at the beginning and goes to the end. 'Deliverance from the Evil One, with which the prayer ends, is as much concerned with that name of Father as the hallowing of it, with which it begins, and each new petition follows from what goes before, expanding still farther the content of calling God our Father in Heaven.'

It is not as an interpretation of the Lord's Prayer alone that Professor OMAN makes 'Our Father' run throughout it. It is as an interpretation of all life. The Lord's Prayer is only an illustration. In all life the beginning is right reverence, and right reverence goes to the end. Reverence, or the recognition of God, expresses itself as loyalty. As St. Paul says, faith works through love. But the kingdom does not come by the loyalty, it comes by the reverence. 'The supreme hindrance to the coming of God's Kingdom is idolatry, not evil-doing.'

How often, says Professor OMAN, 'is that order, reversed! Let us do Thy will, that Thy Kingdom

may be gradually brought in, and, in the end, every heart be inspired by the true reverence! The result is striving and crying, with the perpetual menace of defeat and the increasing shadow of despair. But the servant of the Lord should not strive, nor be, after that fashion, morally strenuous. An essentially apocalyptic hope, a dependence, not on man who runs, but on God who gives the victory, dominates this prayer as it does all our Lord's teaching; and the ground of it lies in beginning with the manifestation of God, and, only through it, reaching the activity of man, the order being first reverence, then surrender, then obedience.'

This is the comfort with which we ourselves are comforted when our sons have fallen in the war. This is the comfort which we can carry to others. Every man is judged according to the deeds which he has done in his body. That, says Professor CLOW, is one of the fundamental facts. And that is the idea of judgment which most of us have and will always have. But the deeds done in the body are only the outcome of the recognition of God. First 'Our Father,' then the loyalty to that discovery, and whatever deeds we have time for. If we have time for only one deed, the supreme act of self-sacrifice on the battlefield, that is enough. It does not save us. It does not atone for an evil life. But it expresses in the only way left to us now the fact that does save, the recognition of God in the heart, the reverence which finds its sufficient expression in the familiar words, 'Our Father which art in heaven.'

Now the recognition of God may be born in a man's soul in a moment, and the words, 'Our Father which art in heaven,' may at the same moment leap to his lips. Are we afraid to credit the men who are dying for us with a religion which they never professed? Real religion is not a process, it is an act. As Dr. FORSYTH says characteristically, 'It is not evolution, it is always revolution.' A crisis, a moment's deep emotion, the imminence of a unique experience—that will

do it. And that moment was theirs who faced the fact of death in the grey of the misty morning across the scarred fields of Flanders.

The last act of sacrifice does not wipe out the past. God wipes it out. And since it is God that wipes it out, the evil of it is not insurmountable. Therefore it is that to the mother of the wildest lad that ever lived we can come with assured confidence. It is assured confidence in God. We can even feel that in this there is a welcome compensation for the horrors of the war, that it has given to this one and to that the opportunity of uttering the word 'Father' in sincerity. That word uttered, the rest is with God.

When will the war be over? Does nobody know? Yes, one man knows.

Mr. E. A. BURROUGHS is Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford, and Canon of Peterborough. He is also Chaplain to His Majesty the King. Mr. BURROUGHS is not likely to assume the office of prophet without being called to it. Yet Mr. BURROUGHS knows, and says emphatically that he knows, exactly when the war will be over.

Mr. BURROUGHS has published a pamphlet on *The Delayed Decision* (Longmans; 3d. net). The title tells us at once that the war should have been over before this time. Why is it not over?

'There is a two-fold conviction which grows upon me, as (I doubt not) on others also, as the months drag on. One side of it is that the war was never meant by God to last so long. If we and our Allies had faced from the start the logic of it, and set ourselves to be morally and spiritually worthy of the cause He gave us to defend, we should, I believe, long since have reached a happy and righteous peace. Lord Kitchener's forecast of three years—"a year of preparation, a year of struggle, and a year of victory"—was not lightly made. When the third year began, the conviction

of all our troops in France, at any rate, was clear that it was "the year of victory."

Why did it not become the year of victory? Because we said, 'Gold and khaki will do it.' That was our British creed. We expressed it on the poster of a very popular journal in January 1917. And gold and khaki did not do it. A few months later gold and khaki found themselves effectually neutralized by that sudden outbreak in Russia of 'the unruly wills and affections of men.'

We need not blame the gold or the khaki. They both did all that it was possible for them to do. But they were not enough. We left out of account the things that are moral and spiritual. And without these things the war will never be won by us.

Wherever we look to-day, says Mr. BURROUGHS, whether in Russia, in France, in Italy, or in Britain, 'all that is thwarting us has but one root—lack of principle *somewhere*, lack of conscience *somewhere*. That is the real enemy behind Boloism, and profiteering, and strikes, and food-hogging, and uneven distribution, and most of the other difficulties which not only in themselves are a handicap to us, but also are the prolific sources of pessimism, disaffection, and labour unrest. If there were more conscience in every part of the community, there would be less incompetence, less unfairness, and less discontent. Our traditional British way of "muddling through" is not merely due to lack of parts: it is much more due to lack of application and thorough, thought-out work—that is, lack of conscience. It is lack of conscience that impairs efficiency, reduces output, saps enthusiasm, and so prolongs the war. And conscience is only another name for the sense and the fear of God.'

A secular writer has said that religion is the true cement of society. Had we and our Allies recognized it as such, Mr. BURROUGHS believes that 'the merely material gains resulting—to say

nothing of what help God Himself might have added thereto—would have been enough to win us the war long since. It would have "paid" materially to have reformed spiritually. And, what is more important, it would have left us ready to make the best use of peace, instead of having to think, as we now do, of the After-War period with sinking hearts. As it is, we have left religion—the greatest uniting, inspiring, and constructive force in the world—almost outside our calculations. If the coming of the war was the nemesis on materialism, its continuance is the penalty of opportunism—of halting between two opinions, paltering with God.'

And so the war will end when we truly take in God. The Pope has said so. Mr. BURROUGHS says so. Mr. BURROUGHS is surprised to find himself in agreement with the Pope—'especially when the war is in question.' But he is cordially at one with the Pope in what he said last Christmas. 'The present calamity,' he said, 'will never finish till men return to God with the warmest prayer from the heart. As the unbridled lust of the senses plunged once celebrated cities into a sea of fire, so in our days public impiety and atheism, erected into a system of so-called civilization, has plunged the world into a sea of blood.'

But what exactly do the Pope and Mr. BURROUGHS mean by returning to God? Mr. BURROUGHS at any rate knows what he means. He means surrendering the lusts of the flesh. He says emphatically that the war will go on until we do surrender them. Now we are showing no sign at present of surrendering the lusts of the flesh. 'Some of the most dangerous of those lusts have in this time of war, by common testimony, gained a hold among us such as they probably never had before. The things one hears on this subject from all quarters, at home and in the field, are utterly sickening; and there seems to be no real revolt of the national moral sense against it.'

But not only does Mr. BURROUGHS see that the destruction of those lusts will end the war; he also sees how they can be destroyed.

First of all, by means of 'a fighting faith.' 'Our one supreme duty, whether as Christians or patriots, is to cry aloud and spare not, to leave no stone unturned, until our Government and people face the Fact which alone can save us. We must pray, and press, and organize, and if need be fight, to secure some honest, national recognition of God before it is too late. Other "interests" can impose their will on the Government—the brewers, for instance. Why cannot the Christians? The concessions extorted by the brewers are dead inconsistent with all that our rulers tell us is needed to win the war; yet, at the cost of eating their own words, our rulers go on making them. Why? Because the brewers appear to have an organized body of opinion—or, shall we say, of appetite?—behind them. The concessions which we Christians need to press for would be all in line with the appeals for sacrifice, economy, courage, and so forth, which are constantly being made to the nation: they would give them the background, the reality, which at present they lack. Are there really not enough convinced and united Christians in the country to compel the Government to see that we *can't* be ignored—that God, whom we plead for, is also a Great Power who must be considered first of all? If we believe that nothing else can save the situation, we have got to do this, cost what it may.'

Next, by mutual encouragement. 'We may encourage ourselves in the thought that there are thousands of patriots, not labelled Christians, not organized in Churches, who would welcome and back a brave and solid move along such lines: men and women who, three years ago, would have been indifferent, but now have suffered, and have learned their need of God, though they await a strong lead to rise and follow Him. Their faith is a national asset of supreme importance which can only be realized through our faith coming out

into the open—if need be, going “over the top”—in the effort to make our Government, who are our representatives, give effect to our will that they should recognize God.’

Thirdly, by throwing the same responsibility on the irreligious. For ‘we may well believe that even among the frankly irreligious a move in this direction would be welcomed, and would tend to restore public confidence, which is far more necessary than so-called optimism for winning the war. Even a man who has no religion himself knows what it is—in business, for instance—to trust before all others one who is known to be a man of God. There are some of our leaders whom we all want to *know* we can trust implicitly. Nothing could give us confidence in them—in their judgment as well as their devotion to principle—so much as some public avowal, in word and act, that they are placing their trust in God. Abraham Lincoln, bearing a burden infinitely less than rests upon our War Cabinet, tells us, “I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go: my own wisdom and that of all around me seemed insufficient for the day.” It is not only religious circles that would be reassured by the knowledge that our leaders also sought their leading upon their knees. A man who is really relying upon God has the secret of three things indispensable in a trusted leader: a quiet mind, inspiration, and freedom from any taint of self-seeking. And ultimately it is only a Christian politician whom any Christian either can or ought to follow blindly, as we are bidden follow to-day. That is why President Wilson means so much to the Allied cause.’

And last of all, by the continual remembrance that it is faith in God that secures the future. ‘Whatever may happen with regard to the end of the war, the hope of a new and better world after it rests with the men and the women in all nations who believe in God and will act accordingly. “True religion,” says “A Student in Arms,” “is

betting your life that there’s a God.” And that is the very heart of Christianity. That is the secret of the abolition of self, which is the fruit of the Spirit of Christ in a life. It is only a great wave of selflessness, passing through the whole community, that can make after-war reconstruction possible; and I challenge any man to show me whence we can get it except from Christ Himself. Patriotism produced such a wave in the early days of the war. But even that did not spread wide or deep enough; and now its force is largely spent. Patriotism as such, where it has ebbed, cannot now be recalled on an adequate scale. We need the higher and deeper devotion that comes with the spirit of Christ, to neutralize “self” in all its forms.’

‘We stand,’ says Mr. BURROUGHS, ‘face to face with a situation not unlike that in which London found itself in the year 1666, when, after the Great Fire, it became necessary to plan a new London for the future. It is on record that Sir Christopher Wren presented to the then authorities a comprehensive scheme of reconstruction, to centre in the new St. Paul’s Cathedral, from which broad, convenient thoroughfares would radiate in all directions. The plans were accepted; but it proved impossible to carry them out, to the great loss of London to this day. Why? Because the individual citizens of those days insisted on having their own little houses on their own little plots built up exactly as they had been before. Self arose and spoiled the future: and so the old London, with its crookedness and its narrowness, is with us still. And for us to-day the question is, Shall the new world after the war perpetuate the crookednesses and narrownesses of the pre-war world? or shall it be a world intersected with broad ways of righteousness and truth, converging upon, and radiating from, their one true source and centre—the living worship of the living God? It is only the Christians of the world who can secure that this ideal is realized — by *being* Christians, that is, reformers and fighters by God’s side, and never resting till the Christian law and spirit prevail.’