This article was downloaded by: [York University Libraries]

On: 16 November 2014, At: 14:19

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Religious Education: The official journal of the Religious Education Association

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/urea20>

THE RELIGIOUS BASIS OF WORLD ORGANIZATION

E. Hershey Sneath Ph.D., LL.D.

Published online: 09 Jul 2006.

To cite this article: E. Hershey Sneath Ph.D., LL.D. (1918) THE RELIGIOUS BASIS OF WORLD ORGANIZATION, Religious Education: The official journal of the Religious Education Association, 13:3, 180-192, DOI: [10.1080/0034408180130303](https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408180130303)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0034408180130303>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

THE RELIGIOUS BASIS OF WORLD ORGANIZATION

E. HERSHEY SNEATH, Ph.D., LL.D.*

When we reflect upon the situation of the race today, with the leading nations in the throes of a war of unparalleled dimensions and destructiveness, we are appalled at the impotency of those forces that heretofore have tended toward world organization. Time was when international treaties and laws seemed to have at least a semblance of inhibiting sanctity, but in recent years they are regarded in certain quarters as mere "scraps of paper," and the supposed "rights" of nations are treated with scorn and contempt. The black flag of piracy, hitherto regarded as the symbol of international outlawry, floats on the high seas, and the assassination of neutrals and noncombatants is regarded by some as a national virtue. For centuries humane considerations obtained with reference to prisoners of war and to partially conquered nations. Now, certain nations have substituted for such humanitarianism, outrage, brutality and enforced slavery. In short, international pact and law seem to have broken down. Their restraints have yielded to the unbridled force of national greed and lust for power.

Again, in the past, the moral imperatives, independent of political treaties and laws, have exercised a wholesome constraining and restraining influence on the relations of different peoples, and have made for fraternal world organization. Man is constitutionally a moral being, and is, to a certain extent, governed by sentiments of justice and benevolence. These moral elements of our nature have led us to have regard for man as man, rather than for men as members of particular nations and races. Hence, in our interaction there has been a tendency to recognize and respect what we have been wont to call human rights as growing out of the essential constitution of personality. The same tendency has characterized our attitude toward men organized under political government. But alas! these fundamental moral claims are now flagrantly violated. The morally right has, with some nations, degenerated into the right of might.

Again, in the past, Art has made for the unification of the race. The æsthetic consciousness is on the side of harmony. It hates chaos and loves order. It functions in the social and political spheres and tends toward unity rather than anarchy—toward peace rather than war. What Paulsen says of the unifying effect of Art on a partic-

*Professor of the Philosophy of Religion and Religious Education, Yale University.

ular people is, in a large measure, true of nations. He says that "Art binds together and unites the members of the nation; nay, all the members of a sphere of civilization; all those who have the same faith and the same ideals. Opinions and interests differ and produce discord; art presents in sensuous symbols the ideals which are cherished by all, and so arouses the feeling that all are, in the last analysis, of the same mind, that all recognize and adore the same ultimate and highest things."¹ When we deal with the ideal we are dealing with the Universal. Thus Art transcends individualism and nationalism. It contributes toward cosmopolitanism, toward international goodwill. But, how ineffective it has proven along these lines during the last few tragic years. One of the first great outrages of the war was the wanton bombardment of the beautiful Rheims cathedral. The world protested against this iconoclasm, but it continued. Destruction and the robbing of nations of their art treasures are features of *Kultur*; so the breach between nations widens despite the supposed unifying power of Art. The nation of Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, Mendelssohn and Wagner grips with mailed fist the throat of the nation of Michaelangelo, Titian, DaVinci, Corregio and Raphael, and tries to strangle the nation of David, Delacroix and Millet. The nation of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller schools its children in a gospel of hate toward the nation of Shakespeare and Milton and a long line of glorious poets from Chaucer to Browning. The refining and organizing influences of Art have given way to the brutal instincts of malevolence and greed, and a lofty idealism that bound the nations together in a golden chain of beauty finds the precious chain rudely broken. Art, like the other binding forces, has apparently failed in its work of unification.

Another force that has been operative in world organization is religion, and especially the Christian religion. With its proclamation of the universal Fatherhood of God and brotherhood of men; with the law of love as its law of social interaction; with its "Go ye into all the world and preach my Gospel"—a Gospel of universal membership in a kingdom of supreme values—in which every member is on a moral equality with his neighbor—the Christian religion has been promotive of a spirit of goodwill among men, and of harmony among the nations. But what is the case today? A nominally Christian nation joins bloody hands with a traditionally murderous nation of Mohammedan faith in wholesale assassination of one of the most ancient Christian peoples, merely to enhance

¹ *A System of Ethics*, trans., New York, 1900, p. 559.

her own selfish interests. Furthermore, in the present crisis we find Christian nation arrayed against Christian nation; Protestant against Protestant; Catholic against Catholic; Protestant and Catholic united against Protestant and Catholic. Christianity is stabbed in the house of her friends, whose hands are covered with the blood of her wounds. Peoples in whose ears for centuries have rung the glad tidings of "Peace on earth, goodwill toward men" are today gripping one another in mortal combat. The star of the East that is said to have guided the Wise Men to the manger of the Prince of Peace seems to have lost its radiance and directing power. Never since the star shone were men apparently farther from beating their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. The unifying power of Him whose blessed life illustrated even better than his parable of the Good Samaritan the highest law of human relationship is not in evidence today. Where is the power of that cross, the vision of which carried with it still another vision of a world attracted to, and unified by, the power of self-sacrificing love: "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me?" Is the power of sacrificial love drawing the hearts of men and of nations together in the fellowship of Jesus Christ? Are not the dominant forces operating today centrifugal rather than centripetal? It is not the skeptic, or cynic, or pessimist, who asks these questions. They are the questions of thousands of earnest men and women who face the supreme crisis of human history. They bring home to us the fact that religion, even in its highest form, like international law, like morality, like art, however promotive of human brotherhood it has been, has failed in this most crucial test, to prevent the dreadful work of the destructive forces of mankind. This is a fact that the sincere believer in religion must face, whether he wants to or not.

RELATIONS AFTER THE WAR

In view of the failure of all of these more or less harmonizing and synthesizing forces to prevent such a gigantic war, what are we to say about world organization after the conflict? Nations must live and sustain relations to one another. They must establish some *modus vivendi*, and it must be founded on justice. The necessity of righteousness and goodwill in international relations has been made more apparent than ever by this most tragic conflict. And the question arises: What organized forces are to establish such righteousness and goodwill among the nations? In my judgement,

we must depend upon the very same forces that have been operative in the past; that is, upon international law, morality, art, and religion, but they must be made more effective. How this may be done in the case of religion it is the aim of this paper to try to explain.

In the first place, if religion is to become powerfully effective in this direction, it must take a really ethical view of God; He must be regarded as essentially moral in his constitution; as ruling in absolute righteousness, and whose ultimate aim with reference to men and the world is the realization of a new heaven and a new earth wherein righteousness is to dwell. Much as believers in religion have said on this subject, the conceptions of many as expressed in belief and conduct have contradicted their words. When the nation of Martin Luther, including not merely the docile masses, but the clergy and university professors, among whom may be numbered such religious leaders as Harnack, can accept and pray for the success of the war-program of a ruler who regards himself to be the vicegerent of the Almighty, co-operating with Him in a scientifically organized movement for the triumph of the most diabolical forces the human race has ever witnessed—approving the vices of hell as though they were the virtues of Heaven—this nominally Christian nation is either guilty of awful blasphemy or it has lost its vision of an ethical God. Such a conception of the Deity proves divisive rather than unifying. It recognizes merely a partisan tribal Deity who co-operates with a people to realize its own ends, however unworthy and debasing those ends may be. Its influence is promotive of national selfishness, and makes against a brotherhood of nations. Professor Leuba speaks of the utilitarian ends for which men believe in God—making him hardly more than a meat purveyor.¹ But the German conception of God is much crasser than this. "*Gott mit uns*" is a God that is asked and believed to co-operate in the most damnable atrocities the human mind ever conceived in order to further low national aims.

Now, there is an important psychology here that we must reckon with. Professor Stratton, in his work on *The Psychology of the Religious Life*, calls attention to the fact that religion breeds conflict, it gives birth to opposites or antitheses, and he devotes nearly the entire volume to a consideration of these conflicts. In one of his most interesting chapters² he points out the fact that religion is productive of both breadth and narrowness of sympathy, of both social and anti-social feelings, of both egoism and altruism. He illustrates this in pointing out the exclusiveness of some religions,

¹Monist XI., p 571 ²Pt. I., ch. II.

such as that of the Jews, and of the catholicity of others, such as Buddhism and Christianity. He points out, also, the jealousy and intolerance of the monotheistic religions, such as Judaism, Christianity and Islam, as compared with polytheistic religions, like Buddhism. The former, like Elijah, are very jealous for their Lord, and such jealousy breeds narrowness and intolerance. It breeds exclusiveness, strife and often persecution. Now most of the conflict between narrowness and breadth of sympathy to which religion gives rise is due to wrong conceptions of the ethical nature of God. This manifests itself in many ways. God is conceived as a God of one people, rather than of others; or of one people particularly and peculiarly, and of other peoples merely generally; or a God choosing and rewarding the elect and damning the non-elect; or a God favoring only one mode of salvation peculiar to a certain people or sect, and hostile to all others; or a God of one revelation, rather than of another. In short, God is a partial God; a God of favoritism; a God of some rather than of all; a God of a particular household of faith, instead of the God and father of all mankind. Such a God is not a God of justice, much less of love. Such a conception is productive of division, rather than of unity in the race. It breeds strife, rather than harmony. Witness the religious wars that history records. Witness the history of the conflict between Mohammedanism and Christianity; between Protestantism and Catholicism. Now, as a rule, religion is so involved in the life of a people that it becomes an integral part of their nationalism. Historians call attention to the fact that the monotheism of the Jews was largely the outgrowth of reflection upon their own history as a people. They saw in this history a Divinity that had shaped their ends, however rough hewn they may have been. For several centuries a similar belief prevailed in America. Our wonderful history led people to believe that we are a favored nation. God's providential government reveals a partiality for America when compared with other nations. With such conceptions of a partial God, it is but a short step to making use of God for national ends, and, as illustrated in the case of the German nation today, only another short step to conceiving God's willingness to co-operate in realizing ends which, in the judgement of the world, as expressed in international law, as well as in its own unwritten verdict, are regarded as unrighteous. Until the God of the race supersedes in actual belief and practice the God of nationalism; until the God and Father of all mankind displaces in our belief the God of sect, and the God of one religion rather than of another; until the God of

absolute and universal righteousness takes the place in our minds and hearts of the God of partiality and favoritism, which is the God of injustice; men and nations will not be bound together in one great and glorious fraternity. The root idea of religion is the idea of God, and as is our idea of God, so will our religious life be. If it is the idea of an unrighteous Deity, our individual, national, and international life will be unrighteous. The fundamental necessity in the determination of the religious basis of world organization is an ethical conception of God.

In the second place, in our religious efforts at world organization we must entertain and put in practice a far more ethical conception of man than we have in the past. The inalienable rights of personality must be recognized and their sanctity remain inviolable. That valuation which Christianity puts on man as man must be seriously reckoned with in our reconstructive efforts after the war. Or, as Kant puts it, every man must be regarded as an end in himself. He must not be used merely as a means to an end. The significance of this is, that there is an essential moral equality among men. On it all political relations, whether national or international, must be based. This means, first, that within each nation a true form of government, under whatsoever name it may be known, must be democratic. Autocracy is opposed to moral and political equality. It treats its subjects as tools or instruments. Thus it has built up governments of force that ignore the moral claims of their own people, reducing them to a docility in which they are little more than "dumb driven cattle." Thus subjugated, they are schooled from childhood in a creed of jealousy and hatred of other nations. They can be hurled in masses "into the jaws of Death" in an unrighteous war of conquest. Autocracy is upheld by militarism, and militarism means strife. On the other hand, militarism is upheld by autocracy. It first robs the people of its own nation of their rights and then proceeds to plunder other nations. It is essentially anti-social in character, and it is so because it is anti-moral. It overlooks the moral equality of men.

Now the religion of the future must set its face like flint against this immoral view of man. It must emphasize the autonomy of the human spirit—the essential worth of a soul that can determine its own conduct in the light of ideals of worth. Once it does this, the relations among men will grow clearer; they will become more ethically articulate, and the law of social interaction will be at least the law of justice, and in a measure the law of love,—"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,"—which being interpreted means, that

just as one is under obligations to labor for the realization of the highest humanity in one's own person, so he is under obligations to work for the realization of the highest humanity in the person of others. And this highest law of human relationship must be recognized, not merely as obligatory upon individuals in their relations to other individuals, but also upon nations in their mutual relations. Morality is transcendental in its character. It overleaps the bounds of individualism. It knows not men merely, nor nations merely, nor groups of nations merely;—it knows the race. It knows man, rather than men. It is difficult for us to realize this. Just as it was hard for primitive tribes to realize any obligations to other tribes, so today, notwithstanding centuries of so-called civilization, somehow or other an international morality fails to have the binding force either of personal, community, or national morality. The righteousness that exalts a people seems largely to be a righteousness within its own borders. Egoism in a nation is just as blameworthy as egoism in an individual. In the vast group of nations, no nation liveth unto itself alone, if it is to live according to the moral law of benevolence, or according to the Christian law of love. The religion of the future must, in its practical belief, emphasize this fact far more than it has in the past. The parable of the Good Samaritan must teach its wholesome lesson to every man in his relation to his fellows and to every nation in its relation to other nations. Nations are simply larger human units, and the golden rule in its obligatory force applies just as truly to their interrelations as it does to those of individuals.

So I insist that in our efforts at world organization, religion must take this ethical conception of the nature and relations of men, whether we are dealing with persons merely, or with groups organized under political government. It is no more Utopian in the latter case than in the former. It serves at least as an ideal to control action and it is the nature of all ideals to transcend the real. There is, indeed, a sense in which one owes duty primarily to self. He is responsible first, and in a unique sense, for the humanity in his own person; and it is only as he meets this responsibility properly that he can rightly deal with his responsibility to his neighbor. Hence the law makes self the norm according to which we are to determine our relations to our fellows. We are to love our neighbor as we love *ourselves*. We are to do unto others as we would have them do unto *us*. The same thing is true with respect to relations among nations. There is a peculiar sense in which a nation must consider its own interests first. It must do so if it would properly interpret its duty to a neighboring nation. But when this is con-

ceded, then both morality and religion must, if they would realize their true ends, recognize the binding character of this law of reciprocal relations. If it be said that this would weaken patriotism, I answer, "No;" rather would it place patriotism on a loftier plane, eliminating the purely egoistic or selfish element. One is not less loyal to family if he tries to introduce the spirit of goodwill that prevails among its members into the community at large. And so, if we labor to establish the spirit of brotherhood among our own people, we are not less loyal to them if, in our relations to other peoples, we try to maintain the same fraternal spirit.

Now, in this work of establishing a real brotherhood among individuals and among nations, religion has the advantage over mere morality, for it can avail itself of the power of the religious sanctions in trying to realize its ethical aim. But, on the other hand, a subtle danger lurks in religion which it may be well to point out here, and which must be guarded against in our future efforts at community, national and world organization, for it tends to subordinate the ethical element in religion, and often degenerates into an anti-social program. According to the sanest views of the psychology of religion, the whole mind as intellect, sensibility and will functions in the religious consciousness. Because of this, there is a possibility of developing a wrong sense of values in the religious life. There has been a notable tendency in human history to stress the intellectual element in religion. This has resulted in a large body of doctrine which frequently assumes extraordinary significance. The main thing, then, is to give intellectual assent to dogma and creed. Orthodoxy of belief rather than orthodoxy of life becomes the primary thing. The ethical element in religion is subordinated to intellectual belief. And how divisive and anti-social, rather than unifying, dogma has been, and how deadening to real moral endeavor! This constitutes a long and very tragic chapter in the history of Christianity, as well as of other religions.

Again, there has been another marked tendency in the history of religion and that is the substitution of the religion of feeling for the religion of will. Pietism and sentimentalism have supplanted in a large measure the ethical. Such religion is dominantly non-social, if not, indeed, anti-social in its character. It doesn't make for brotherhood. The pietistic monk shuts himself in a monastery and tries to work out his soul's salvation with fear and trembling, rather than by working it out in aiding his neighbor or society to work out theirs. Buddhism and Christianity have been most unfortunate victims of this substitution of solitude for solidarity. Furthermore, in some Christian denominations there is a tendency to over-

emphasize personal religion of a decidedly emotional and sentimental rather than of a volitional type,—a religion of feeling rather than a religion of doing. Dean Brown once said to the writer that there is a great deal of pietism that is utterly wanting in ethical quality, and that is true. It is a kind of selfish subjectivism devoid of any real moral character. It is self-centered and non-social. It represents the minimum of true religion. Where in such pietism do we find the universality of obligation involved in the ethical law of benevolence or in the Christian law of love? Such religion does not bear the marks of a socialized gospel. It has developed a wrong sense of values.

Again, there is in practically all religions a large element of symbolism—the religious life expressing itself in worship—in rites and ceremony. And this carries with it a dangerous tendency in evaluation. A wrong sense of religious values often substitutes ritual and ceremonial for what is the real essence of religion—namely, righteousness. The great Hebrew prophets and Jesus contended strongly against this misinterpretation of religion. With them it represented a wrong evaluation of the essentials of religion. Indeed, it threatened its very life—the heart of which in their conception is righteousness in God and man.

All of these elements—the intellectual, the pietistic, the æsthetic or symbolical, have a rightful place in the religious life, but they are all subordinate, and exceedingly subordinate, to the one great dominating element, the moral. And it is because of a failure to adequately recognize and practice this element that so many supposedly Christian nations are today in deadly conflict. All of them persist in their theological beliefs; all of them persist in pietistic communion; all of them persist in rite and ceremony; but how few of them even approximate the exemplification of the fundamental ethical requirements of their faith. Their theology, their pietism, their worship, their religion, have not been moralized; and unless we are willing to make, both in belief and practice, the religious basis of world organization truly ethical, we will fail as lamentably in the future as we have in the past.

APPLYING THE PROGRAM

Finally, how is such a religio-ethical program to be carried forward? The answer is, by systematic religious education. Such an educational procedure involves beginning at the beginning, and that is, with the child. Here, again, we meet with a melancholy

failure in the development of a true sense of values. Despite the progress that modern religious educational effort has made, there is still a widespread lack of genuine appreciation of the importance of childhood for moral and religious instruction. The premium is still placed on the adult. We have but to examine the average church program to be convinced of this. In a large number of churches we have three Sunday services—two of which are devoted to adults and one to children. In the average church the week-day services are largely services for adults. Our sermons, our hymns, our prayers, many of our week-day meetings cover chiefly the interests of grown-ups; and the lamentable condition of home religious education painfully fails to make up this deficiency in what Bushnell called Christian nurture. Indeed, under a false conception of conversion, and a false apprehension of the spiritual birthright of children in most Protestant quarters the child, as the late Professor George P. Fisher once remarked to the writer, is regarded as an alien to the Commonwealth of Israel. Instead of being born into the church and treated as a member of the household of Faith, he must serve his probation as a heathen, and await the dawn of adolescence when he will have developed sufficient maturity of mind to interpret and give intellectual assent to a creed. The absurdity and tragedy of it all are manifest when we take into consideration the ethical character of religion, and the fact that childhood is pre-eminently the period for establishing the individual in habits of virtue. There may be some exaggeration in Stanley Hall's statement, that the moral and spiritual destiny of the average person is determined in the first ten years of his life; but, to any one who has studied the psychology of moral and spiritual development, it is evident that Hall is dealing with far more than a half truth. The receptivity and plasticity of the child make it possible for those to whom his most vital interests are committed to really save him or damn him. And, as we establish children in right thinking and right living, so we establish the community, the state, the nation, and ultimately the nations in their reciprocal relations. In more ways than one is Wordsworth's statement true: "The child is father to the man." It is pre-eminently true in the moral and religious sphere. The kingdom of God and his righteousness will never make the progress on earth that they should make until the scales really fall from our eyes, and we gain a true vision of our duty to the child in establishing him in personal and community righteousness, and thus pave the way for the application of the law of righteousness in the state and among the nations of the earth.

In still another way, to one who is convinced of the supremacy of moral and spiritual worths and of the ethical aim of all true religion, is the lamentable failure to develop a true sense of values manifest. Professor Pratt calls attention in his *Psychology of Religious Belief* to what he regards to be a fact, that in the average American community, "we find our friends and neighbors, of all degrees of education and intellectual ability, almost to a man accepting God as one of the best recognized realities of their world and as simply not to be questioned."¹ That statement is in the main true. In other words, we are a religious people. And yet, notwithstanding this fact, so far as thoroughgoing, systematic religious education is concerned, when compared with the time and efforts devoted to, and quality of education along other lines, it suffers painfully. In nearly all of the states, five days a week, of at least four or five hours each, are given to what we call secular education, as against one day per week, of one hour each, to religious instruction and worship. In secular education we have, on the whole, a trained body of teachers. In religious education we are dependent largely on amateurs. In most places religion is not allowed a voice in our schools, so far as *systematic* training is concerned, and in comparatively few communities has a systematic course of moral training even been introduced. What does all this mean? Does it not mean that we err tremendously in our sense of values? If there is any doubt concerning this, reflect for a moment on the possibility of organizing a community on a basis of the vices instead of the virtues. Try to found a community on sensuality, falsehood, dishonesty, injustice, hate, and murder, and see how far you will succeed. Society could not hang together for a single day on such a basis. The vices are all anti-social in their character. The virtues are social: they make for unity, for organization. And what is true of communities is true of states, and of nations—not only in their internal relations but in their relations to other nations. The virtues make for national and international organization. Now, religion deals with these sovereign values, and yet, comparatively speaking, we—a religious people—relegate them to the background in our educational scheme. We will never succeed in world organization until we genuinely appreciate the unifying power of the virtues, the harmonizing and binding force of righteousness, and systematically train a generation from childhood in a knowledge and an appreciation of their supreme worth, and try to mould their wills in conformity to their requirements.

¹p. 231

But, as Herbert Spencer wisely remarks, we have not an ideal environment in which to work out our ideals. And that is eminently true in this case; therefore, wisdom dictates that we try to do our work with reference to the conditions of the actual environment in which we are placed. If, for apparently good reasons, it be not expedient under present conditions to introduce systematic religious education into the public schools, it is possible for us to make provision in some other way for religion to have its rightful place in the general training of our children. This would require a religious school organization, with a curriculum that interprets religion as ethical in its aim. It would require a scientifically graded moral scheme with its corresponding religious sanctions; also the creation of a literature to meet these demands. It would require, at least, three sessions a week. It should be separate from the Sunday School, where, with present conditions, sectarianism still enters into education, and yet it should be supplementary to it. It would call for a specially trained teaching force; and for skilled professional supervision. All this ought to be done; it can be done; and it must be done. We must do it in the interests of the individual, of the family, of the community, of the state, of the nation, and of the brotherhood of nations. It is a thoroughly practicable scheme. The literature exists already; colleges, schools of religion, and theological seminaries can easily become training schools for the preparation of religious teachers. The only difficulty in the way, which is, indeed, a serious one, but by no means insuperable, is the time schedule of the children. In my own judgment, if a real effort were made by the churches of any community, a plan could be formulated in relation to the public schools whereby the children would become available for such religious instruction. If the community is a religious one, it has a right to, and must insist upon, having the children a fair share of the time for such purposes. If the moral and spiritual values are the supreme values of society, then it is in the interests of society itself that these values should receive proper recognition in formal education for citizenship. The real trouble is, that the churches are not really in earnest concerning this important matter. It has taken a war of such gigantic proportions to call forth the consideration of such a program as this Association has formulated. It has taken an awful social cataclysm to make us realize that nations no more than families and communities can hang together on any other basis than the cardinal virtues, and that something more than a mere formal recognition of these virtues is required for world organization. Men

and nations must be disciplined in them, and the way to do this is to begin in childhood. If the schooling of a nation in a gospel of national egoism and hate be largely responsible for the present war, why is it not possible to school the nations in those things that make for goodwill and world organization? To doubt it is to doubt the might of right.

In conclusion, my plea is, that, in our efforts at world organization, so far as religion is concerned, we adequately reckon with its ethical character. Let us take, first, an ethical view of God—that He is a righteous being, that He deals justly with all men and all nations, that He cannot be used by any individual or nation for unrighteous ends, that He is the father of us all, and that He co-operates with men in their efforts to bring in the reign of righteousness upon earth. And, secondly, let us also take a more ethical view of man; recognizing the worth and inalienable rights of personality; that no man may be used as a means, but must be regarded as an end in himself; and thus, whatever may be the outward form of government, it must in essence be democratic, rather than autocratic; that the law of interaction among nations must be the same as the law among individuals—the law of benevolence or the law of love. Let us develop a true sense of values in religion that will place emphasis on the voluntaristic or ethical element rather than on either the intellectual, pietistic, and symbolical or æsthetic. Finally, let us try to realize this program (a) by thorough, systematic religious education in which we shall emphasize the interests of the child rather than the interests of the adult; (b) by giving an ethical interpretation to the curriculum; (c) by organizing a trained body of teachers; and (d) by insisting that a fair amount of the child's time and effort shall be devoted to education in the supreme values of society. If we act on this program, if we make this really the religious basis of world organization, we will make long strides toward the dawn of a better day, when nations shall seek war no more; and the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our righteous God and his Christ, whose gospel and life teach the universal fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man.