

and the spirit of a dignified, deliberative body, sat speechless in their chairs. By and by, when the second sober thought of the country began to be heard, and it was discovered that public sentiment was not stricken with the fury of the war spirit, calmer counsels began to be expressed. The discouraging feature of the whole discussion lay in the fact that those counsels were not uttered at the very moment when they were most needed, and that no brave and statesmanlike voice made itself heard above the tumult.

This temptation to cowardice, which makes so many of our public men mere echoes and trimmers instead of leaders, is supplemented by the vice of "bunkum"—that is, the vice of an exaggeration of what they suppose to be public sentiment. If a listener in the galleries of the Senate or the House during the debates on the Cuban resolutions had shut his eyes, he might have supposed himself to be in a boys' school, such was the rant, the violence, and the truculence of a great deal of the speechmaking. There was plenty of material for clear, well-balanced, and effective criticism of Spanish action, of the kind which is consistent with decency of manners between nations, and which ought to be persuasive in deliberative bodies; but that proud and sensitive country was insulted by every epithet which an invention weak in history but strong in language could devise. From one point of view it was laughable; from another it was humiliating. The orators seemed to feel in duty bound not only to express what they supposed to be the sentiments of their constituents, but to give that expression the wildest possible rhetorical exaggeration. Good manners and decent language are quite as necessary between nations as between gentlemen. When men of honor and force differ, they sometimes express their opinions of each other with a great deal of definiteness, but they do not assail each other like pickpockets, nor do they indulge in the language of blackguardism. Between nations the same proprieties ought to be observed. The Outlook has no sympathy with Spanish rule in Cuba, or with Spanish spirit and methods in many other directions, but, for the sake of our own honor and dignity, our public men ought to be able to express national disapproval without either vulgarity or violence. As a matter of fact, a great deal of this talking is pure "bunkum." It represents neither the indignation which comes from a thorough knowledge of facts nor that coming from profound conviction; it is an inflated expression of what is supposed to be public sentiment, and it brings into clear light a vice which a great many of our public men have contracted. The evidences of real strength lie always in power of independent action and in that moderation and balance of statement, scrupulous of the truth, which gains in effectiveness by refraining from every form of exaggeration.



National Honor

It is very clear that what constitutes national honor stands in need of radical revision. In the conceptions of many people it is as unreal and artificial as was the old sense of honor which constantly bred duels. The case of Italy is in point. Italy has wantonly invaded Abyssinia, without a shadow of moral right. Her armies have been met by the best-equipped barbarous people in the world, and they have been overwhelmingly defeated. If they had been successful, the enterprise would have done little for Italy except add enormously to her expenses. Meanwhile Italy is practically bankrupt. She is loaded with an enormous debt; her people are crushed by vexatious and oppressive taxation, and the very vitality of the nation has seemed to

be diminished by the enormous loads which have been imposed upon the people. As soon as news from Abyssinia comes, the shout goes up that the national honor is in peril and must be protected at any cost of life or money. What is national honor? Is it a keen sense of righteousness, a keen desire to do justice, an intense longing to consider the rights of all, an application of a high-minded common sense to affairs? or is it a determination, when one has made an immoral blunder, to persist in it, to waste treasure and life like water in the carrying out of a policy which is morally indefensible and which is financially ruinous, even if successful? This is a good illustration of the conception of national honor which is being constantly appealed to in a great many newspapers and by a great many persons in this country. National honor is not a conventional or artificial thing. It is a fine sensitiveness which grows out of a noble thought of a nation about itself. It is not a blind, arrogant, unscrupulous forcing through of a policy which has once been inaugurated. It is not a stupid refusal to learn a lesson when the lesson has been taught.



Law or War?

We publish on another page a series of opinions from distinguished men in favor of substituting Law for War as a means of settling international difficulties. These writers, and those whose letters we have previously published, represent every section in the community—East, West, North, and South; every class—merchant, lawyer, farmer, statesman, soldier, clergyman; each party; and both the Protestant and the Roman Catholic communions.

Judge Cooley shows that a permanent tribunal is entirely practicable; and Judge Cooley's judgment on that question would be conclusive with most dispassionate readers, even without being reinforced as it is by the similar judgment of Justice Brewer, Professor Thayer, and other jurists. Captain Bourke shows that the National honor would be safer in the hands of a tribunal comprising such men as Sir Charles Russell and Chief Justice Fuller than in the hands of "the political wirepullers, *et id omne genus*." It does not need Carl Schurz to show that statesmanship calls for this one further step in advance, along the pathway of National honor and prosperity which this Nation has been treading for a hundred years; nor such clergymen as Drs. Lorimer and Newman and Father Malone to bear their testimony, with that of substantially all Christian clergymen of every name, that the Church concurs in this judgment with the judge, the soldier, and the statesman.

Not one of these men, nor The Outlook through which they speak, desires to leave the country defenseless. Our navy is large enough. Our army needs but little increase, if any. Coast defenses we probably do require; but so rapidly is invention changing the methods of war that great sums appropriated for coast defenses to-day would probably have to be followed by new appropriations to destroy the defenses almost before they were finished. The spirit of peace forbids expense for offensive warfare. The spirit of prudence demands caution in expenses for even defensive warfare. And both the spirit of peace and of prudence admonish us that the best defense of National honor is to devote to the beam in our own eye the attention which Congress is now devoting to the mote in our neighbor's eye, and to guard our interests by the creation of a tribunal as quick to guard the rights of our neighbor as our own. Better than to prepare for war is to prevent it altogether. And the history of eighteen centuries demonstrates the truth that Law prevents War by preventing injustice.

The Foundation of Home Life

It is one of the anomalies of our American civilization that many a mother who has been absolutely devoted to her children while they were scarcely more than young animals will allow them to grow apart from her with the growth of their intelligence, so that, when they are eighteen or nineteen, and most in need of guidance and restraint, they have their own mental tastes and independent development, and often have for her a feeling which is at bottom, in so far as anything intellectual is concerned, a form of affectionate contempt.

These words from the "Critic" state one of the partially realized facts in American home life. The freedom given to girls after the age of twelve and thirteen—freedom in the choice of companions, books, hours; freedom as to the number and kind of organizations with which they unite, and the responsibility assumed in them; freedom as to the studies undertaken, and the utmost freedom as to the standards maintained in them—shows how willing too many American mothers are to surrender their responsibilities even to the undeveloped intelligence of their children. It is a great mistake to assume the management even of one's own child, after he is old enough to have the right of choice, without considering that child and consulting with him. The secret of character-training is in educating the will. We may compel outward obedience to what seems to us right, while the will is in absolute rebellion. In such case the uneducated will waits only for a day of freedom to act on its own conception of right and wrong. But there is as great an error in too much freedom as in too much control. Freedom given in advance of the mind's ability to use it wisely is almost certain to result disastrously.

The lack of intellectual relationship between parents and children in many homes raises a problem for which wise parents are seeking a solution. The secret of cordial, confidential, mental relation between parent and child is founded in sympathy. This should begin at the child's birth. If the parents do not possess it, it is the gift for which they must pray. Sympathy between parent and child cannot begin when the child has reached that point of intellectual development where there is companionship. The secret of companionship lies in the closeness with which the parents live with the child through his whole life. Every period, for the true parent, has its special degree of interest, and its possibility of true companionship. The story-telling of the first days of dawning intelligence lays the foundation for the intimacy which will control the relation of parents and children from the moment the child takes his first step into that great, alluring, bewildering, determining world, first met in the kindergarten, to the moment when parent and child are parted by death. It is not living down to the child, but living with the child through all stages and periods of development, that determines the degree of intimacy in maturity. The secret of parental relation is to recognize that, though a child is bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, he is still more his own possession—an immortal soul, born into life to work out his salvation and character; having, not our responsibilities, but his own, not our gifts, but his own, not our conscience, but his own. A child is clay in the hands of the potter, but the parent is not the potter. The design is God's. Time is the potter. The instruments are many. Heredity, environment, education, purpose, will, which are only measurably under the parents' control, are working out the character of him whom we call our child. He is ours when we live in such relation to him that we represent the invisible God, just, true, loving, understanding, sympathetic, patient, forgiving, never making the mistake of holding back the lesson of life, that every wrong act brings its own punishment. Not mere obedience to the

parent represents the true relation of parent and child, but obedience of both to God. Liberty, governed by an intelligent, spiritual conception of the right of choice, is the secret of high spiritual development, without which there can be no stability in relation between man and man, or man and God. The home should be heaven made visible.



Gymnastics and Ascetics

A Lenten Meditation

A vital difference between these two has been obscured in our Bibles, with loss to Christian thought and power. Gymnastics is exercise for development. Ascetics is exercise for repression. This difference appears in comparing Paul's exhortation to Timothy, "Exercise thyself unto godliness," and his declaration before Felix, "I exercise myself to have a conscience void of offense." In the former, Paul's Greek word (*gymnaze*) denotes gymnastic exercise; in the latter (*askō*), ascetic.

That Christian endeavor has been exercised in repression rather than in development is significantly intimated by the fact that *ascetic* is naturalized in our religious vocabulary, while *gymnastic* has no place therein. Christian morality still runs largely on the negative line of Judaic legalism, "Thou shalt not," and but moderately on the positive line of the Beatitudes. A large part of Christendom still emphasizes the annual religious revival called "Lent" by exercising itself in special abstinence, rather than by special insistence, such as the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah requires for the "acceptable fast," on works of justice and mercy.

Here is the cause of the moral weakness and degeneration that afflict the churches to-day. Much of their goodness is of the ascetic rather than of the gymnastic kind. Its type is in the negative righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, rather than in the positive righteousness of Christ.

The recovery of the long-observed truth of the real humanity of Christ has already in part restored to Christian consciousness its long-neglected companion truth, the imitableness of the moral excellence of Christ. This is the sole line of Christian power to overcome the world by redeeming the world. Already, as Dr. Gordon has said, "the conduct and spirit of Christian nations are under the stimulus and rebuke" of the moral standard of Christ. But the world, whose conscience thus does homage to Christian theory, lies in wickedness for lack of the Christian practice that should enforce it. Nor can the Church any longer give a valid reason for her existence in any distinction from the world, except as a society for the practical illustration of Christ's theory of life.

To effect this, she must do far more than practice the negative precepts, which Christ took over from Moses. Gymnastic, not ascetic, morality is required. She must go forward in the school of Christ, master the advanced lessons, pursue the higher courses, go through the university training, exercise herself in the purer righteousness, the finer charity, the more heroic self-sacrifice, the diviner consciousness of her Master. This divine morality can be successfully cultivated only as it is identified with religion itself. It is, indeed, one with "pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father."

This is what Lent is for, if it is for anything worth attaining. Whatever subsidiary value there may be in ascetic exercises of abstinence to promote a devout remembrance of the self-denial of Christ may be freely recognized and sought. But the essential exercise of the genuinely Chris-