

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Review & Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_rande_01.php

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. VI.

January, 1908

No. 1

THE OLD FAITH AND THE NEW PHILOSOPHY.

BY PROFESSOR C. S. GARDNER.

The most vigorous philosophy of our day is the reflection in the sphere of theory of our intensely practical habits of thought and life. It does not seem to be seriously handicapped by its unfortunate name, Pragmatism. This is a harsh, uncouth, angular word. I feel sure that any system of thought which is not killed outright at its birth by such a name has extraordinary vitality. There is nothing about it that suggests the lofty altitudes, the wide, misty vistas, the dreamy twilights and vast cloudlands of philosophy. It rather suggests the jolting of a heavily loaded wagon over a pavement of granite blocks.

As a practical, common-sense, hard-headed way of looking at things, this mode of thought has long enjoyed general vogue. But its elevation into the dignity of a philosophy of the world is recent. Many causes have contributed to the development of this philosophy. As already suggested, it is in harmony with the practical, experimental, scientific temper of our age. Every philosophy which gains a general currency must be in some way a speculative formulation of widely prevalent modes of thought and ideals of conduct, i. e., a reaction of the speculative intellect upon the life-conditions of an age. But its more immediate and specific origin is to be found in the recent de-

velopments in the study of psychology. It has now become the fashion in this science to think of all one's mental activities or processes as so many functions, so many ways in which the psychic being tries to adjust itself to, or organize, its environment. It is recognized that in any given mental act or process the whole mind is engaged. You, I, all of us, are engaged in an almost continuous series of efforts to get into wider and more satisfactory relations with the things, personal or impersonal, which in any way enter into our experience. Thinking is one form which these efforts take. We select from among the many things that strike our senses, or from among the many conscious movements of our souls, some to which we give special attention. We compare them, analyze them, group them, make affirmations about them, draw conclusions from them—and all for what purpose? Manifestly, in order that we may deal with them more effectively, handle them more successfully, get into more satisfying relations with them, and through them find our way to new, larger and still more satisfactory relations with all the factors of our experience. The function of the intellect, then, is to help us to enlarge and harmonize our experience, to get into broader and more satisfying relations with persons and things; or in less technical phrase, since the power and joy of life consist in the number, proportion and satisfactory character of these relations, the purpose of thought is to promote life, to make it broader, deeper, richer. It is obvious, then, that the intellect is successful in the performance of its function, i. e., attains to truth, in proportion as this purpose is accomplished. From these considerations the conclusion is reached that the true test of the truth of any judgment formed by the intellect is whether it enables us to adjust ourselves satisfactorily to our environment, to enlarge and harmonize our experience; or, in more homely phrase, whether it will work, will bear the test of practice. Here, you see, while we have traveled the path of science we have come out just where the unsophisticated, everyday man has stood all the time. Although he may be entirely innocent of the philosophy of his position, yet he stands very firmly upon the proposition that the final test of the truth of any doctrine or theory or affirmation which claims his

assent, must be, "Does it work well in practice?" The hard-headed man of affairs will no doubt welcome the scientist and philosopher to this platform, although his convictions will probably not be greatly strengthened by their tardy concurrence in his common-sense postulate. Anyhow, this common-sense test of truth is set up as a cardinal principle of the Pragmatistic philosophy. And I wish to consider now the bearing upon Christianity of this new and aggressive philosophy, which claims to spring directly out of the well-established methods and results of modern science, which seems to fit admirably the scientific mental habits of this age, and which gives evidence of its ability to extend its sway over the higher ranges of modern thought. It is eminently probable that it is with this fashion of thought that the Christian leaders of the rising generation will have chiefly to deal in pressing the claims of our religion, both among plain people and among those of higher culture.

In one of his entertaining and illuminating lectures, Prof. William James says: "If theological ideas prove to have a value for concrete life, they will be true for Pragmatism in the sense of being good for so much. For how much more they are true will depend entirely on their relations to other truths that also have to be acknowledged." In other words, Pragmatism must be considered in its bearing upon our religion both from the standpoint of its practical and also from that of its metaphysical implications. Let us consider first its metaphysical implications in relation to Christianity. These implications are being worked out by a number of acute and able thinkers, chief among whom are Professors James and Dewey in this country and Professor Schiller in England. They are contending with a great deal of power that reality is plastic and is moulded or constituted by intelligence; that truth is not a mental copy of a fixed and rigid order of reality, which exists apart from the knowing, acting mind, but is a successful organization of the elements of one's experience, so as to secure the harmony and extension of experience; that the universe is not a finished thing with which it is the business of the mind to bring itself into correspondence, but is now being organized or constituted, or is

in process of construction, in which constructive process every intelligent being is engaged; and that the very significance of our intellectual and moral activity is that we are working, along with all other similar beings, in building a universe which in the end will be what we shall have helped to make it.

Of course, in so brief a summary we can give no hint of the elaborate and often very subtle reasoning by which these philosophical principles, so roughly outlined, are sought to be established. I must confess that with reference to their cardinal metaphysical contention as to the nature of reality and truth, my own experience has been somewhat peculiar. While reading their cogent arguments, the fabric of the old philosophy which they attack seems to collapse hopelessly, and I find it difficult to resist their conclusions. But on the other hand, when not reading them, I find it difficult to maintain their point of view. Whether this is due to the persistence of an old mental habit, I do not know. But the question is not now as to any difficulty in adjusting our mental focus, but has reference solely to the bearing of this style of thought upon our theological ideas. At any rate, their criticism of the old philosophy seems overwhelmingly convincing.

The cardinal principle of this philosophy as expounded by Professor James is the primacy of the will, and has been called Voluntarism. He takes direct issue with the school of rationalistic thinkers who have stood so persistently for the primacy of the intellect. The Pragmatists have proved, it seems to me, beyond successful contradiction that the motive of all thought is feeling or desire, and that thinking is a mere preliminary to and preparation for conduct. They would amend the famous dictum of Matthew Arnold that "conduct is three-fourths of life," and would add the other fourth. From the incipiency of mental movement in sensation, through the more or less complex processes of thought to its *finale* in some kind of reaction, the mind is dealing practically with its environment, is adjusting itself, is acting, is fashioning its world, and all of this is the function of will. In this process the will is free, within limits; is truly creative in a qualified sense. Its choices are not mere illusions; they are real; they determine the direction in

which the spirit itself develops, and in some measure also the form which the universe takes. In so far as the universe has been organized it is a limitation, though not an absolute one, upon the will; but everywhere the Pragmatist sees will or wills at work. Nothing can be wholly true, according to this philosophy, which satisfies the logical faculty only. That which satisfies the desire for intellectual harmony or logical consistency and leaves the emotions starved or the will without a sense of real responsibility is so far untrue. The rounded, whole, complete truth must meet the desire for intellectual harmony, but must also afford satisfaction to the affections and supply to the will an undivided and powerful motive. The heart has as much right to be heard in the search for truth as the head. It may be said that action is the supreme function of the human spirit, and truth must energize the will and direct it along lines that lead to the greatest and most lasting emotional satisfactions.

Furthermore, as Professor Schiller says, 'It [Humanism or Pragmatism] points to the personality of whatever cosmic principle we can postulate as ultimate and to its kinship and sympathy with man.' Personality is the secret of the universe. It is original and it is final. The cosmic process is in fact the creation, development and perfection of personalities. What we call the material universe is only the foil of personality. It is the scaffolding used in the construction of this magnificent universe of personalities. It is an open question whether, in the last analysis, it be not wholly a creation of intelligence. At any rate it can be no more, to use the old Aristotelian word, than a mere *ύλη*, a formless stuff, chaos, in the fashioning, moulding, organization of which personalities grow into the fullness of spiritual statue.

Now it seems to me that a sane Christian theology has little to fear from a philosophy in which this is the central idea. For one thing, it seems to deal a mortal blow to the old Rationalism which for so long has vexed the souls of believers in religious verities, who often could give no better answer to its criticisms than the truly Pragmatic one—"I believe, nevertheless, that these things are true." It is equally as effective as a break-water against the floods of Materialism, which for a time appar-

ently threatened to overflow the loftiest summits of the Christian faith. The conception of the plastic character of reality certainly leaves ajar the door of possibility for a divine revelation, for miracle, for the objective as well as the subjective efficacy of prayer. Dr. Schiller is disposed to maintain that the laws of nature, whose alleged infrangible and inflexible character have so often balked credence in the wonders of the Bible and weighed down the wings of upward rising petition, are in some measure modifiable by the activity of human intelligence. If the universe is an unfinished product of intelligence and will, as these philosophers maintain, and if the activities of all spirits are contributing something to its final organization, or hindering its progress, and if this vast constructive enterprise holds immeasurable possibilities of failure and perversion on the one hand, or of glorious success on the other, surely such a situation affords ample philosophic ground to maintain the reality of sin and of the atoning suffering of the divine Being whose responsibility for the completion and perfection of the universe must be supreme.

But I need not specify further. The Pragmatists certainly hold no brief for Christianity. They are not busy making philosophical garments for a theology which many people have supposed to be standing naked and shivering out in the cold; nor are they physicians who have been called in to administer philosophical stimulants to a dying faith. They are simply untrammelled thinkers who are engaged in formulating a philosophy which is believed to be the logical development of the marvelous scientific work of modern times. If their doctrines turn out to be helpful to the Christian faith, it is because that faith in its characteristic elements is in fundamental harmony with the great body of scientific truth, and because that harmony becomes more apparent as scientific truth becomes more proportionately developed and more thoroughly organized. And this, specifically, is my contention.

Dr. Geo. Burnham Foster has recently said: "In my opinion Christianity is in the most grievous crisis of its history. * * * It may be objected that the old churches were never so powerful and active as today; never so much engaged in labors of love.

But the question is whether all this is the blush of health or the last flush of fever on the cheeks of the dying; whether its glory is the glory of her springtime or of her autumn; whether the next season is summer or winter. It is the dying of the old faith which Western Christendom is experiencing. * * * The deepest doubters of our day are those whose consciences themselves are precisely the forces which have given birth to their doubts, and that deep doubt is not now with reference to dogma and cult and organization of an historic church, but whether the ideals which were sacred to the fathers are real gods worthy of all adoration * * * or whether those ideals are grinning and grotesque idols in the gloom of ancient temples, and which can endure no sunlight of modern thought." As the learned professor so reads the signs of the times and so measures the drift of modern thought, I shall not question the propriety of his giving utterance to a prophecy which to so many hearts is so shocking. However, his preaching of the funeral of Christianity is not only lacking in becoming tenderness, but is, it seems to me, entirely "too previous." He has diagnosed the inevitable disorders of growing youth as the infirmities of age and the pangs of approaching dissolution. It is the "blush of health" and not "the last flush of fever on the cheeks of the dying" which suffuses the face of present-day Christianity. It might be safely left to any jury of experts in the religious development of mankind whether extraordinary "labors of love" are the characteristic activity of a moribund faith. Indeed the merest tyro in the subject knows that when the health of Christianity has been low the decline of vitality has invariably manifested itself by quite the opposite symptoms. Heretofore, certainly, the predictions of the collapse of Christianity have been based upon the alleged absence of these labors of love. This reminds us that this is not by any means the first time that Christianity has been declared to be *in extremis*. Our religion is in the situation of the man who has lived to read many obituary notices of himself. It may be said with all kindness that usually such pronouncements are either the advertisement of a personal hostility to some perverted type of Christianity, or a cheap method of exposing the carcass of the writer's own defunct faith. They

are the inevitable but disagreeable incidents of a period of transition.

And surely we are in a period of transition. Christianity *is* in a crisis, and I am willing to admit that it is "the most grievous crisis of its history" (although I do not like the implications of this adjective). I am aware of the enormous scientific activity of the last hundred years; of the mighty floods of new knowledge that have been poured into the minds of men. I know that scientific inquiry has pressed its way into every sphere of life and has worked out surprising and sometimes startling results in every realm which it has entered. I know that it has paid scant respect to ancient prejudices and hoary dogmas. I know that some of its great generalizations when announced have been felt like explosive shocks that sent a tremor to the very foundation of creeds which seemed to be established upon the Rock of Ages. I know that the modern mind has been taxed to its utmost capacity in the effort to correlate all this new knowledge with the precious tenets of its traditional faith, and that while toiling at this huge unfinished task it has been again and again surprised and disconcerted by shouts arising from some other part of the field announcing some new discovery or proclaiming some new theory which only added to and complicated the difficulty of the undertaking. I know that we have been living and are yet living in a period of intellectual disintegration and reorganization which is without parallel perhaps except in the first century of the Christian era. I know that many minds have become hopelessly confused; many have been panic stricken; many have reacted into the most narrow dogmatism, and with bitter pessimism assail the scientific spirit as the breeder of religious and moral anarchy; many have become tipsy with the wine of new knowledge and their over-stimulated brains have been fertile in wild fancies which have no significance except as they add to the general uproar; some in their too eager desire to prophesy concerning the new order have concluded that amid the triumphs of the human intellect they were witnessing the tragic death of the one great religion of the heart. Let us take our stand among that number who in the midst of the prevailing con-

fusion have striven first of all to maintain a clear and balanced judgment. By all means let us firmly refuse to be driven into an attitude of blind and stupid reaction. If the ship be in danger we cannot save it by driving it into the dangerous shallows of a narrow obscurantism, for there it will strike fast upon the ragged rocks and be beaten to pieces by the merciless waves. With equal firmness let us refuse to be stampeded into a frenzied radicalism that proposes to scuttle the ship because of an irresponsible report that it has sprung a leak and cannot reach the port. To my mind, it is fundamentally a question of correlation; of building up a philosophical conception of the world which will harmonize and unify the results of science and the postulates of faith. I have not a doubt that this can be done. The work is under way; and the Pragmatists are probably making at the present time the most important contribution to the undertaking. Their enterprise is to develop a philosophy which shall spring directly out of the soil of science. Without doubt the hour has struck for this task. Its successful performance, I fancy, must be the next great achievement of the human intellect. The work is not by any means completed, but I make bold to say that while I am quite unprepared to commit myself to all the conclusions thus far reached in this philosophical enterprise, it certainly renders faith in the great tenets of our religion easier than did the old philosophy which it is replacing. I am persuaded indeed that a clear eye can discern amidst the intellectual confusion of our day that the most significant contest going on is between two philosophies, and that the new and winning one is creating an intellectual atmosphere which will prove a more congenial climate for Christian faith. The real outcome toward which the world-transforming activity of scientific thought is tending is not the destruction of religion nor the paralysis of faith in the great Christian verities, but toward a reconstruction of the philosophical conception of the universe. Christian faith had entered into a *modus vivendi* with that old philosophy, but surely no one familiar with the history of human thought can claim that that *modus vivendi* was without tension and strain. The accommodation was never free from grave difficulties. If

the figure may be tolerated, our religion and that old philosophy dwelt together in matrimonial bonds, but I maintain that Christianity was under duress when she entered into and abode in that alliance. The peace of the union was not unfrequently disturbed. The noise of the domestic altercation sometimes became a public scandal; and the dissolution of that unhappy marriage, if it come about through natural processes, may not prove a great misfortune. The intellectual unity and harmony of experience was never fully achieved, and a radical reorganization of our reasoned conception of the universe, while it may bear a superficial resemblance to the disintegration of the Christian faith, may in fact be but the liberation of that faith from a serious philosophical handicap. At any rate, before we become paralyzed with fear that the house is on fire, let us examine to see whether the origin of the smoke is not a burning rubbish heap on the back premises.

But let us now turn to consider the more practical side of our question, or, as Professor James phrases it, "whether theological ideas prove to have a value for concrete life." There are at least four concrete demands which human need makes upon every religion.

First, the cleansing of the conscience. The guilty conscience is a great and solemn reality, however we may account for it, or in whatever terms we may define it. We may in theological terms describe it as sin and the consciousness of divine disapproval; we may scientifically regard it as the pain of maladjustment to the moral order of life; or, speaking psychologically, as the painful tension of psychic disharmony, the signal of a lack of unity in the soul. But it is one of the great facts of life. (These scientific definitions may enlarge our conception of the problem of guilt, but they are not to be taken as adequate substitutes for the theological terms.) To remove guilt, to bring about reconciliation to God, or, if anyone likes the term better, to secure moral adjustment and psychological unity, is one of the great functions of religion. The guilty soul feels the frown of condemnation on the face of the Infinite, and so every religion undertakes in some way to remove from the miserable soul the shadow cast by this cloud. Has Christianity been suc-

cessful in performing this great function of religion? To ask the question is to answer it. Through its doctrine of the divine sacrificial atonement it has brought to successive generations of penitent sinners the blessed sense of reconciliation to God, of restoration to the divine favor, of moral adjustment and inward unity. How many millions of simple souls have felt this relief! There has been an unbroken and distinguished line of cultured spirits who likewise have entered into this joyful experience which has changed for them the significance and trend of life. Nor is there any likelihood that we shall ever advance beyond the need of the doctrine of the atonement to meet this crisis in our moral experience. I do not see how it is possible thoroughly to comprehend the significance of the brilliant work done in the psychology of religion by such men as Baldwin, Starbuck and James without perceiving that there is a real psychological basis, so to speak, for this great doctrine of our faith. The need of it is rooted in the ethical processes that are normal to human nature.

But the great efficiency of our religion in meeting this ethical need is evidenced not only by the fact that it gives ease to the disturbed conscience, but that, while giving ease, it also gives increased vigor. There are religions that give ease to the conscience after the manner of an anæsthetic. They quiet moral pain by producing moral insensibility; but Christianity does not cause the frown on the face of God to disappear by clouding the vision of the eye that looks Godward. It does not remove the discomfort of moral maladjustment by decreasing the sensitiveness of our moral nerves. Rather does it impart a higher sense of the holiness of God, a keener consciousness of the moral order of the world. It overcomes the moral disorder by giving a higher moral vitality. It uses constitutional treatment, it bestows moral health. This is a fact which cannot be given too much emphasis in considering the practical claims of Christianity. I am aware that ethical perversion has accompanied the prevalence of a corrupted type of Christianity as inseparably as its shadow, but this only confirms my contention. It is equally true that where a true, unperverted type of Christianity has prevailed consciences have been quickened into greater energy and moral activity has been

but the outshining of its rays. Despite the periodic ebbing of the tide and notwithstanding occasional epochs of ethical confusion resulting from great social changes, it is simple historic truth that Christianity has been a most potent promoter of moral progress. There have been two phases of this progress. First, there has been an elevation of the moral ideal. The contemplation of the character of Jesus and its dynamic authority as an ethical standard has steadily and inevitably resulted in purifying and refining moral sentiments, has, in fact, rendered it impossible for the moral life of Christendom to crystallize on any lower level than that of perfection. Second, there has been a progressive ethicizing of all life, i. e., an application of the moral standard to wider and wider spheres of life. For instance, can one easily measure the moral distance that lies between our present imperfect application of the high ethical ideals to politics and the Machiævillian principles that once prevailed in that great realm of human activity? If one wishes to be converted from pessimism on that subject, let him read history. Today the politician cannot escape the troublesome query, "Is it right?" although he too frequently is successful in clouding the issue, and sometimes in openly defying the demands of conscience because of a lack of sufficient organization and cohesion among moral forces. The brilliant senator who made the remark, "The Decalogue has no place in politics," and who was merely an unusually frank survival of an ancient order of things, found not only that the Decalogue had secured a place in politics, but that it had better staying qualities in that arena than he. The organization of the Hague Tribunal marks a new era in the history of international politics because it signalizes the entrance of moral ideals and standards into a sphere of human relations in which it seemed through the long, dreary, bloody ages that they could never gain a footing. It marks the beginning of the end of an exclusive group morality and the beginning of the establishment of standards of righteousness that are absolutely universal in the domain of politics.

And what is true in regard to politics is also true in every other department of life. Business methods and policies are

likewise being subjected to a rigorous moral criticism. The question, "Does it pay?" is balanced by the question, "Is it right?" In fact, the whole system of economics which for so long was accepted as unquestionable is now undergoing an examination as to its ethical soundness, and everywhere higher moral standards are fighting their way to control. In this connection, I think, we come upon a very interesting paradox. There is current today a distinctively ethical type of pessimism, i. e., a pessimism that grows directly out of moral progress. There have been within a lifetime great strides toward measuring all life by high ethical standards, and some men become gloomy when they contemplate the apparently growing gap between facts and ideals. Whereas, the real difference between the present and the past is that we are now measuring more of life by ethical standards and by higher standards than men of the past did. This kind of pessimism is but the shadow cast by crude facts in the light of resplendent ideals as they illuminate larger and larger areas of life.

Second, this leads me to notice another demand made upon religion by the practical needs of life, viz.: that it shall give repose to the soul. We may derive a sort of comfort from witnessing a form of pessimism that arises from the very rapidity of moral progress. But religion ought to be a refuge from pessimism, from gloom, from fear and anxiety. The theory that the sense of dependence is the root of religion, while inadequate, has a very considerable measure of truth. Although man is conscious that the world around him is, to a limited degree, responsive to his efforts, and can be moulded in part by the energy of his will, he never rids himself of the keen consciousness that he is surrounded and acted upon by forces over which he has but little, if any, immediate control. The most obvious of these are the mighty elements and processes of nature—cold and heat, storm and calm, drought and flood, the treacherous wave and the trembling earth, "the pestilence that walketh in darkness and the destruction that wasteth at noon-day." But as our human relations multiply and become more complex and far-reaching, as social life becomes more highly organized and the interdependence of men more extensive, and the subtle

social reactions become more difficult to trace, we find ourselves in this realm in the presence of forces that affect our welfare as profoundly and that as far transcend our power of individual control as the drought or the tornado or the earthquake. A war in a distant part of the earth may mean economic weal or woe to a merchant or a workman in Louisville. Not long since the collapse of a bank in New York which had been dishonestly administered sent a shock through the financial world which meant disaster to many men who lived in remote sections of the country. A business policy determined upon by a little group of men gathered in a star-chamber meeting in an Eastern city means plenty or want in some humble home on the Pacific coast. This determines, perhaps, whether some youth shall be educated or not, and upon this determination depends the the direction and significance of life to him; and who shall trace the far off consequences in other lives and other times? It takes but a slight acquaintance with the conditions under which we live in these modern days to give one an overwhelming sense of his individual littleness and helplessness in the presence of these mighty forces that play throughout the social universe.

Besides the uncertainties of life that grow out of the incalculable play of these forces of the natural and social worlds, which transcend individual control, there confronts every man the dread uncertainty of death, whose coming he can neither calculate nor avoid, and which will usher him into a realm whose darkness and silence are to him impenetrable and unbroken. He cannot foresee the hour when he or those whom he loves will sink into that darkness, but knows that the hour approaches with every beat of his heart.

Is it any wonder that under these conditions fear and anxiety eat out the hearts of men? Always man has needed some sovereign antidote for fruitless care, and the more extensive organization and the higher complexity of life are continually emphasizing this need. Anxiety is a fire that does not refine the gold, but burns up the dross and the gold together. It exhausts vitality; it dries up the fountains of life. Some fortification must be found against this, the most deadly enemy, next to sin, of the soul's welfare. And surely there is no forti-

fication against it like faith in the sovereign power and loving care of God. It is interesting in these days, when the psychological significance and the therapeutic value of good cheer, of optimism, of serene and happy states of mind are so much emphasized, to turn again to read the words of Jesus upon this theme and be reminded how very modern he is, notwithstanding the archaic forms of his ministry and message. When one has measured in a scientific way the immense importance of states of mind in the development and economy of vital energy, he will not consider it extravagant to say that if the teaching of Jesus in this one particular were literally and generally practiced the result would be to conserve for useful purposes more than one-third of the total energy of humanity, which now goes to waste in worse than fruitless anxiety. "Consider the lilies of the field how they grow, they toil not neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. If God so clothed the grass of the field which today is and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, oh, ye of little faith?" "Which of you by anxious thought can add one cubit to his stature?" "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in me." Verily in these words, the purest poetry, the purest science and the purest theology are combined; but their noblest quality is their simple, practical usefulness, constituting as they do the very answer of divine wisdom to one of the deepest and most abiding needs of human life.

Third, it will be observed that this need of support to the mind in the midst of the anxiety-breeding conditions of life is given in a way to augment rather than to diminish the energy of the will. There are religions that give repose by freezing the soul into a stoicism that contemplates with equal indifference all possible experiences. But a repose that is purchased by yielding one's self with indifference to the decisions of fate, by eliminating contingency, choice, freedom, responsibility, is the repose of death and not of life. The oak that lies prostrate on the earth is at rest, but it is a different kind of rest from that of the monarch of the forest whose widely ramifying roots grip the earth with a firmness that enables it to stand reposeful amidst the howling winds.

There have been two notable instances in history of amazing outbursts of national or racial energy conditioned or developed by a fatalistic religion. One was the overrunning of the Eastern world by the followers of Mohammed; the other was the overthrow of the Russian power by Japan in Manchuria. Without going into an analysis of the causes of these extraordinary phenomena, let us observe, first, that in both instances it was energy which moved and swayed men in the mass, but did not individualize them; second, that in each case it was a belligerent and destructive rather than a peaceful and creative energy; third, that in the case of Mohammedism the spurt or spasm which aroused a passive people from age-long lethargy spent itself like the fury of the tempest and the people sank again into a stolidity and immobility out of which their religion seems to have no power to revive them; fourth, that while religious fatalism gave the Japanese their remarkable carelessness of death, which in part accounted for their striking victories, their stoic courage would have proved futile had it not been reinforced by the use of methods and instrumentalities which their own civilization had not developed, and had they not previously been awakened into creative activity by the touch of influences that came from afar; fifth, that many thoughtful and sympathetic observers, as well as some of Japan's most acute thinkers, perceive that the career of new, peaceful, creative activity upon which Japan has so auspiciously and proudly entered can not be maintained upon the old ethical basis on which her former civilization had rested, but for its successful continuance demands a change in her religious ideas.

It is one of the glories of Christianity that it does not give to the soul the serenity that checks the wasteful leakage of vital energy by sinking the individual into a conscious insignificance which renders interest in one's personal welfare illogical and foolish, nor by smothering the emotional and voluntary nature under an exhausted air-pump of fatalism; but that it stimulates emotional interest in life and liberates the potential energy of the will, while it assuages the vain tumults of the heart, smoothes the wrinkles of care from the brow and replaces the painful tension of fear in the countenance with the restfulness

of a divine peace. It is not an accident that those people which have led the great advance in the useful arts, in free and effective government, in scientific mastery of the forces of nature, in economic efficiency; which have traveled furthest upward from the stolidity and cruelty of the brute world toward the intelligence and kindness of the world that is divine; which have spread their civilization, their ideals and their dominion most widely over the earth, not through the dead weight of superior numbers but by the might of a superior energy; which today are everywhere looked to by backward peoples as their teachers and guides, and which hold in their hands the destinies of mankind—it is not, I say, an accident that these peoples are the adherents and propagandists of the religion of Jesus. It was the gift of life, of vitality, of energy, which the author of that religion declared that he came to bestow upon men. "I am come that they might have life and might have it abundantly." The fact that the energetic and dominant peoples have been adherents of the Christian faith since that faith was established in the world is too great and striking a phenomenon to be dismissed as accidental or insignificant. It is true that some peoples have declined in vigor and efficiency while still adhering to Christianity, but in every such case they have at the same time and in about the same degree apostatized from the simple and genuine religion of Jesus, and incorporated non-Christian elements into their religion. The facts show beyond question that by some principle Christianity and practical efficiency are vitally related to each other. It would be too much to claim that Christianity is the sole cause of the superior vitality of the more powerful nations and races, but unquestionably Christianity has been propagated most readily among and gained the most permanent hold upon the most vigorous peoples, because it finds in them the most suitable soil for its growth. It is also unquestionable that it conserves and develops whatever capacity for creative achievement may be latent in a people.

Fourth, this leads us to the consideration of another demand made by concrete life upon religion, i. e., that it shall afford a sufficient religious basis for an adequate social ethic; that its doctrine of God shall involve an ethical principle which can guide social adjustments in a progressive society.

One sees in the social world a state of things very similar to that noted in the sphere of philosophy—uncertainty, unsettlement, confusion, a babel of voices. Just as authority of every kind has been discounted in the realm of speculative thought where universal reorganization seems to be the order of the day, so in society the institutions of authority are either discredited or subjected to radical criticism, being called upon to give an account of themselves and justify their existence and methods in the court of public opinion. Are these institutions promoting the true ends they were created to subserve? The fact that they are here and that they claim the allegiance of men is not accepted as sufficient answer to this question. Our churches, our civil and political institutions, our economic methods, all the separate parts of our social organization—shall we throw them all, or some of them, overboard? Shall we reconstruct them all and readjust them to the conditions of modern life? Legislatures are no longer looked to as fountains of wisdom. Courts can claim but little reverence, no matter how long the gowns of the judges nor how immaculate their ermine. The clergyman no longer overawes men by looking down upon them from a lofty pulpit, nor by buttoning his coat up to his chin. The cry everywhere is that men are not rightly adjusted to one another in and through these institutions. Amidst all the clamor and scramble after personal interests, while those time-honored institutions which of old have been the symbols and instrumentalities of social order are being shorn of their traditional authority, a discerning ear can hear rising higher and higher a mighty demand for a stricter and a wider justice, a fairer adjustment of man to man in all the interests and activities of life—a demand which seems to be the expression of a determination that this end shall be realized if necessary at the cost of a complete reconstruction of the social fabric. All of this is only the application of the test of Pragmatism to these institutions.

We observe other phenomena, also, similar to those noted in the domain of speculative thought. There are stolid reactionaries who seem convinced that the only remedy for agitation is petrification; there are frenzied radicals who fancy that the

only agencies capable of effecting necessary changes are the torch and the bomb; and there are others who believe that the method of true progress is conservative change and are striving to maintain a level head in the midst of the hubbub. Now the encouraging aspect of this situation is that while the general agitation is largely due to the efforts of special interests to exploit society, it has developed to an unprecedented degree the consciousness of the solidarity of society and awakened the consciences of men to a sense of social wrong as they have never been perhaps in the history of the world. The result has been to stimulate men to an examination of the ethical principles that underlie our social order, and to undertake a reorganization of society on the basis of the soundest and most rational social principles that can be discovered. He is a blind man who cannot see the opportunity which this situation opens to Christianity. Is Christianity ready for it? Has our religion a social gospel? Is there a social ethic rooted in its cardinal doctrines which is so vital, so related to the fundamental facts of human nature, so universally adaptable that its thoroughgoing application would bring in the reign of social justice and the progressive realization of all the true ends of human association? A volume would be required to give an adequate and detailed answer to this question. I dwell upon it here only because I believe it to be the supreme practical test which our religion must undergo. I do not hesitate to say, speaking from the point of view of the Pragmatist, that by its answer to this question Christianity will stand or fall in this age; and I do not at all fear the test. It is this social ethic of Christianity, which is rooted in its very heart, that has received less emphasis through all the Christian ages than any other element of our gospel. From the bottom of my heart I am thankful that the insistent and alarming exigencies of modern life are compelling attention to it.

How has Christianity stood similar tests in the past? For we must remember that while this is by far the most acute crisis of this kind which our faith has met, it is not at all the first social test to which it has been subjected. It was not long before primitive Christianity compromised with the heathenism

around it, but at least three great social achievements must be laid to the credit of that alloy of Christianity and heathenism which for so long was the dominant religion of Christendom. It arrested the decay of the ancient civilization and prolonged for centuries the life of the social fabric of the Roman Empire. When at last the disintegration of that social order was complete this impure type of Christianity gave integration and unity to a world which otherwise would have sunk into almost absolute chaos. It fertilized the germs of the social order that succeeded the old, and has presided over the development of Western civilization until comparatively recent times; and now Christianity, partly as a result of the social development fostered by itself and partly as the result of the fermentation of its inherent spiritual forces, is ridding itself of those alien and heathen elements which had been mixed with it, and in its purity, simplicity and vitality is making ready to wrestle with the greatest social task it has ever confronted. Who will doubt its success?

In order to see this most interesting situation in proper perspective, let us briefly contemplate the relation of Christianity to social development from a point that gives a wider outlook. What in general has been the function of Christianity in social progress? There have been two great foci of social progress. At first society was organized around the tribal group as the unit of value. The individual was secondary, the group was primary. The conditions of life were such that to maintain the life of the group was the supreme need. This, of necessity, made the life of the group and its interests the focal point in the consciousness of men. All life was organized and conducted on that principle. Religion was of the tribal or national or group type. It was so because religion is a practical thing, and is intended to meet the actual primary needs of life. But through the inevitable expansion, collision and amalgamation of these groups there comes a time when the narrow group organization of life gives way and with it the group consciousness, and by consequence the group religion; then there must be found another focus of social life, another unit of supreme value; the emphasis must be transferred from the group to the

individual. The unit of value is no longer a certain group life, but it is the life of a man. Around this new principle all life must be reorganized and this new organization of life must have a religious basis and an authoritative ethical principle. Now Christianity came into the world when the foremost peoples of the world reached this transition point. It furnished the ethical basis of this new organization of man's thought concerning himself. Could the world have made this transit from one standard of supreme value to another, from one focus to the other of social organization without Christianity? I maintain that it could not. Christianity has met every people in history which has made this transition at that point in its development and enabled it to take that most significant step in progress. Where Christianity has not gone social development has been arrested at that point. On this premise may be based a strong sociological argument for the extension of Christian missions in the Orient, whose people are now facing the necessity of making this transition. It would lead me too far afield to discuss the sublime failures made in that Oriental world to establish a universal religion; but it is a notable feature of those abortive efforts that while the social group was given up as the unit of value, the individual was not substituted for it. The result was that they were unable to guide society in a further stage of social progress, and hence the stationary character of those civilizations whose people nevertheless exhibit excellent native intelligence and capacity.

Now notice three great principles of the social ethic of Christianity: First, the immeasurable value that is placed on the individual; second, that the individual can realize himself only in and through the life of the group of which he is a conscious member; third, that the most important group of which every man should feel himself to be a member is humanity. When the present social struggles and problems are studied in the light of these three great principles, it is apparent that Christianity contains the answer to our fundamental social question. We must have a social organization which magnifies the value of the individual; but that individual must be socialized, must realize the identity of his interests with the interests of all; and

narrow group loyalties must be subordinated to the wider loyalty to humanity, as the group of which each is a conscious unit broadens into the great organism of mankind. The struggle for such a social organization is the secret of the history of our time. Christianity contains no detailed model of the social fabric; it gives no plans and specifications of the great structure we are erecting; but it does what is far more fundamental and potent, it sets forth the great principles which must be embodied in that structure and enforces them by the highest sanctions which the soul recognizes. It urges these principles as springing directly out of the character and will of God as manifested in his relations to men. Accordingly the embodiment of them in the organization of society is the continuation and fulfillment of the cosmic process, so far as that process comes within the purview of man. It is manifest, therefore, that so long as society is struggling toward the complete organic expression of these ideas the preaching of the gospel of Christ will be a practical necessity. The fact that men are arriving at the scientific demonstration of the truth of these principles does not render obsolete or useless the religious doctrines with which they are vitally related. If it were possible (which it is not) to substitute for the sanctions of religion the sanctions of science, the latter would turn out to be but a rendering in different terms of the realities expressed in the former. It would be only a scientific statement of religion. Yes, until this social idea shall have been completely realized the preaching of the gospel of Christ is an indispensable condition of progress. Only thus can a social apostacy—a sinking back to lower levels—be prevented; only thus can the individuals composing society be restrained from following selfish and disintegrating courses of action and their consciences be kept tense in the struggle toward a social state in which righteousness and peace shall kiss each other, which shall be irradiated with the light of a justice that is one with love.

But I must hasten toward a conclusion. From whatever point of view the subject is examined, Christianity stands the test of Pragmatism. As a theory of the world and as a practical, scientific method of discriminating between truth and

error, this new philosophic movement which expresses the significance and trend of modern scientific thought has in it no menace for our faith. The deepest and most powerful intellectual current of our age is in the main running parallel with the current of our faith. I consider it a matter of especially great importance that the ministry of our times should realize this fact. We have no right to suffer the impression to prevail, either vaguely or definitely, that the all-embracing and irresistible scientific movement of the age is inconsistent with the triumph of our faith. Is there not abroad among preachers as well as others a certain more or less vague uneasiness which springs from an apprehension that the universal prevalence of science will sap the foundations of faith? Reactionary theologians and unbelieving scientists are both responsible for any such impression as may exist. A really powerful ministry, a ministry adequate to the needs of the era into which we are entering, is not possible unless this unnatural tension between science and faith is removed. Christian workers cannot go out to do well their great task in the individual salvation and social progress of mankind with a false and debilitating apprehension that if men knew more they would believe less. Our ministry must go out with all the energy and aggressiveness that come from the consciousness that science and faith are different but correlative aspects of the same great realities; that the enlightened intellect does not veto the instincts of the faithful heart. I believe that the last generation witnessed a most serious breach of the unity of consciousness in this matter. Many men were embarrassed; there was much hesitation in some quarters and much heated recrimination in others, while among the masses of men there was a wide-spread paralysis of faith. It ought to be the achievement of this generation to restore the unity of consciousness to Christendom—to reconcile the head and heart—for only thus can the vast and difficult tasks which are common to Christianity and science be accomplished. We shall come to see in this generation that Christianity is scientific and that science is Christian; that, as was so eloquently declared from this platform not long since, "this is an evangelical universe," and we shall find that at the same time it is a scientific

universe. Many theologians have been comforting the distressed by assurances that there can be no real conflict between what God has revealed through inspired men and the processes and constitution of his world, which it is the business of science to discover. But too largely this comfort has been based upon a mere hope that somehow harmony would yet be found. Is not the hour close at hand when this harmony should become a demonstrated fact by the actual correlation of the results of science with the postulates of faith? It is my opinion that the alienation, which was based upon the fact that neither quite understood the other, not only ought to cease but ought to be replaced with a consciousness of their essential unity. There certainly must come a time when science will be included as a part of the Christian cult, one of the great departments of Christian duty, partaking of the nature both of worship and work, wherein we at once adore the Creator and execute His purposes. Christianity is a revelation, i. e., an unveiling. Science is a discovery, i. e., an uncovering. The relation of the two is manifest; they supplement each other. In the one God takes the initiative, and man co-operates; in the other man takes the initiative, and God co-operates. Together they constitute the great process by which the secrets of the universe are disclosed to men, by which men come to the proper knowledge of, and adjustment to, all reality, especially knowledge of and adjustment to the will of God, which is the reality of transcendent importance expressed both in revelation and in nature.

Standing in the vale of Chamouni a little above the village and looking up toward the Mer de Glace, you will on some days see all the higher altitudes shrouded in mist. By and by, if you wait long enough, you will see the mists part and lift, disclosing to your view a scene which lingers in my mind as the most sublime which has ever expanded and exalted my soul. The Aiguille du Dru and the Aiguille Verte, whose sharp peaks rise 9,000 feet above you, together form the double-pointed spire of a cathedral whose proportions and splendor dwarf into utter insignificance all the architectural creations of human genius. I shall never forget how, as I climbed alone the side of Montanvert, I stopped more than once as there burst upon

me from some new point of view the vision of those marvelous peaks piercing the intense and silent blue, and exclaimed audibly: "I know now for the first time the meaning of the words 'the Glory of Almighty God.'" I was transported with holy emotion; I knew and realized that this earth is God's temple and felt that the only adequate worship of him was the life of humanity redeemed and sanctified in all its activities. And surely these apocalyptic visions are our sanest experiences and give us our surest glimpses of the real meaning of this universe and of our life in it. Such a vision assures us that our religion is growing, not decaying; expanding to include scientific activity, not contracting and fading before the advance of modern knowledge; is standing upon the threshold of an era of vigor and conquering might such as it has not entered upon since the apostles were sent forth in the power of the Holy Ghost. Let us, the members of this Institution, felicitate ourselves that we have been called to be ministers of this faith.