

# Psychology of the Social Redemption



By

James Melville Coleman

Author of *Social Ethics*



THIS little book comes to you as the author's contribution to the saving of our common country. He will appreciate the kindness if you will send to him at Quinter, Kansas, any review of the booklet that you write, or opinion that you may wish to express.



## FOREWORD

Some nineteen centuries ago a jeering crowd was gathered around three crosses near the city of Jerusalem. On these crosses three men were suffering the agonies of crucifixion. Two of these were common criminals, whose chief interest for us lies in their association in their death with the third who hung between them, as though the most dangerous of the three. Who was this man? Over his head is an inscription which tells us that his name is Jesus, that he comes from the hill village of Nazareth and that he is a King. This raises other questions?

Why was the King dying on the cross with criminals? The hardened soldier who nailed him to the cross said that he was the Son of God. What was the purpose of this tragedy? The crowd did not know. But Jesus knew. The Father knew. Dimly as yet the disciples knew. It is in the belief that many are vitally interested in the purpose of this dying man that these pages are written.

The best explanation that can be given of his purpose is in the words of the man himself. He began his ministry with a call to repentance. "Repent for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand," he said. The Kingdom was present in the person of the King. When he had gathered a little group of twelve men he sent them out to preach the Kingdom. Later he sent out seventy to preach the Kingdom. He taught his disciples to pray for the coming of the Kingdom. He told Pilate that he came

to earth to be a king. On his cross his enemies wrote that he was a King. He told the Roman Governor that his Kingdom was not built on force like that of Rome, else would his servants fight in his defence. His was a Kingdom that wielded no sword, but that of the Spirit. His dying was to make that Kingdom prevail.

What is this Kingdom that Jesus Christ lived and died to win for his brother men? Nowhere does Jesus define the Kingdom. But he said that the Kingdom was righteousness and peace. Those who made the Kingdom the goal of life would have all other things added to them. For the instruction of the citizens of the Kingdom he issued a Manifesto that we call the Sermon on the Mount, which is the constitution of his Kingdom. Nicodemus came to learn about the new way and was told that naturalization in the Kingdom demanded that the alien should be born from above. Every one that is born of the Spirit, whether individual or nation, belongs to the Kingdom. So the Kingdom is coming every day in Africa and in India and in China and your neighborhood. Some tell us that the Kingdom is a way to get to heaven. But Jesus did not say that the Kingdom was in some distant heaven or future time. He said it was among them. Instead of being a way to get men into heaven, the Kingdom is a way of getting heaven into men. It was to be reached not by dying, but by living.

Jesus taught that doing the will of the Father was the goal of life. So the Kingdom means the

reign of God on earth. He taught his disciples to pray for the coming of heavenly conditions on earth. "Thy will be done." Where? "On earth." "Thy Kingdom come." Where? "On earth." "Hallowed be thy name." Where? "On earth." So we see that the purpose of the cross was primarily social. Jesus came to save individuals, but as citizens of the Kingdom. The Kingdom was the end; the saving of individuals was a means—an absolutely necessary means—to the end.

In recent years we have heard much about the social gospel. Some call it a new gospel. But it is not new. It was the gospel which Jesus preached and lived. It was the gospel on which the early Christian Church was trained in the time of its power. It was the gospel of the Kingdom and this means a new social order. It was revolutionary then. It turned the world upside down. It is revolutionary now. Old things may remain, but must be filled with a new Spirit.

The World War did not mean the failure of the Christ, but of the church which did not witness for him. Had the Kingdom been preached in faith by the church in the last generation, had men been taught that the same moral law applies to nations as to the citizen, there might have been no World War. The church must confess that it was mainly her members that were responsible for the war, often her members that fought it, and that in every land the church supported it. Yet that was the denial of the gospel of the Kingdom. The church did not see that then. She sees it now. In that war the

Christian church crucified the Christ as surely as the Jewish Church did nineteen centuries ago.

Also the church may confess that Jesus was nailed to the cross for the same reason in 1914 as in 30. It was because men did not understand the cross and the Kingdom. For the church then and now did Jesus pray, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do."

The individualistic gospel regards this world as a wreck out of which some individuals may be saved, but the wreck goes down. Jesus had a larger purpose. It is to save both wreck and crew. We are all familiar with John 3:16, which deals with individual salvation, but forget 3:17 which promises social salvation. The purpose of the cross is to save the whole world, its individuals and its institutions. Those who tell us that life is divided into the secular and the sacred seem to think that Jesus and the devil have gone into partnership, allowing individual life to the former and public affairs to the latter. Satan's title to any part of human life was destroyed by the sacrifice on the cross and he is a squatter, who will be evicted when God's people have faith in his power to save.

The nation is sacred to God. Some writers affirm that a nation has the same character as a corporation. But this is to confound an organization with an organism. Men make organizations. So they make corporations. But men do not make a nation. That is an organism and only God can make an organism. The nation results through the working of God in human history. No man plan-

ned the United States as a nation. God planned it. The United States is a psychological organism, just as a plant is a biological organism.

What is a nation? Is our nation a personality? Does the League of Nations represent personalities? Does Secretary Stimson at the London Conference represent one personality that we call The United States and does Premier MacDonald represent another personality that we call England? Can a nation do right, or wrong? No one questions that. Is a nation responsible for what it does? The answer to that goes far to decide the question of responsibility.

For a dozen years the responsibility for the World War has been a burning question. The Allies wrote into the Treaty of Versailles that Germany was guilty and the German representatives were compelled to sign it. But Germans did not believe it. They said Russia and France were the guilty parties. Ask any man on the street and he will tell you which nation it was and while the answers differ from each other, there is one thing in which all agree. Some nation, or nations, was responsible. The world has a unanimous verdict on that point. The world agrees that nations are morally responsible for what they do, as certainly as are individual citizens. Does it then appear that since nations are morally responsible that they are moral personalities.

Does not the demand for reparations rest on the same basis? Germany might present an alibi with the claim that individuals were responsible. Ger-

many might lay the responsibility on the Kaiser. She might claim it was the General Staff that was to blame. But she has not done so. She accepts the fact of national responsibility. But if the nation is morally responsible to other nations, is there not also responsibility to God.

Does The United States have a soul to save? Do I? My Behaviorist friend says, No! He says that I am a machine. He claims that I have no more responsibility than the car I drive. Some make the same claim for the nation. Does the moral responsibility of the nation on which all are agreed demand a national soul? Some nation, or nations, sinned in 1914. Does national sin mean a national soul? Does the fact of a national soul show that the greatest menace in national life is not some other nation, but national sin? Certainly against this menace armies and navies are no defense.

Jefferson said in regard to human slavery, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just." Was slavery a national sin? Was the suffering of the Civil War a penalty for sin? Can a nation repent? What makes any sin national as well as individual? Has God a claim against our nation for a lost Sabbath? Has the nation sinned against the little children that work long hours in shops and factories?

All these questions are concerned with the issue of social salvation. Many men are preaching what they call a social gospel. Does it have this end in view? The nation of Israel entered into Covenant



with God. Moses put that question to a vote of the people and it carried. Every Christian has come under the Covenant of grace. Does a nation need to do that? What would it mean to the nation?

If a nation is a personality, if a nation has moral responsibility for its decisions, all these questions are in the issue. If the world is to be saved, as Jesus said, the church needs to face the issue. You and I, as members of the church, need to face it. That it is humanly impossible to save the United States, one readily grants. So is it humanly impossible to save an individual citizen. Both are miracles of grace. Looked at from the standpoint of the cross are not both these miracles necessary and normal? Is one less possible to Jesus Christ than the other? Does not the issue resolve itself into a human faith in Jesus Christ that is adequate to the purpose of the cross? When the agonized father brought his demoniac son to Jesus he said "If thou can'st do anything, help us." Jesus answered the father and he answers us "If thou can'st. All things are possible to him that believes."

## THE UNITED STATES: THE SUBJECT OF REDEMPTION

Shall our country be saved? That is the most important question before our citizenship. We are interested in the economic issues of the tariff and taxation and labor. Prohibition is a vital issue for the nation. The future of our own nation and others seems to hinge on the outlawry of war. But of greater moment than any of these and including all of them in its program is the issue of getting right with God. It is as we keep faith with God that we keep faith with our fellow men.

The redemption of our country was the issue raised in the foreword. Is the nation a moral personality? You and I are moral personalities. Does the nation have the same moral law, the same peril from sin, the same Savior as the citizen? That is the thesis of this writing.

Shall we see where this premise leads us?

Whatever program may be suggested for the transforming of the national life will, humanly speaking, depend upon the church for its execution. The church failed in the World War, it failed at times before and may fail again, but it is the human agency commissioned of God to do his work. What should be the program of the church in national salvation?

The first thing would seem to be a frank acceptance of the commission to preach the Kingdom of God to the world and accept the Kingdom as the

rule of church life. Perhaps no one can tell what this means until the church has a real experience of Jesus Christ. "He that willeth to do his will shall know the teaching." The characteristic of the teaching of the church of the first century was its wholeness. When Jesus said to a man "take up thy bed and walk" he added "sin no more." He saved the whole man. Within the Christian brotherhood the age-old feud between Jew and Gentile died. Class lines vanished. Slave and freeman broke the common bread.

If the Kingdom is to prevail it means not only to save the business man, but the business. Not only the politician, but politics. Not only the judge, but the judiciary system. The preaching of the Kingdom includes institutional salvation. Our revivals have aimed at, and have secured, individual transformations. Acceptance of the Kingdom means also social transformation.

There must be faith equal to the task that the church undertakes. Jesus had no doubt about the triumph of the Kingdom. Paul had no doubt. Peter said that the doubter could accomplish nothing. John stood as an exile for the faith on the Island of Patmos and looked back upon a transformed world. It is the work of the church to witness for Christ and his Kingdom; it is the work of the Christ to bring it to pass. Faith there has been on the part of individual Christians, but the corporate faith of the church that made Paul such a mighty missionary force has been lacking. He was the fist to smite the gods of Rome, but the corporate

faith of the home church was the arm that drove the fist.

A revival that changes a nation seems to need a national leader. Moses led a revival out of Egypt. The great revivals in Israel were led by the kings, Josiah and Hezekiah. Luther was the most prominent leader in Germany. Knox was the greatest figure in Scotland in his struggle with Queen Mary and the Roman Catholic Church. Francis First might have carried France for the Reformed faith as William of Orange did Holland. Bryan's campaign in 1896 and that of Roosevelt in 1912 had enough of religious significance to show the possibilities in leadership. Seldom has any body of men sung "Onward Christian Soldiers" with more fervor than the Bull Moose Convention. Ramsay Mac Donald might shake England to the center with a religious revival.

Does the church in this country actually want the Kingdom to come for which we profess to preach and to pray? It can be had for the price. Is the church ready to pay the price? If the church is ready God is ready. It is with the faith that the church will take up seriously the campaign to win the Kingdoms of this world that some program is suggested for capturing the political institutions of the United States.

*This is God's World.*

When one is building a structure that is to stand the test of time and human experience he needs to look well to the foundation on which it stands. So

we begin with this foundation fact. Scientists have speculated about the origin of this world in star-mist, or some other primitive form of matter, but whether star-mist, or granite, it needs an author. Even star-mist did not make itself. So whatever view one may have of world beginnings his first premise is-God. God made this world out of his own material, in his own time, and in His own way. Man manufactures things, but he creates nothing, therefore he has no more than a conditional title to anything. God alone has absolute title to the things which He has created.

2. It is also God's world because when it was wrecked by sin God redeemed the world by giving His only Son to die for the world sin. Usually world rulers have been quite willing to give other men's sons, but God gave his own. He had no partners in redemption that he did not have in creation. The plan was His. The work was His. So God has a double title to the world.

3. It is a good world in the plan of God, good enough for God to love it. Five times during the work of creation God said that it was good. One wonders that God gave so much thought to making the eye of the fly. Why was there so much care in painting the wing of a butterfly? The bewildering faces that look at us out of many a pansybed and the glory of a sunset show infinite interest. The only explanation seems to be that infinite love was lavished on the world.

A mother sews her love into the garment that she fashions for her child. That was what God did

with this world in the making, so that men might come to know and to love Him. One fails to grasp the inner meaning of the world when he sees in it only so much weight and extension, so much land and water and sky, so much rock and forest. All of these get their meaning from the fact that through them is manifested the love of a personal God "Who is over all, in all, and through all."

*This World Must Be Run on God's Plan.*

It might seem that the mere statement of this fact would be sufficient without discussion, were it not that so many programs are put out with no apparent regard to the divine plan. That they come to nothing in the end does not dissuade others from following the same fruitless road. The fact that observation makes sufficiently clear is that every device must be run on the plan of its maker.

One cannot run a wagon on the same plan as a cart, even though both are very simple machines and a world must be run on the plans of its maker as certainly as a wagon.

Institutions and nations are made on designs as definite in the mind of God as the plans of model "T" in the mind of Ford and at the same time they are much more complicated and difficult to operate. For forty centuries and more men have been trying, with their limited knowledge of history and science, to tell how nations came into being and how they should be managed, drawing their conclusions from a world that was disfigured and distorted by sin, with the result that the wisdom of one period has

been the foolishness of the next. The great temptation of Jesus was to take the popular way—which was Satan's way—to win the Kingdom and not all statesmen through the centuries have said, "Get thee behind me."

Few nations of modern times seems to have followed the false light of science with more loyal devotion than did Germany up to the revolution of 1918. They took to heart seriously the idea of "struggle" from Darwin and added to that the idea of "force" from Nietzsche. Then with these was joined the driving power of the idea of serving the fatherland. From that one should not conclude that the Kultur of Germany that led up to the World War was any different in kind from that of France on the west, or of Russia on the east, except that it was carried out with German thoroughness. The correction that William Second and his Junker supporters made on the ideas of Darwin and Nietzsche was to limit them as did Burgess of Columbia to international affairs, demanding within the nation cooperation to the last degree for the fatherland.

Never again need any statesman lead his countrymen into following the teachings of Haeckel and Nietzsche and claim that he was not warned. If force had been destined to rule the world, the rushing German corps would not have turned back from the Marne. It was not English tenacity, nor French strategy that stopped the rush for Paris. It was God. Again and again during the fearful four years of war was that same power shown, when all else had failed. So the army of the Kaiser was turned back from Paris as Napoleon from Waterloo to show

that this world was not to be ruled by force. When the Germans forget Verdun and the English forget Ypres and the French the Marne and the Americans the Argonne, then may some statesman, who has led his people into the inferno of war, say, "I was not warned." God did not make this world on Nietzsche's plan and that is sufficient reason why it will never be run successfully on that plan.

The wreck of 1914 was not the first, even if one think it the worst, of its kind. As we look back along the highway of history there are wrecks, sometimes total wrecks, of the national personalities ditched by their drivers and left as monuments by the wayside to warn other nations against meeting a like fate; nor does history fail to make plain that these emperial machines were wrecked because they were not run according to the plan of the maker.

### *The Wrecks on the Road.*

Why have Assyria and Babylon and Greece and Tyre ceased to have a place among the nations of the world? Why have their civilizations vanished sometimes without leaving a living trace? Why have the capitals of these nations, whose armies once ruled the world, become heaps of dust in which the spade of the archaeologist must delve in order to uncover the palaces of kings that aspired to rule the world? They had art and literature as well as the nations of the present time. They had their schools and their universities and their libraries, for paganism had a splendid record in its material civilization. Some of these buried nations, like Tyre,



named the Yankee of the East, sailed all the known seas. Why are they but memories now, over which we ponder in our museums, these empires whose kings ruled over the millions of the earth?

Egypt was a great empire in its time, great in its science, for some of the inventions of modern times were known and lost again in Egypt, great in its education, for Greek scholars went to Egypt to study, great in its engineering, for the building of the pyramids is still a marvel of the age. There were periods in the history of Egypt when it seemed that she might last like her pyramids. But these conditions passed and her fortunes passed with them, until now her affairs are administered by the Anglo-Saxon and her ancient civilization is as defunct as her mummied kings.

Babylon was the wonder of the world and the market place of the nation. It was not surprising that her great monarch as he stood on the city wall and looked upon the engineering feats wrought out in palaces and hanging gardens should say in kingly pride, "Is not this great Babylon that I have builded," neither is it strange that God, who takes his own time and way of training men for service, should have led him out to take a graduate course among the cattle of the field until he had learned the lesson, so hard for statesmen to get, that "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." But the lesson learned by Nebuchadnezzar did not serve for succeeding rulers of Babylon and the empire was wrecked because it did not follow the plans of its maker.

Greece, splendid in her art achievement, carried

her language and her civilization far to the eastward in her unconscious mission of preparing the way for the coming of the Gospel of the Kingdom, but with the passing of Alexander, Greece ceased to be a great power in the earth and only the magnificence of her ruins shows what she has been. It is a far cry from the Greece of Pericles to that of Venizelos.

Then came Rome, the mistress of the world, so stable in her government, so enduring in her character that she was named the Eternal City. From the Highlands of Scotland to the Euphrates the word of Rome was law and along her highways, that are still the wonder of road builders, marched the legions that were the symbol of her power. So vast were her empire and the greatness of her name that the death on the cross of a humble citizen of Nazareth, falsely charged with insurrection, did not even receive mention in a governor's report. With the record of a thousand years of life, is it strange that when Rome fell at last, men thought it meant the end of the world and Augustine wrote his City of God to prove that another city, eternal in fact, would rise out of the ruins of the Empire.

Historians tell us that Rome fell because of the coming of the German from his home in the North, but that was the occasion of the fall and not the cause. If it had not been for the foe within, the luxury and vice that had sapped the vitality of the descendants of Cincinnatus, they would have turned back the Goths as centuries before they had defied the greater menace from Carthage, when Hannibal was at the gates of Rome. Rome fell as the tree falls because it was rotten at the heart.

Call the roll of the empires that in turn ruled the world, Hittites, Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greece and Rome and there is no answer except that which ruins tell of former power, and even where the name remains, it has ceased to raise emotions of either hope, or fear. What to the modern student is the value of all these wrecks by the highway of history? Why has the historian so generally failed to diagnose the cause of decay and death? Is it not because so many historians have failed, as Gibbon failed, to know the laws of national life.

If the modern student is to profit by the lessons which these wrecked nations teach, he must learn that these repeated object lessons were meant to make emphatic the conclusion that they were not run on the plan of their maker, and that if modern national personalities are to escape the like fate they must learn and profit by the lesson that armies and navies are no defence against the deadly foe, the emperialism of sin, that overthrew the civilizations of the past.

### *Danger Signals.*

These tragic wrecks are God's danger signals to every patriot and statesmen to warn them that if modern nations are guilty of the ancient sins they may claim no immunity from the ancient judgment. It was when Rome welcomed the unholy mysteries of Egypt and Asia,—when the Orontes flowed into the Tiber—that the sturdy citizenship of Rome was corrupted and made an easy prey. God made Rome

and he made America and he made them according to the same moral laws. God does not change; moral law does not change; the consequences of sin do not change. The Ten Commandments, wrought into the constitution of mankind, operate with the same certainty that they did fifteen centuries ago. The Siamese twins of luxury and vice may have been more evident in Rome than here, political corruption in high place may have been more evident, the oppression of the weak may have been greater, but we have them all in contagious forms and we can not afford to run heedlessly past the danger signals of history.

The World War was a trumpet call to the nations to be just, and even generous in their dealings with each other. But as we consider the conquerors, or the conquered, which one of the nations engaged has profited by the judgment, which came on them all? Where is the sign of national repentance for the sin that blighted the world and of which none was guiltless? What single nation gives evidence of even professing to turn to God, in whom are the issues of national life? The nations have run by a signal of a world on fire and do not seem to realize that it was set for them.

*The Instruction Book for Individuals and Nations.*

When an automobile maker sends out his machine it is with the hope that it may run with safety to its driver and his neighbors, so with each machine there goes an instruction book that tells something of how the car was made and how it should be

operated for the advantage of all concerned. So when God made this world with all its complex individual and social life, which is altogether more difficult to operate than any human machine, He gave with it an instruction book of how the world was made and urged that the book should be studied and its instruction faithfully followed, as well as giving many illustrations of the consequences of failure to follow instructions. It tells us how different nations, especially the Jews, managed, or mismanaged, their affairs and the consequences of these courses so that we may profit by their experience. In fact God values this instruction book so highly that He offers to insure the life of any individual, or nation, that faithfully observes the advice given.

It does not seem that any extended argument should be needed to show that a man ought to know something about the car he undertakes to run, nor that a statesman, with the responsibilities of national control resting on him, should gain a working knowledge of the Bible and respect for its teachings and that the man lacking these essentials of statesmanship would be as dangerous in the administration at Washington as an unskilled driver of a car on a city street. Does it not seem beyond question that the only man who can really qualify as a statesman is the one who can enter sympathetically into God's plan for the administration of God's world? It is well that one should be well versed in the writings of Hamilton and Jefferson, he should know the mind of Lincoln and Roosevelt and Wilson, but of even more worth

than these, in the fundamentals of statesmanship, would be a knowledge of Moses and Isiaah and Jesus.

*God Put the World in the Repair Shop.*

When one's car stops on the road he looks at the gasoline guage, tests the spark plugs, examines the wiring and when he has exhausted his plans for getting under way, he puts it in the garage for adjustment. It needs the expert to set it right. When sin came into the world everything was thrown out of adjustment both in the world of human kind and the world of nature.

This was the condition when the wrecked world was turned over to Jesus Christ, who had made the world and who was, therefore, specially fitted to set it right. We often think of reconstruction as beginning with 1919, but that is far from correct. The greater catastrophe took place when sin, the moving cause of all wars, came into the world. It was then that Jesus Christ began his work of setting a sinful world in order and it will continue until this task is done.

In this work, in which Jesus Christ is the foreman, there have been many helpers. All the prophets have had their assigned work under the foreman on the world task. All the kings have had their part, Pharaoh as well as Moses; Cyrus, as well as Ezra, for God uses his foes as well as his friends to work out his plans.

Not only is the Kingdom of God the goal which each individual should give the first place, but the

same is true of institutional life. The church is the publicity department of the Kingdom of God to keep all other departments informed concerning the reconstruction plans of the foreman in the work. For the lack of sufficient knowledge at the present time our schools and our business organizations and our governments are wasting valuable time and a vast amount of human material in work which often has little permanent worth, since only that which meets the demands of the foreman will be lasting.

When Jesus sent out his disciples with his message its dynamic urge was the Kingdom of God, not that kingdom which the Jew had had for many centuries desired to see, of which Jerusalem would be the capital, the Aaronic ritual would be the law, and a Messiah winning by force of arms would be the king. It was to be a community finding its life and its law and its unity in the personality of the Christ and that would have in it no dominant race, no ruling class. That was the message they were to give the widest possible publicity and trust to the dynamic magnetism of its divine leader to bring men and institutions into it.

That the message they were to carry was meant for both men and institutions is indicated by the divisions in the instruction book, the Old Testament dealing with group life, specially in the family and the nation, while the New Testament has the individual for its main theme. The element that has been lacking in the publicity work of the church in the period since the Protestant Reformation is the social message of the Gospel, of which the Old

Testament is so full. That seems to be the reason—at least a chief one—why institutional life has lagged behind the individual in realizing the Kingdom and the present halting in the march of the Kingdom suggests that the individual can not reach his end until the institutions, of which he is a member, move forward. We cannot lift the citizen away from the city, nor can the politician be on the way to heaven while politics goes to hades. The church needs to hear and heed the message, which is order Number One, to “preach the Kingdom of God.”

### *The Task of the Nation.*

If this is God's world—and the evidence points to that—the nation, as well as the individual, has a part in the work of reconstruction that Jesus Christ has undertaken and the nation will realize her own end and interests in fulfilling her obligation. Evidently, not all national personalities will have the same part, since each has her own peculiar genius to make use of in her work. Burgess has noted that the Anglo-Saxon had a skill in organization, since nearly all the dynasties of Europe were at one time of Teutonic stock. England is the greatest example that the world has had of this organizing genius and her work is being consummated as the peoples under her rule are being prepared for self-government. Lord Elphinstone said years ago, “My task is to pave the way for the English out of India,” and there is no little insistence in India that the English should use the road.



Judging by our experience in the Philippines, where we have been governing at considerable cost through military men and measures to the general dissatisfaction of those concerned, our work lies at home. To us have come the peoples from the ends of the earth to be trained in co-operative work for the world reconstruction. Not that the immigrant had such a purpose in view in his coming,—usually that was to make a better living,—but making a living can not be separated from living and living must mean partnership with the other peoples for a common end.

Not a few smiled—or worse—at Ford's Peace Ship in 1917 that was to get the fighting men out of the trenches, but from his point of view it was quite the practical and proper thing. He had all these nationalities that were trying to kill each other in France working together in Detroit in making cars and there seemed no good reason why they should not get along together in Europe. Also it may be premised that if the original trouble had been referred to men like Ford there would have been no war at all. The purpose—may we say God's purpose—in bringing the various races to this land is to train them to work together and to show the reality of a League of Nations on the sidewalks of New York. The United States is the experiment station on the road to democracy. Our mission is not simply to make members of these hostile races American citizens, but to make them co-operative world citizens, who are not less loyal to their own country than they are loyal to humanity. What is being worked out in industry in De-

troit can be worked out in politics. The United States of America should become, if she fulfills her mission, the United States of humanity. The various peoples who come here with their memories of ancient feuds and race hatreds should be taught, by precept and example, the love of God and the fear of sin. Isolated as we are from all danger from external foes, we are designed as God's great laboratory for working out human problems and our vast material resources give to us abundant means for social sacrifice. To no other people is given such an opportunity to serve the generation and from no other will so much be required.

#### *The Great Commission.*

Before Jesus Christ died upon the Cross to win the world from Satan's power, He gave a commission through which every individual and institution receives a call to service and finds a sanction for the passing duty. The disciples were sent out "to disciple the nations \* \* \* teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you." Here Jesus left no doubt as to the meaning of his message. The nations were to be won for the Kingdom, to which baptism was the entrance, so that they might fit into the divine plan of redemption and it was on the condition of obedience to his will that they might expect the fulfillment of the promise, "I am with you to the end of the world."

The reason for the commission is found in its opening statement, "All authority is given to me

in heaven and in earth." It was because of this absolute authority that he possessed that he could issue such an order with such a thrilling promise at the close, "I am with you." Some question the possibility of this world being won for righteousness, but there appears no questioning doubt in the mind of the Foreman who has the world in charge and who commissions whom he will in the execution of his plans.

*God Delegates Authority to Jesus Christ.*

The delegation of authority is a principle with which we all are familiar. When a salesman is sent out with his sample case, his instructions usually include the price that he shall ask, the quality that he shall guarantee, the amount of credit that will be allowed and so long as he keeps within his instructions he acts with all the authority of those who send him out. This is the meaning of delegated authority. When our consuls and ambassadors go abroad to represent us in foreign countries in business or political affairs, they have all the authority of the government behind them while they keep within their instructions. That is delegated authority. In business transactions a minor child acts by delegated authority.

The authority which Jesus used in the commission was given to him by the father. After sin came into the world man lost communion with God, except through Jesus Christ. When one man quarrels with another it is sometimes the work of some friend to act as a go-between to make them friends

again. That was the place that Jesus Christ took between the Father and sinful man and for that reason, He is called the Mediator, because he is the only connection between God and man. God meets with man through Jesus Christ and man goes to God through Him. "No man cometh to the Father but through me" were the words of Jesus and He knew. So because he was the Mediator between the Father and man, He was given all authority in his dealings with man. Therefore this world, shattered by sin, through all its time of reconstruction—which includes all of human history—is under the Mediatorial reign of Christ.

It is as co-workers with Jesus in his task of world redemption that we pray, "Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." There is no dualism in this world, no double standard of moral law, no division in the authority over the world. Jesus Christ is absolutely supreme in all human affairs and no agency of man, or devil, can prevent the accomplishment of what is vital to the plan of God.

### *Is Jesus the Divine Mediator?*

This is the crucial point at issue, not between science and Christianity—there is no conflict there—but between many scientists and Christianity. The facts of science are supernatural in their origin, supernatural in their sustained existence and supernatural in their purpose. All were made by God and for his glory. Naturalism has no place in God's plan. But the scientists often deny any supernatur-

al element in the world of things and men and in that they deny a personal God. The issue is clearly drawn in regard to the person of Jesus Christ. Is he God-man, or is he only good-man? If one takes the former position he denies the naturalistic theories of scientists; if he takes the latter view he denies Christianity. God himself can not reconcile these views of the personality of Jesus. The view is accepted here without reservation that Jesus is God-man, in the full faith that without that there is hope neither for the individual, nor the world. When it is demonstrated that men can lift themselves by their boot-straps, we may believe in a purely human salvation.

*Jesus Christ Delegates Authority to the Nation.*

We commonly speak of the sovereignty of the nation, but this is true only in a relative sense of the word. The nation is sovereign in its relationship to other nations, but is subject in its relationship to God. One of the dangerous beliefs that was current in the World War was that there was no higher authority than the nation, no moral law except what the nation willed. Such a theory of national life would make the nation a wild beast, indeed there is no conception of the nation except as under Jesus Christ, that makes her amenable to moral law.

In God's ethical government of this world there is no place found for irresponsible persons, or—what is the same thing—for irresponsible power. Such irresponsibility would destroy the order of the world.

If nations have absolute sovereignty, then we reach the conclusions of Hobbes that right is only what the sovereign commands and wrong is what the sovereign forbids and there is no moral standard in human affairs, therefore no God over all. But since in the divine plan the nation is under Jesus Christ, since his will is, in last resort, the law of the nation, there is a standard of right for the nation, as really, as for the citizen, and it is the same standard. What is wrong for the citizen is also wrong for the nation. A nation has the same call to make sacrifice in time of need, the same demand upon her for unselfish service, as has the individual citizen.

But while all nations, under the commission of Christ, have a part in reconstruction, it is seldom enough that they have used the opportunity. Germany, before 1914, with all her genius for organization, might have led the nations into a great cooperative plan, but she failed to seize the opportunity of world service and it passed. After the Armistice was signed the United States had an opportunity of ushering in a new era of good will such as seldom has come to any people. The people of the world, if not the governments, were willing to follow our leading as they had accepted our leader, Woodrow Wilson. We had not been weakened as had others by the long agony of war, nor been bound by the terms of a warlike peace. Had the United States in that crucial hour backed Wilson in demanding a peace settlement on the basis of the Fourteen Points on which the Armistice was based, instead of being led away by political

partisanship that neglected the opportunity and broke the leader, our country might now have its name revered by the firesides of the world as she had in the idealistic days of 1919. But the hour passed and the opportunity and the leader with them.

God gave to Israel her opportunity to set before the world an example of a nation that was loyal to God and his law as she had covenanted to be. Some may think of the Old Testament records as belonging to a different order of the world than the present, but the Bible is not a book for a single age, rather for all ages, and its examples never lose their meaning. Jesus Christ is the God of the United States as truly as he was of Israel and even though we have made no covenant with Him as did Israel, we are in the same reconstruction plan and under the same obligation as the nations of the past.

What is the penalty of the worker when he fails to obey the instruction of the foreman? To pass over such disobedience would destroy the order of the world and make impossible the completion of God's work, so the only results possible is to give the task to another. That is what took place in the case of the great empires of the past, who had failed to use the talent given to them. Each had her opportunity, in one case for a thousand years, but all failed and therefore were discharged from their work and from life. God's reconstruction plans must not fail and the work that He has entrusted to Rome, or to England, or to the United States must be done by them, or turned over to more faithful servants. The nation does not have

the time limit on life that is set for men. National extinction comes, if it comes at all, when the nation fails to do its allotted task.

*The National Personality Delegates Authority to Her Government.*

It has already been noted that Jesus Christ receives "all authority" from the Father and that he in turn delegates authority to the nation to carry on her task. In the next step in the delegation of authority the nation organizes its government and gives to it authority to use for the common good. In the administration of government there are three departments to be considered, the executive, the legislative and the judicial and the differences in governments usually consists in the various ways in which these departments are adjusted to each other. These differences in the relations of the departments to each other are settled by the constitution, sometimes an unwritten constitution as in England, sometimes as in our own country by a written constitution, which definitely prescribes the powers of each department of government. In United States the Federal Constitution declares itself to be the supreme law of the land, this supremacy being guarded by the Supreme Court, which has assumed the duty of declaring all laws unconstitutional—and therefore of no effect—that do not conform to it.

It is scarcely necessary to say at this point that government has not the character of sovereignty,



nor has it any original authority. It is the creature of the nation, the expression of the national will and, therefore, has only such powers as are granted to it by the nation in the Constitution. A contrary belief is sometimes voiced by lawyers, trained on the Commentaries of Blackstone,—who accepted conclusions from Hobbes—that the government has some inherent powers, as the English king still theoretically has. But the idea that the king, or the government, is in any way the source of law and right belongs to the past and needs no consideration. It is one of the strange results of following legal theory that the English king, whose effective powers are exclusively moral, should still be held as the source of all legislation and executive power. Legal fiction can do almost anything,—but work.

But while the people delegate authority to the government, it is a common error to hold that they are the final source of authority. In the plan of God, there is no more inherent authority in the nation, than in its government. To be sure the nation is superior to its government and directs its acts, but in the same way, Jesus Christ is superior to the nation. The idea of government does not arise in the will of the nation, but in the divine plan. Man was created by God for institutional life and the development of his life demands such institutional expression. All communities, even the most primitive, have some form of government, so that not only does the authority come from God, but as well the institution itself.

So while government is human in its con-

stitution—since man chooses the form that suits him—it is divine in its institution. That leads to the conclusion that the nation is under the same obligation to carry out the will of the source of its authority, Jesus Christ, as the government is under obligation to carry out the will of the nation. With this in mind, one gets a true perspective on human history and understands how thoroughly this world of men and things is organized around its center, Jesus Christ. It is a Christo-centric world.

*The Government Delegates Authority to Municipalities, Corporations, Individuals.*

It is impossible for the government, as such, to cover the whole field of political and business administration, so it is necessary for it to use other agencies to perform the needed service. In our machine age it is becoming ever more necessary that the growing mass production should be controlled both for the sake of producers and consumers. Therefore the corporation and its relation to the government and to the public generally is becoming increasingly important.

In its origin the corporation is the servant and agent of the government so that in the nature of the case, it is a public institution with public service as its end. A firm needs no government assistance to get started on its way, since it is only a matter of private agreement, but a corporation gets its existence and its authority from the government. A

railroad corporation has so much of a public character that it can force its right-of-way through private property because of the powers it has conferred on it by the government and with its privileges go corresponding duties.

The municipality also has its origin and its authority through government action. Even such a municipality as New York City, with an expense budget that exceeds that of many nations, with all its millions of inhabitants, has its authority granted to it to conduct its affairs as does some small country village.

This illustrates and enforces the statement that there is no provision anywhere for irresponsible power. The machinery of world organization is in place and all that is lacking is the proper principle of action. The postman on his rounds, the policeman on his beat, the representative sent to the foreign court, are all alike using authority granted to them by the government, so that each in his place is administering a trust committed to him. Therefore, as we look at God's comprehensive plan for the government of the world it is evident that there is no place in the world plan for any merely secular calling. Every individual worker and every legitimate institution is a factor in God's ethical world and each is a steward for what has been committed to his care.

We have been considering how authority is delegated by Jesus Christ to men and institutions and it will be next in order to notice what principles are to be applied in the use of authority.

1. *Where Authority is Given a Law is Given with It.*

2. *Where Authority is Received Its Source Should be Recognized.*

3. *No Steps Should be Passed Over in the Recognition of Delegated Authority.*

Since these principles are in daily use not only in our political and business affairs but as well in the home work, their application is familiar. All of them belong to the relation of principal and agent, wherever this may be operative. It is quite evident that where authority is given to act for another there should be a distinct understanding as to what may be done under the terms of the agreement. When a corporation is brought into existence it is through a charter granted by the government. No one would think of giving authority to a railroad company without limitations and directions. The very fact that it must have a charter in order to function at all shows that it is a public servant with a public service to render. The same is true, in a less degree, of the municipality. Every public institution is controlled by public law and it is this law that creates it.

The next principle named is equally clear and essential. Specially is it necessary in the case of the business corporation that it should recognize the government which called it into being for it is its relation to government that makes it amena-

ble to law and keeps in the mind of corporation directors that they are public servants.

A good illustration of these principles is found in the field of political experience. An American citizen is appointed as our ambassador to the English people and government. On the way across the Atlantic he will travel as an ordinary citizen, but when he is presented at court he is accorded the honors that belong to a representative of a great nation. The instructions that he carries with him from Washington become his rule of official conduct and if any matter arises not covered in his letter of instructions he will at once cable to Washington for additional guidance. His authority lies in the commission which he carried and when he presents that to the Court of St. James he is by that act acknowledging the authority that commissioned him. Also one notices that the authority that he acknowledges is not that of the American nation—since that would be passing over one step in authority—but the American government. Therefore it is clear that in the ordinary course of events our ambassador observes the three principles that are concerned in the delegation of authority.

Probably these illustrations will make clear—what may have been sufficiently plain at the outset—the familiar use of the principles that we wish now to apply to the different agencies in the delegation of authority in God's plan of the world. The immediate interest will lie in observing how far the American government and American nation have observed these principles.

*Are These Principles Observed in the Existing Relations Between Our Government and Her Officials and Chartered Institutions?*

It seems evident that as far as United States political officials are concerned the question may be readily answered, except in certain cases to be mentioned, in the affirmative. The government official, let us say a sheriff, receives a commission, or warrant, that defines his duties for him and empowers him to do all that the warrant covers. As long as he acts within his instruction he has all the powers of the government back of his action, but beyond the specification he has no more authority than the ordinary citizen. The commission is the basis of his authority and it is also his law.

Before he can perform any of the duties of his office he must swear to the Constitution of the United States, that is the charter of the government, and in so doing he recognizes the government that commissioned him. Every government official, with a very few minor exceptions, must take this oath, so that practically all officials own the authority of the government in their oath of office. Recent events in connection with the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment show the danger to the public interests and the public order in the failure of officials to observe these principles, especially the third, which holds that no steps should be passed over in the recognition of authority. In many of our largest cities, the foreign elements that gather there, together with the lawless of na-

tive stock, make up the controlling power in the city administration and officials ignore the authority of the government, which they have sworn to support, recognizing instead the sentiment of the community. The application of this method of the nullification of law would make each community a law to itself regardless of the acts of government and would make social order impossible. If each State is free to choose whether it shall obey the Constitution and the laws of Congress and each city to decide if it shall obey the laws of the State, then one is approaching the position of Rousseau who held that each individual needed to give his consent to a law before it would be binding on him.

A constitutional amendment is made, or a law is passed, only because there is an element in the population that needs to be coerced into obedience to the will of the people, otherwise the law would not be passed at all. If some did not steal, there would be no laws against theft. If there were no murderers, there would be no law against homicide. The case of the Eighteenth Amendment is no different from any other measure that proposes to prohibit by law the satisfying of any harmful appetite. Laws are made for "the lawless and disobedient" and not for others. It is probable that the persistent violators of any law do not number more than one-tenth of the population and the issue is whether the one-tenth or the nine-tenths shall rule in the affairs of the nation. It, therefore, seems fair to conclude that the good order of the nations demands that all these three principles should be observed by the citizen. It is the place of the of-

ficial to enforce the law to which he has sworn, or to resign the position which he can not conscientiously fill.

Corporations raise their issue with the government in a different way. They exist by a grant of powers from the government through a charter, which specifies the business in which they may engage and the capital to be used, along with other details of the operation of the corporation. So the corporation recognizes the authority over it and theoretically meets the conditions laid down, but it too often seeks to control the administration of government in a way that is prejudicial to the public interest. While this is being written the corporations that operate behind a tariff wall are busily engaged in lobbying in Congress for higher tariffs on their goods, to be later collected from the consumers in higher prices. Also they are often able to control judges and legislators for the profit of the corporations. So the chief danger from the business corporations is that they tend to become a super-government and to act as the master instead of the servant of the political administration.

*2. Are These Principles Observed in the Relation of the Government to the National Personality?*

Does the government recognize the authority of the people and the law laid down for their guidance in the Constitution? It would seem that there would be little objection to a sweeping affirmation in answer to the question. The govern-



ment does in general recognize the authority and does observe the law. The framers of the Constitution were evidently fearful that the new government might act rashly and become an instrument of oppression to the people and, therefore, they carefully restricted it in the use of the powers granted. Indeed, as one studies the Constitution it might be readily concluded, since so many safeguards are placed against hasty action, that the framers of the great document were much more concerned about how to prevent things from being done, than to get them accomplished. One might almost think that instead of being framed for a popular government it was framed to restrain an incipient revolution. The Senate was designed to act as a check upon the President and the House and few would claim that it had not lived up to its possibilities, for Thomas a Becket was scarcely more concerned for the privileges of his order than the United States Senate for its prerogatives. The President was to act as a check upon Congress. The Supreme Court was to act as a check on everything else, so our government has been called a system of checks and balances, with the emphasis on the former. With all its worthy features, and they are many, the Constitution was framed by an aristocracy that was trying to guard against a feared rising tide of democracy.

One of the most objectionable checks is that which enables one-third of the Senate to prevent the ratification of any treaty, a provision which has allowed political partisanship to stand in the way of sharing in movements that look toward

international peace, while, on the other hand, a majority of Congress can declare war. But the whole effect of these restrictions on the different departments of government demonstrate how the nation, as principal, guards its agent, the government, from transgressing the national will.

Not only does the Constitution, the definitely expressed will of the nation, become a law to the government, but it also provides that all the officials of the government should recognize the will of the nation. The preamble of the Constitution opens with the words, "We the people of the United States" and it closes with the phrase, "Do ordain and establish this Constitution." As all government officials are required to swear to the Constitution, the government makes full recognition of the authority of the nation, its immediate source of authority.

3. *Does the United States, the National Personality, Observe the Three Principles in Her Relation to Jesus Christ?*

In the other cases that we have studied we have found only isolated instances in which the three essential principles have not been observed. The government in all its departments makes clear and explicit recognition of the nation which organized it and, with exceptions already noted, the same is true of the agencies and individuals responsible to government. Now if the same might be said of the nation in its relation to Jesus Christ, the ethical

system of which our institutions form a part would be formally realized. What we have yet to consider is whether our Republic owns her relations to her Lord.

In these years when the crowns of kings and emperors are being thrown in the scrap heap of history, there is one king who ever remains superior to time and circumstances. Whatever fate may befall other kings, his throne is secure. Jesus Christ won his right to rule this world by his sacrifice upon the cross and he is waiting until the nations own him as their Lord. "The Lord hath said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Through all the centuries the question of paramount importance to all others is that of Pilate, "What shall I do with Jesus who is called the Christ?" Pilate answered it by sending him to the cross and died in exile. The Jews demanded his death and became wanderers in the earth. Every individual and national personality has in some way answered the question and according to their answer has been their fate.

The answer which the United States will give,—or any nation will give,—will not decide the right of Jesus Christ to be the nation's king. That was settled long ago in the court of last resort and no earthly decision can change the judgment of God. But the answer which a nation gives will decide whether she will live until the end of time, or whether she will take her place among the nations whose epitaphs are already written in dust. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is the rightful King of every nation now—that place was given to him by the Father—and

while any nation may, rebelliously, refuse allegiance to him, that does not dethrone him. Shall the American Republic stand with Pilate and the Jewish nation of nineteen centuries ago, or shall she own him as her Lord? One of these alternatives the Nation must finally choose and as it chooses shall be its destiny.

*The Nation Does not Have Inherent Authority to Enact and Execute Law.*

This thought has been latent in statements already made and is put clearly here to suggest how entirely the nation is dependent on God. We readily agree that the municipality and the corporation have no inherent authority, since in both institutions the authority is derived from the government; also there will be no disagreement in this age of thought with the statement that government has no inherent authority. But the dependence of the corporation on the government and of the government on the nation, is paralleled by the dependence of the national personality on Jesus Christ.

There is much discussion over the justification for capital punishment, but the demand for the death penalty for certain crimes still remains on the statute books of most of the States. Whence does the authority come to take life? Evidently this right is not inherent in government. Does the nation possess it? We do not think that it does. What it can not give, it may not, of itself, take away. The God who gave life is he who imposed the death penalty for murder and the execution of his verdict

for that offence is simply doing God's will in that regard. The nation, through its government, is acting as God's agent and that is as it should be.

Nor is the case greatly changed if the death penalty for murder should be changed to imprisonment for life. Such a verdict means for the criminal a living death and it does not appear that the nation has any more inherent authority to take away a man's liberty than to take away his life. One may not agree with Jefferson that liberty is an inalienable right, but there is a grave doubt if any merely human personality has such authority over life, where it is not delegated authority.

Is it not true that all authority goes back for its origin to the final source of authority? Does not all authority come from God? Where is the law of the individual, or the group, or the atom to be found? Objectively it is found in the author, God; subjectively in the personality, or the thing. The law of the tree is not something that acts on the tree, but that acts in it. Man's law is not something that works on him, but that works in him. The law of anything is its constitution and constitutes its nature. The laws of attraction and gravitation, by whatever name these influences are known, are not made for a rock, but operate in every particle of it. Fundamentally law is not something imposed from the outside, but works from the inside.

Law may be defined as the necessary relations that belong to the nature of anything. So the law of any nation—the real law and not some human ruling—is in the spiritual constitution of the nation and includes all the relations that are necessary to

the life of a nation. A lawyer is inclined to think of law as that which he can find written somewhere, but the greater part of law is never written. It is lived and experienced. The fundamental moral and physical law of the individual person is what God made in him and that law can no more be changed than the constitution of the atom.

This is the reason why moral law is its own executive. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die," is as irrevocable as any law in nature. Laws on the statute book do not enforce themselves—a policeman is needed for that—but moral laws in man provide their own penalty and there is no possible escape from it. The same is alike true of the nation. National sin is unconstitutional from the standpoint of God and unless that sin is in some way atoned for it will cause death.

Not infrequently we read the statement of some wise, or otherwise, man to the effect that the moral law of the Ten Commandments, in some part, is no longer effective, supposedly because we now belong to a different order of the world. At what time in the last thirty centuries did the physical constitution of man change? Has the bloodstream changed its quality, or the tissues their character? What reason is there to believe that man's moral constitution has changed any more than his physical?

The Ten Commandments were written for Moses in the stone of Sinai, but those stone tablets were perishable compared with the laws written on them. These laws were as old as man. They were man's constitution from the beginning and would have

been as effective in his life if God, in his mercy, had not revealed them to him. If man had never heard of the Fourth Commandment, a seven day working week would have weakened his body and dwarfed his soul. If he had not heard that it was sinful to kill, the act would still have destroyed the murderer's peace of mind. A sign at the railroad crossing tells of the danger, but the danger would be there just the same without the sign. So that sign is a merciful thing and so are the Ten Commandments. There seems to be no more reason to conclude that these moral laws have been changed than that there has been change in the laws of the atom.

It seems necessary, then, to conclude that the nation gets her authority as she gets her law, from God through Jesus Christ, the foreman on the reconstruction work of the world. Does The United States recognize the source of her authority and her law? The nation requires the government, her agent, to make clear and explicit recognition of the authority of the nation. Does the nation do for her superior, what she demands of her agent? Jesus asks no more than that and it does not seem that he should ask less. There are two places, and only two, in which we may look for an answer to the question. One of these places is the national life. Do we find Jesus Christ owned in the national life? The other place, the inferior place, is in the law and the institutions of the nation. Do we find him owned in the law of the Land? These are the two witnesses that we shall examine in making up the answer to the question.

*Does the National Personality Own Jesus Christ  
in Her Life?*

It is a matter for rejoicing that there are many Christian features in our national life and character, but also there are many that are pagan. The question to be answered is that of dominant influence on the thinking and the conduct of our people. Which is ruling in the caucus and the convention and the campaign? Are our corporations loyal to Jesus so that his teachings would be acceptable in a meeting of the directors? Are business methods such as Jesus would approve? Is the national life being patterned after Greece with its self-interest and force, or after the Kingdom of God with the dominant influence of sacrifice and love? Raymond Robbins answered these questions in an address before the Federal Council of Churches. He said, "There is not in all the world a really Christian community, or city or nation. Yet two thousand years of experience have shown that nothing can save the community, or the city, or the nation, but the Christ in the whole life." By this Raymond Robbins did not mean that cities and nations are not nominally Christian for nominal Christianity is everywhere in evidence. Our whole civilization shows the influence of Christianity upon it. What he meant was that evangelical Christianity does not dominate any social group. Where would one find the spirit and the teachings of Jesus ruling the life of a community? That is what Christianity means, or it is a form without content.



The statistics of church membership offer some hopeful suggestions. In 1800 only six per cent of the population was counted in the membership of the churches. At the present time it is forty-two per cent. That would suggest, even if it does not prove, that we are getting more of the mind of Christ than in earlier times. But few who understand what it means to have a life dominated by the Holy Spirit would hold that our nation is thus saturated with an actual experience of Jesus Christ. The Kingdom may be coming in larger measure than a hundred years ago—many things indicate that it is—but there will be a mighty change of attitude to God when the Spirit comes in power. We rejoice in the fact that there are many Christian citizens, many Christian leaders in business, and in politics, with the Eighteenth Amendment as the greatest moral victory in modern times, but a claim that the mind of America is Christian does not seem to agree with the facts of national life.

### *Does United States Recognize Christ in Its Law?*

It was the conclusion of the preceding paragraphs that the Spirit of Jesus is not clearly dominant in the private life of the people of this country, much less in control of public life as shown in business and politics. It is quite possible that some will differ with the conclusions drawn in regard to Christian life and character, but when we come to a consideration of the recognition of Jesus Christ in the supreme law of the land,—as the Constitution declares itself to be,—it does not appear that

students of the subject need have much difference of view.

The Constitution is the fundamental law of the land because more than any other law it expresses the will of the national personality and also because all other laws must be made to agree with it. We may, therefore, regard the Federal Constitution as the authorized standard of the law and the institutions of the nation and the attitude of the Constitution to Jesus Christ may be taken as the legal attitude of the nation.

In the Federal Constitution there is no mention of the name of God, nor Jesus Christ. Earlier documents had used one or both these names of Deity, so the omission in the Constitution is significant. It is also significant that after the adoption of the Federal Constitution these names, especially the latter almost ceased to be used in public documents. This shows the educational value of the Constitution and its effect on all inferior laws.

But the issue in question is not simply the use of a divine name. That when used often means no more than an expression of sentiment, such as the inscription on our coins. What we are considering is a recognition by the nation of the authority of the Foreman of world reconstruction. This is much more than an expression of sentiment. It is a confession of allegiance and loyalty. For this reason the claim that some make of divine recognition in the dating "in the year of our Lord" has little meaning. The great question is whether the nation wills to do the will of Christ. Otherwise

the nation cannot be used effectively by the Foreman in the reconstruction of the world.

Nor is it sufficient to recognize the authority of God. That is passing over one step in the delegation of authority and is disregarding the word of God that he has given "all authority" to Jesus. Jesus said, "No man cometh to the Father but by me." There is no other way. "He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father that sent him." To ignore Jesus Christ as the Ruler of the nation also ignores him as her Saviour. If we refuse him the crown we cannot expect to profit by his cross.

*The Federal Constitution Does Not Recognize the Bible.*

The Bible is the law that God has given to rule the lives of man and nations. The Constitution is the law that men have made to rule the nation. God insists that his law is supreme. The Constitution claims to be the supreme law of the land. Both of these claims can not be valid, since there can not be two supreme laws over one country. Therefore the Constitution is in direct conflict with the Bible in regard to the question of jurisdiction.

This lecture started out with the proposition that this is God's world. If that is true, then this is God's nation. It belongs to him by right of creation. He wants it to join in his plan of salvation. To that end he gives the Bible as the instruction book to show the way.

Nations, no less than individuals, need a stand-

ard of conduct. Few persons will question that. What shall the standard be? The only code that Jesus gave to us is found in the New Testament. Is there any other so suitable for deciding the moral issues of individuals and institutions? We are told that even Christians differ about Bible interpretation. Yes, they differ, but not on moral issues. Christians differ about the forms of baptism, but not about the Ten Commandments. They are not agreed about free-will but they are one about honest government. They may not agree about inspiration, but they are against the liquor trade. Christians are at one about what Jesus teaches on the moral issues in politics and the actions of the Federal Council of Churches on moral issues is the proof. For the rule of conduct in God's world there is nothing that compares with God's book.

*The Constitution Expressly Excludes Any Religious Acknowledgment from Its Provisions.*

A clause in the Constitution of the United States reads "No religious test should ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the United States." Some have said that for "religious" we should read "ecclesiastical" to get the proper meaning of the clause. If such were the intention of the wording it should have only commendation. We want no issues between religious denominations in politics. But if it means just as it reads—and one is of the opinion that the framers of the Constitution were not careless in the use of words—that there shall be no demand under the

Constitution that a candidate for President, let us say, shall be a professing Christian, or a Christian without profession, then does the Constitution declare itself non-Christian? In regard to this issue the Christian citizen cannot be indifferent. Many citizens urge that only Christian men be nominated for office. Is such action unconstitutional? So it would appear. Jesus Christ is the greatest religious test the world has known. Where would he stand as a citizen under the Constitution? Or, could he qualify as a citizen? A striking comment on this question lies in a recent decision by Judge Burrows of the Federal Court at New Haven, Connecticut. Professor MacIntosh of the Yale Divinity School applied to the court for naturalization. In answering the questions of the Judge Professor MacIntosh declared that while he had served through the World War that he would not agree to do military service when his conscience told him the cause was unjust. The memorandum of Judge Burrows reads in part as follows: "it appearing that the said petitioner, considering his allegiance to be first to the will of God, would not promise in advance to bear arms in defense of the United States under all circumstances, but only if he believed the war to be morally justified, it is decided that the petitioner is not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and further that the petition for citizenship is denied." So the decision of Judge Burrows is that when one considers "his allegiance first to the will of God" he is "not attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States" and may not become a citizen. This

has raised the issue of the attitude of our national Constitution to God as never before. The Christian Century declaring that according to this interpretation of the Constitution a loyal Christian can not be a citizen. That the decision of Judge Burrows is appalling is evident, but is it unconstitutional? That is the question for the courts and the country to decide. The writer believes that the decision, however shocking to the Christian sentiments of the country, is according to the Constitution, which declares itself to be the supreme law of the land.

Are the Christians of this country agreed that the Constitution should make allegiance to God a ground for the denial of citizenship? So may we not add to our program for national transformation such change in our Federal Constitution as shall honor Christian citizenship instead of considering it the equivalent of crime.

We believe that the Constitution of the United States is one of the greatest state papers ever written. But it is not perfect. It was not considered perfect by the men who made it. It was not thought complete by those who adopted it, for they at once added ten amendments. It has not been considered perfect in later periods, since nine more amendments were judged necessary. During the last three-quarters of a century we have recognized the negro as a person so that the Constitution draws no color line; we have given to women an equal place with men before the law; we have recognized the rights of our children to be born under a flag that protects no open saloons. The greatest remaining need is to own the rights of the crucified and now

the reigning Christ. Either in the Constitution, or in some place that will express the national will we, as a nation, should write a solemn confession—a confession possible only through a national change of heart and life—that Jesus Christ is, of right, the ruler of the nation, and the ethics of the New Testament the moral law of the nation's life. Then we should have a recognized moral standard for legislation and court decisions on the moral issues that rise in political affairs.

Since the Federal Constitution, as Hamilton so well said, "contains the principles by which we have chosen to be governed" these principles should include the teachings of the Christ. Where is there a code of human conduct that compares with the Sermon on the Mount? Where else can one find economic teachings that equal the Parables of the Kingdom? Or, to turn to the Old Testament, where do we find lessons so apt for national guidance as those in the Prophets of Israel?

### *The Changing National Mind.*

When the Federal Constitution was written in 1787, the thinking of America was greatly influenced by the deism of England and the infidelity of France and it would be difficult to say which of these influences was most paralyzing in its effect on the spiritual life of the country. At that time only one person in sixteen was a member of any evangelical church. Slavery existed without much question both North and South. Drunkenness was prevalent everywhere. We are apt now to idealize colonial morals, but history does not.

It was under these moral conditions that the Constitutional Convention met in Philadelphia in 1787. In the sessions which lasted from May until September the differences of view were at times so great and the contention so violent that it seemed at times as if they might fail of agreement and Washington said if they separated they would never come together except in blood. But in spite of the imminent danger of the dissolution of the Convention there was not from the beginning to the end a word of public prayer. In one session when the divergence of opinions seemed likely to disrupt the Convention, Benjamin Franklin, himself a deist, proposed that prayer should be offered at each session. He closed his remarks with these words, "I have lived, Sir, a long time and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of the truth, that God governs in the affairs of men. If a sparrow can not fall to the ground without his knowledge is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?" Franklin's proposal did not find support in the Convention, some objecting that it were known they were offering prayer to God for help it might be taken as a sign of weakness and the proposal was not renewed. It seems probable that Washington fairly represented the mind of the Convention in his letter to the Massachusetts Sentinel where he writes that religious features were excluded from the Constitution, "because religion belonged in the church but not in the state."

Such were the conditions in thought and conduct when the Constitution was written. Now two persons out of five are credited with membership



in some church. Slavery is gone. The saloon is gone. In most of the countries drunkenness is gone. No President would now voice the view of Washington that "the state is not concerned with religion." There are sins that remain in our national life and the greatest of these is the failure to own the Lordship of Jesus in the national life and law. Our Republic needs to put into deeds the song,

"Bring forth the royal diadem,  
And crown him Lord of all."

In order to secure this change of law we must have a change of national mind without which a merely verbal change of the Federal Constitution would have little value. The Christian Amendment to the Constitution, which recognizes Jesus Christ, can be secured in the same way as the Prohibition Amendment. It will come when education and regeneration, the human and the divine forces, cooperate in bringing about the conversion of the nation. Whatever changes are effected in the national life would soon be reflected in the national law. Christ in the life in a vital way would result in having his will done in law and institutions. Does it seem impossible? So did Emancipation seem three years before its triumph. So did prohibition five years before it was written into the Constitution. The mission of faith is to work the impossible.

What we are proposing is that the national personality finds the way of life and peace just as the individual citizen finds it—in Jesus Christ. He is "the Way" not only for the individual per-

sonality, but quite as well for the nation. That is the only "preparedness" that will make our beloved country right with God and keep it right with other nations of the world. Sometime, if our nation is to continue to have the blessing of God, it must be done. Why not move for it now?

We may fittingly end this discussion by a statement of some reasons why United States should show her loyalty to Jesus Christ the Foreman of the reconstruction work of the world by owning his lordship over the life of the nation.

1. The challenge of Russia.

It is a notable fact that the two international leaders that are contending for the kingdoms of this world were both workingmen; one a Galileean carpenter who was crucified, the other a German worker named Karl Marx, who was an exile from his country. It scarcely needs the prophet's vision to forecast that around these two leaders the struggles of the coming years are to be waged and that the nations will align themselves with one, or the other.

In 1917 the Russian Revolution set up the Soviet Republics. With the economic program of Russian Soviets we are not here concerned farther than to say that there is no necessary connection between economic communism and atheism. The early order in the Christian Church is sufficient proof of that. But Marx joined them in one issue and the Russian missionaries who are carrying the gospel of Marx through Asia are his devoted disciples. It was Russian organization and the Soviet gospel that carried the Chinese Revolution to the gates of

Shanghai and the expulsion of the Russian agitators is not the last word in the battle for China. With all the zeal of new converts the Russian youth march under the banner with the Marxian legend "Religion is the opiate of the peoples."

The Soviet is the first government in human history to declare war on God. The government of the United States has tried to be neutral on this issue. The Constitution was framed for neutrality. Justice Brewer declared in 1894 that, "The government as a legal institution is independent of all religions." America tried to be neutral in the World War and failed. The issue was too great and the world too small. Neither can America keep out of the world struggle between Jesus and Marx. Individuals cannot be neutral. Nations cannot be neutral. The issue is immensely greater than that in the world war and the United States will be involved as surely as in 1917. Smug statesmen may think to preserve our neutrality by deporting a few aliens. Judges may jail a few children. But we can not deport ideas, or jail beliefs. These laugh at political boundaries and exclusion laws.

There is one way to meet the Soviet attack of God. This is not by intervention in Russia. Neither is it by religious neutrality. The first is dangerous; the second is futile. We can meet the economics of Marx by an application to our business affairs of the economics of Jesus. We can meet the materialistic leadership of Marx by the spiritual leadership of Jesus Christ. We can meet the atheistic Third International with a Christian Church bearing the cross of the workman of Naza-

reth. The moral personality, The United States, has stood for religious neutrality, but the Soviet declares war on neutrals. In the coming years we face the issue of Jesus, or Marx.

2. To provide for national safety.

What makes a nation safe? Not a great navy and a thriving commerce. Tyre had that and now that mart of the old world is made a place where the fishers spread their nets. Not an efficient army. Rome had that. Not art and education. Greece had that. Not vast dominions. Assyria had that. Not thorough preparation for war. Germany had that. Not a belligerent nationalism such as is prevalent today. Most of the forgotten tribes had that. What has the United States to rest its confidence upon that the buried nations of the past did not have?

There is the unfailing judgment for national as for individual sin, except that the former judgment is for time and the latter for eternity. Every epoch of history has its balance struck and there is a settlement with God. When Israel sinned against God he sold them into the hand of Sisera. When Belgium provoked God he delivered them into the hand of Germany. The same brutalities were reported as inflicted on the Belgians as they had visited on the natives of the Congo. So also was France sold for national sin. Every maimed soldier is a messenger of God to the nation calling her to repentance for sin and the acceptance of the sovereignty of Jesus Christ. There is no absolution, therefore no safety, except in Him.

### 3. To win the world for Christ.

What is the present need in the winning of the world for Christ? Men and nations learn best through object lessons. We get more through the eye than through the spoken word, more through the logic of events than the logic of argument. That is the reason for the picture in the child's primer and the cartoon in the daily newspaper. The power of the missionary seems to be less in the stumbling message which he is able to give than in the object lesson of his life. That speaks a language which is understood in every land.

At the present time the missionary can show to the man he would win for Christ an object lesson of a Christian individual, sometimes of a Christian home. But he can not show to the native of India, or China, who comes to America, an example of a Christian city, or a Christian nation. How can the missionary prove to these visitors that it was the Bible and not science, not industrial efficiency, that made England and America great powers in the earth? How shall he make plain to him that science and efficiency came because we have an open Bible, even when we have failed to realize its precepts in the common life? The student from abroad finds many of our schools teaching an agnostic science, he visits our cities which show so little of the fear or the love of God, he reads the press which too often lacks reverence for holy things.

What is the report which he will take back to his homeland across the sea? Shall he tell them that America is living the Gospel which the mission-

ary is preaching in the villages of China? No, the traveller may come and go and not see much of the Bible on which this republic was founded three hundred years ago. But he does see our great railway systems and our industrial machinery and he is apt to carry back word that science and steel have made us strong. So he does not ask America to give our Bible, but our science, to China. If America is not living by the gospel of the missionary, why should he ask China to build her civilization upon it?

What is needed is a leader with ideals high enough to vision the redemption of the world and sympathies deep enough to include all races and classes, enthusiasm and dynamic enough to inspire the disillusioned with new hope for a world task. Scarcely since the Christ was born have so many millions looked to any man for deliverance as they did to Woodrow Wilson in 1919 when his name was a household word as well in the deserts of Asia as in the crowded cities of Europe and the hope passed even more quickly than it came leaving the leader broken and discredited. The reason—the inevitable reason—is not far to seek, that no mere man can meet the crises of the world need. National leaders there have been, but the world leaders have been lacking.

To meet the world need for one to lead in the organization of its affairs on a co-operative plan there is but one. Jesus Christ has been waiting all these nineteen centuries until the nations should realize their need of him to lead them into the Promised

land. Already he has inspired millions with an undying faith and enthusiasm in the cause for which he died and lives. Has the fulness of time not come when our Republic, for her own sake and the sake of other nations that are groping for the light, should accept the leadership of the Christ, that the world may be stirred with the hope of a new Pentecost, and a new day?

We have a beautiful custom in our schools at the morning hour. Then, for a moment, before the work of the day begins, the children rise and with outstretched hand salute the flag and pledge their loyalty to the Republic of which it is a symbol. More fitting still would it be if, in this hour, across the land from coast to coast, the children of the nation would rise and with uplifted hand salute the Christ and pledge undying loyalty to him and to his coming kingdom.