



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

1405  
A3

B478345d

**OFFICIAL REPORT**  
 OF THE  
**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EIGHTEENTH MEETING**  
 OF  
**The National Conference**  
 OF  
**Unitarian and Other Christian Churches**  
 HELD AT  
**WASHINGTON, D.C., OCT. 16-19, 1899.**

**CONTENTS:**

Organization	5, 6
Address of the Council	7-10
Report of Proceedings	11-30
Reports	33-49
Essays and Discussions	55-177
Addresses	182-233
Sermon	236-241
The Women's Alliance	241-250
Unitarian Church Temperance Society	251-263
List of Delegates	264-270
Constitution and By-laws	271-275

**BOSTON**  
 GEORGE H. KELLS, PRINTER, 272 CONGRESS STREET  
 1899



OFFICIAL REPORT  
OF THE  
PROCEEDINGS OF THE EIGHTEENTH MEETING  
OF  
The National Conference  
OF  
Unitarian and Other Christian Churches  
HELD AT  
WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 16-19, 1899  
WITH  
THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE CONFERENCE, AND A  
LIST OF THE DELEGATES

---

B O S T O N  
GEO. H. ELLIS, PRINTER, 272 CONGRESS STREET  
1899



# INDEX.

	PAGE
ADDRESS OF THE COUNCIL . . . . .	7
REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS . . . . .	11
President's Address, Hon. George F. Hoar . . . . .	11
The Laity. James M. Drake . . . . .	17
REPORTS:	
Council. Rev. E. E. Hale, D.D. . . . .	33
Address of Rev. Samuel A. Eliot . . . . .	45
ESSAYS AND DISCUSSIONS:	
Is God yet Personal and Immediate? Rev. T. R. Slicer . . . . .	53
Recent Tendencies toward Anthropomorphism in Religious Thought. Prof. Charles N. Tyler . . . . .	68
The Higher Nature of Man, historically considered. Rev. Samuel R. Calthrop . . . . .	85
In the Light of Idealism. Rev. C. F. Dole . . . . .	101
How we understand the Bible, and use it in our Work. Rev. Joseph May . . . . .	114
Our Relation to Jesus. Rev. William H. Pulsford . . . . .	124
How our Doctrine of Immortality helps to promote the Higher Life of Man. Rev. Charles E. St. John . . . . .	130
Discussion of the Three Foregoing Papers. Rev. James Eells, . . . . .	143
The Orthodox Idea of Jesus. Hon. George F. Hoar . . . . .	147
Religion and Education. Rev. Theodore C. Williams . . . . .	149
Religion and Citizenship. Adelbert Moot . . . . .	156
Religion and Sociology. Hon. Carroll D. Wright . . . . .	171
ADDRESSES:	
Religious Conditions at the South. Booker T. Washington . . . . .	181
The Relation of the Child to the Sunday-school. Isabel Francis Bellows . . . . .	188
The Child's Right to Religious Instruction. Rev. T. R. Slicer . . . . .	196

	PAGE
The Appeal of the Unitarian Church to the National Life of the Twentieth Century. Hon. George E. Adams . . .	199
The Appeal for Religious Reconstruction. Rev. Paul R. Frothingham . . . . .	205
The Appeal to Christian Sentiment. Rev. Adelbert L. Hudson . . . . .	211
The Appeal to Conscience. Rev. W. W. Fenn . . . . .	215
The American Unitarian Association. Hon. Carroll D. Wright . . . . .	220
The Message of our Church to our own People. Rev. Sam- uel A. Eliot . . . . .	225
Our Message to Other Churches. Rev. Howard N. Brown .	231
SERMON: Repentance from Dead Works. Rev. Samuel M. Crothers . . . . .	236
THE WOMEN'S ALLIANCE . . . . .	243
Biennial Report of the Directors. Emily A. Fifield . . . .	245
UNITARIAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY . . . . .	251
The Temperance Movement Abroad. Dr. Charles H. Shep- ard . . . . .	252
Abstract of Address by Rev. William G. Eliot, Jr. . . . .	257
Temperance Work in Illinois. Rev. Jasper L. Douthit . .	258
LIST OF DELEGATES . . . . .	264
CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS . . . . .	271
Rules of the Committee on Fellowship . . . . .	274

# THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

---

ORGANIZATION FOR 1899-1901.

## President.

HON. GEORGE F. HOAR, Worcester, Mass.

## Vice-Presidents.

Hon. CARROLL D. WRIGHT, LL.D.	Washington, D.C.
Hon. ROGER WOLCOTT	Boston, Mass.
Hon. DORMAN B. EATON, LL.D.	New York, N.Y.
Hon. GEORGE E. ADAMS	Chicago, Ill.
Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS	San Francisco, Cal.
Hon. THOMAS J. MORRIS	Baltimore, M.D.

## General Secretary.

Rev. D. W. MOREHOUSE, 104 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y.

## Treasurer.

WILLIAM HOWELL REED, Esq., 35 Broad Street, Boston, Mass.

## Council.

Rev. HOWARD N. BROWN, <i>Chairman</i>	Boston, Mass.
Rev. EDWARD E. HALE, D.D.	Boston, Mass.
Rev. WILLIAM H. LYON, D.D.	Brookline, Mass.
Hon. FRANCIS C. LOWELL	Boston, Mass.
Mrs. ROBERT H. DAVIS	New York, N.Y.
Mrs. PAUL R. FROTHINGHAM	New Bedford, Mass.
Rev. THOMAS R. SLICER	New York, N.Y.
Rev. WILLIAM W. FENN	Chicago, Ill.
Mr. FRANK N. HARTWELL	Louisville, Ky.
Mr. CHARLES A. MURDOCK	San Francisco, Cal.
Rev. D. W. MOREHOUSE, <i>Secretary</i>	New York, N.Y.
WILLIAM HOWELL REED, <i>Treasurer</i>	Boston, Mass.



*Committee on Fellowship.**New England States.*

Rev. WILLIAM L. CHAFFIN . . . . .	North Easton, Mass.
Rev. AUSTIN S. GARVER . . . . .	Worcester, Mass.
Rev. EDWARD A. HORTON . . . . .	Boston, Mass.

*Middle States.*

Rev. D. W. MOREHOUSE . . . . .	New York, N.Y.
Rev. CHARLES E. ST. JOHN . . . . .	Pittsburg, Pa.
Rev. JAMES T. BIXBY, Ph.D. . . . .	Yonkers, N.Y.

*Western States.*

Rev. WILLIAM W. FENN . . . . .	Chicago, Ill.
Rev. MARY A. SAFFORD . . . . .	Des Moines, Ia.
Rev. F. C. SOUTHWORTH . . . . .	Chicago, Ill.

*Southern States.*

Rev. GEORGE A. THAYER . . . . .	Cincinnati, Ohio.
Rev. HENRY A. WHITMAN . . . . .	Charleston, S.C.
Rev. A. W. LITTLEFIELD . . . . .	Louisville, Ky.

*Pacific States.*

Rev. THOMAS L. ELIOT, D.D. . . . .	Portland, Ore.
Rev. HORATIO STEBBINS, D.D. . . . .	San Francisco, Cal.
Rev. GEORGE R. DODSON . . . . .	Alameda, Cal.

# The National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches.

---

## ADDRESS OF THE COUNCIL.

*To the Unitarian Churches of America, Greeting:*

In accordance with the by-laws of our National Conference, the Council elected at the session held in Washington, October 16-19, issues the following address, requesting that it may be publicly read in all our churches.

This eighteenth meeting of the Conference was one in which we have every reason to feel satisfaction and pride. There is, of course, no accurate method of comparison with other meetings that have gone before, though some have been saying, as always, that this last was best of all. It is enough to say that the addresses given rose to a high standard of excellence, and that the reputation of the Conference for providing an intellectual feast of the highest order was well maintained.

Furthermore, so far as this Conference sufficed to register the spiritual health and growth of our religious communion, there can be but one opinion of the record it has made. Never before has the note of definite and positive conviction been heard in all utterances at one of our Conferences with equal clearness and strength. Never has it been so sure that Unitarians have a real gospel to preach, which they are able to proclaim with evangelical fervor and zeal. So strongly marked was this feature of the Conference that some observers, not entirely of our way of thinking, suspected a special effort to produce this effect on the part of the Council which planned it. No such special effort had been made; and this positive tone undoubtedly means that the reconstruction of Christian faith now being urged in so many quarters is, with us, a work considerably advanced.

It is also to be noted that discussions among us as to the meaning and worth of the name "Christian" are now prac-

tically ended, and that out of these discussions has arisen a new Christian consciousness,—a sense of continuing the very work which Jesus began, which might not have been arrived at by any other than the road of controversy. The Christianity of Unitarianism is abundantly assured, not merely as a sentiment and tradition received from the past, but as an intelligent faith based upon knowledge of laws in the historic process of man's spiritual evolution.

All this seems to the Council to be just occasion for congratulation and hope, because it gives promise of a coming period of strong advance. Those who criticise our movement have too hastily assumed that we could live in the future only at some dying rate. Certainly, the voice of this Conference was one of sober yet confident and cheerful life. There was no boastfulness in speaking of work done or waiting to be done. There was, on the other hand, the clear perception of a place of dignity and power to be filled, and a strong determination to press forward, with God's help, toward larger usefulness.

With reference to the practical duties of the year before us, the Conference plainly selected these following lines of work for special effort and emphasis:—

Our Unitarian Association, the chief executive agent of our body, has weathered the storm of hard times. It now faces the future with no hampering debt, and no deficit to make good. Every dollar put into its treasury is to be devoted to present forward work, and the extent of this work will be limited only by the amount of financial strength placed at its command. The first and foremost duty of the year is to increase substantially the contributions from the churches to the Association, that its means of doing good may rise somewhere near the level of the opportunities opened before it. Next year the Association will celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of its foundation, and it would be most appropriate to signalize that occasion by the gift of seventy-five thousand dollars.

One of the most effective agencies for missionary work is to be found in our periodical literature. The *New World* has won for itself a high position, and its friends hope to secure for it a fund sufficient to assure its continued life. The *Christian Register* greatly needs the loyal interest of all its friends. Not long since a very generous sum was placed in the hands of a board of trustees to meet an annual deficit; but its subscription price was then reduced, that it might be easier to increase the number of its readers, thus for the time being greatly increasing the deficit. In order to bring

it back to a basis of self-support before this fund is exhausted, the steady support of its old body of subscribers, and their co-operation in plans to secure for the paper a wider reading, are urgently pressed upon our people as one of the important duties of the immediate future.

The address given at the Conference by Rev. Theodore C. Williams, on Religion and Education, in the course of which he unfolded some of his aims and hopes for the new school under his charge at Tarrytown, N.Y., produced a distinct wave of enthusiastic interest on behalf of that enterprise. The generosity of Mrs. Hackley in founding the school received the thanks of the Conference, and will doubtless attract similar benefactions from others. It may interest Unitarians to know that among its first pupils are boys whose pastors are men possessing national fame in the pulpits of other denominations. Parents who propose to send their sons away from home to a preparatory school should inform themselves of the advantages which this school has to offer.

For many years we have had an apostle of our faith in Southern Illinois, whose influence on behalf of every work of reform has been felt through a wide section of that country. Of late Mr. Douthit has added to other multifarious activities the care of a great summer gathering, which does more to shed light in dark places than most meetings of a similar nature. But the financial burden of providing a place for this meeting and carrying it on year after year has become greater than he can bear. To ensure the continuance of the work, Mr. Douthit offers to transfer to the Unitarian Association for \$8,000 the entire property (for a portion of which he was recently offered \$10,000), to be held in trust for the purposes of the Assembly. The Conference voted to raise \$8,000, and a committee, with Mr. George E. Adams, of Chicago, at its head, was appointed to solicit subscriptions to this fund, of which a good foundation was laid during the meeting of the Conference. The Council heartily commends this to the churches as a cause worthy of support.

Other matters of importance were dealt with in resolutions passed by the Conference, but those above mentioned more particularly call for the active help and co-operation of the churches.

All our means and instrumentalities for common work are equipped for service as never before. Our Unitarian Association, the Women's Alliance, the Sunday School Society, the Young People's Religious Union, each and all have a

power of usefulness gained through past experience which is larger at the present moment than at any previous time. It only remains that all our people in their individual places shall believe in the cause for which, as a religious body, we stand, shall perform faithfully the duties that belong to them, and support loyally the undertakings which are designed to strengthen our churches and our fellowship. The result must be a steady growth, both in spiritual power and in practical beneficence.

GEORGE F. HOAR, *President of the Conference.*

HOWARD N. BROWN, *Chairman of the Council.*

EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

W. W. FENN.

W. H. LYON.

THOMAS R. SLICER.

(MRS.) ROBERT H. DAVIS.

(MRS.) PAUL R. FROTHINGHAM.

FRANK N. HARTWELL.

FRANCIS C. LOWELL.

CHARLES A. MURDOCK.

D. W. MOREHOUSE, *Secretary.*

WILLIAM HOWELL REED, *Treasurer.*

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
EIGHTEENTH REGULAR MEETING OF THE NATIONAL  
CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER  
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

---

BUSINESS RECORD.

The eighteenth meeting of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches was held in Washington, D.C., Oct. 16 to 19, 1899.

The subject for the opening evening was "The Nature and Character of God." The meeting was held in the First Congregational Church. Addresses were given by Rev. Thomas R. Slicer of New York on the subject "Is God yet Personal and Immediate?" and by Prof. Charles M. Tyler of Ithaca, N.Y., on "Recent Tendencies toward Anthropomorphism in Religious Thought."

TUESDAY MORNING.

On Tuesday morning communion service was held in All Souls' Church, conducted by Rev. Charles G. Ames, D.D.

At 10 A.M. the Conference was called to order by the president, Hon. George F. Hoar.

Mr. Hoar welcomed the Conference.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

BY HON. GEORGE F. HOAR.

The part assigned to me, in the printed plan of our proceedings, is the delightful duty of bidding you welcome. But you find a welcome from each other in the glance of the

eye, in the pressure of the hand, in the glad tone of the voice, better than any that can be put into formal words.

From hand to hand the greeting goes;  
 From eye to eye the signals run;  
 From heart to heart the bright hope glows:  
 The seekers of the light are one.

Every Unitarian, man and woman, every lover of God or his Son, every one who in loving his fellow-men loves God and his Son, even without knowing it, is welcome in this company.

We are sometimes told, as if it were a reproach, that we cannot define Unitarianism. For myself, I thank God that it is not to be defined. To define is to bound, to enclose, to set limit. The great things of the universe are not to be defined. You cannot define a human soul. You cannot define the intellect. You cannot define immortality or eternity. You cannot define God.

I think, also, that the things we are to be glad of and to be proud of and are to be thankful for are not those things that separate us from the great body of Christians or the great body of believers in God and in righteousness, but in the things that unite us with them. No Five Points, no Athanasian Creed, no Thirty-nine Articles, separate the men and women of our way of thinking from humanity or from divinity.

But still, although we do not define Unitarianism, we know our own when we see them. There are men and women who like to be called by our name. There are men and women for whom faith, hope, and charity forever abide; to whom Judea's news are still glad tidings; who believe that one day Jesus Christ came to this earth, bearing a divine message and giving a divine example. There are women who bear their own sorrows of life by soothing the sorrows of others; youths who, when Duty whispers low, "Thou must," reply, "I can"; and old age to whom the experience of life has taught the same brave lesson; examples of the patriotism that will give its life for its country when in the right, and the patriotism that will make itself of no reputation, if need be, to save its country from being in the wrong.

They do not comprehend the metaphysics of a Trinal Unity, nor how it is just that innocence should be punished, that guilt may go free. They do not attribute any magic virtue to the laying on of hands; nor do they believe that the traces of an evil life in the soul can be washed out by

the sprinkling of a few drops of water, however pure, or by baptism in any blood, however innocent, in the hour of death. But they do understand the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule, and they know and they love and they practise the great virtues which the apostle tells us are to abide.

I think there can be found in this country no sectarianism so narrow, so hide-bound, so dogma-clad, that it would like to blot out from the history of the country what the men of our faith have contributed to it. On the first roll of this Washington parish will be found close together the names of John C. Calhoun and John Quincy Adams. John Quincy Adams had learned from his father and mother the liberal Christian faith he transmitted to his illustrious son. If we would blot out Unitarianism from the history of the country, we must erase the names of many famous statesmen, many famous philanthropists, many great reformers, many great orators, many famous soldiers, from its annals, and nearly all of our great poets from its literature.

I could exhaust not only the time I have a right to take, but I could fill the week if I were to recall their names and tell the story of their lives. Still less could I speak adequately of the men and women who, in almost every neighborhood throughout the country, have found in this Unitarian faith of ours a stimulant to brave and noble lives and a sufficient comfort and support in the hour of a brave death. As I stand here on this occasion, my heart is full of one memory,—of one who loved our Unitarian faith with the whole fervor of his soul, who in his glorious prime, possessing everything which could make life happy and precious, the love of wife and children and friends, the joy of professional success, the favor of his fellow-citizens, the fulness of health, the consciousness of high talent, heard the voice of the Lord speaking from the fever-haunted hospital and the tropical swamp, and the evening dews and damps, saying, "Where is the messenger that will take his life in his hand, that I may send him to carry health to my stricken soldiers and sailors?" When the Lord said, "Whom shall I send?" he answered, "Here am I: send me."

The difference between Christian sects, like the difference between individual Christians, is not so much in the matter of belief or disbelief of portions of the doctrine of the Scripture as in the matter of *emphasis*. It is a special quality and characteristic of Unitarianism that Unitarians everywhere lay special emphasis upon the virtue of Hope. It was said of Cromwell by his secretary that hope shone in him like a fiery pillar when it had gone out in every other.



There are two great texts in the Scripture in whose sublime phrases are contained the germs of all religion, whether natural or revealed. They lay hold on two eternities. One relates to Deity in his solitude,—“Before Abraham was, I am.” The other is for the future. It sums up the whole duty and the whole destiny of man: “And now abideth Faith, Hope, and Charity,—these three.” If Faith, Hope, and Charity abide, then Humanity abides. Faith is for beings without the certainty of omniscience. Hope is for beings without the strength of omnipotence. And Charity, as the apostle describes it, affects the relations of beings limited and imperfect to one another.

Why is it that this Christian virtue of Hope is placed as the central figure of the sublime group which is to accompany the children of God through their unending life? It is because without it Faith would be impossible and Charity would be wasted.

Hope is that attribute of the soul which believes in the final triumph of righteousness. It has no place in a theology which believes in the final perdition of the larger number of mankind. Mighty Jonathan Edwards,—the only genius since Dante akin to Dante,—could you not see that, if your world exist where there is no hope and where there is no love, there can be no faith? Who can trust the promise of a God who has created a universe and peopled it with fiends? The apostle of your doleful gospel must preach quite another evangel: And now abideth Hate, and now abideth Wrath, and now abideth Despair, and now abideth Woe unutterable. With Hope, as we have defined it,—namely, the confident expectation of the final triumph of righteousness,—we are but a little lower than the angels: without it we are but a kind of vermin.

The literature of free countries is full of cheer: the story ends happily. The fiction of despotic countries is hopeless. People of free countries will not tolerate a fiction which teaches that in the end evil is triumphant and virtue is wretched. Want of hope means either distrust of God or a belief in the essential baseness of man or both. It teaches men to be base. It makes a country base. A world wherein there is no hope is a world where there is no virtue. The contrast between the teacher of hope and the teacher of despair is to be found in the pessimism of Carlyle and the serene cheerfulness of Emerson. Granting to the genius of Carlyle everything that is claimed for it, I believe that his chief title hereafter to respect as a moral teacher will be found in Emerson's certificate.

But I must not detain you any longer from the business which waits for this convention. It is the last time that I shall enjoy the great privilege and honor of occupying this chair.

Perhaps I may be pardoned, as I have said something of the religious faith of my fellow Unitarians, if I declare my own, which I believe is theirs also. I have no faith in fatalism, in destiny, in blind force. I believe in God, the living God, in the American people, a free and brave people, who do not bow the neck or bend the knee to any other, and who desire no other to bow the neck or bend the knee to them. I believe that the God who created this world has ordained that his children may work out their own salvation and that his nations may work out their own salvation by obedience to his laws without any dictation or coercion from any other. I believe that liberty, good government, free institutions, cannot be given by any one people to any other, but must be wrought out for each by itself, slowly, painfully, in the process of years or centuries, as the oak adds ring to ring. I believe that a republic is greater than an empire. I believe that the moral law and the Golden Rule are for nations as well as for individuals. I believe in George Washington, not in Napoleon Bonaparte; in the Whigs of the Revolutionary day, not in the Tories; in Chatham, Burke, and Sam Adams, not in Dr. Johnson or Lord North. I believe that the north star, abiding in its place, is a greater influence in the universe than any comet or meteor. I believe that the United States when President McKinley was inaugurated was a greater world power than Rome in the height of her glory or even England with her 400,000,000 vassals. I believe, finally, whatever clouds may darken the horizon, that the world is growing better, that to-day is better than yesterday, and to-morrow will be better than to-day.

The Conference was then declared open for business.

On motion of Dr. Hale it was voted that all the officers of the Conference should be asked to take their seats and vote as regular members of the body.

On motion of Dr. Hale it was voted that the chair should appoint a Business Committee of ten, to which all resolutions and order of business should be referred.

The following *Business Committee* was appointed: Geo. A. King, Washington; James P. Hamilton, Worcester; Charles H. Stearns, Brookline; Mrs. Abby A. Peterson, Jamaica Plain; Courtenay Guild, Boston; Judge T. J. Morris, Baltimore; Henry J. Hosmer, Concord; Enoch Lewis, Philadel-

phia; Duncan Smith, New York; Gen. W. W. Blackmar, Boston.

On motion of Dr. Hale it was voted that the programme as prepared should be accepted and carried out, except as hereafter modified by the Business Committee.

On motion of Dr. Hale it was further voted that no member should speak beyond the time allotted him, except by general consent: that no extension of time should be granted, except with the consent of the Business Committee, and that that decision should not be debatable; that the ruling of the chair should not be debatable; that the Conference should be guided in other matters by Cushing's "Manual."

President HOAR.—The chair read Cushing's "Manual" in 1852, and will apply it so far as he remembers it.

On motion of Dr. Hale it was voted that a Committee on Credentials should be appointed by the chair. The following *Committee on Credentials* was appointed: Mr. Arthur Bradley, Rev. Charles B. Elder, Rev. W. C. Brown, Mr. Herbert C. Parsons, and Rev. David Utter.

On motion of Dr. Hale it was voted that the chair should appoint a Committee on Nominations. The following *Committee on Nominations* was appointed: Geo. H. Ellis, Boston; Rev. C. E. St. John, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rev. W. W. Fenn, Chicago; Henry F. Blount, Washington, D.C.; Mrs. E. A. Fifield, Dorchester.

On motion of Rev. D. W. Morehouse the following assistant secretaries were elected: Mrs. Isabel C. Barrows, Rev. James M. Whiton, Ph.D., Mr. William T. Salter, Rev. Walter Reed Hunt, Rev. William Channing Brown.

On motion it was voted to accept the report of the Council.

An address was given by Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, secretary of the American Unitarian Association.

The hour for discussion of the suggestions and recommendations of the preceding addresses having arrived, Mr. J. M. Drake made the following brief address:—

## THE LAITY.

BY MR. JAMES M. DRAKE.

I have been asked by the Council to say a word on behalf of the laity; and first let me call attention to the fact that on the general programme there are six laymen and eighteen clergymen, and the laymen, like the clergymen, are confined to specific subjects.

Among the officers of the Conference there are six laymen, but not one of the laymen appears as a speaker. Of the Council there are seven clergymen, two women, and three laymen, including the treasurer. Of the Committees on Fellowship for the different sections of the country, fourteen are clergymen, and one is a layman.

It was my privilege to be present at the First National Conference of the Unitarian body held at the Church of the Messiah in New York. It was a new epoch in the history of Unitarianism in this country; and the denomination owes an inextinguishable debt to the late Dr. Henry W. Bellows for having conceived the idea, and by his personal influence having brought about that convocation. I have been present at a number of the meetings of the Conference which have been held from that day to this; and, when I have not been present, I have been with them in spirit.

I am happy to say that, while the organization has passed through a number of crises which threatened its disruption, the broad and catholic spirit which pervades our body as a denomination has saved us from such a fate; and we are still, notwithstanding divergences of opinion, united in the bonds of peace.

It is no part of my desire to strike a note of discord in the spirit which animates this Conference, and yet you will see by my text that it may be a little difficult for me to avoid doing so. I have no complaint to make personally. I wish to speak for those younger than myself, who may be much better qualified than I am, and who may feel that they have a word to say, which may be profitable for the denomination in general and for the Conference in particular to hear.

As laymen, we are accustomed to receive from the clergy appeals for financial help; and it may be a question whether this appeal should come to us from that quarter. When, by a sudden impulse, public sentiment is aroused in behalf of some object of general interest, like that of the perpetuation of the Dewey Arch, for example, those most warmly inter-

ested assemble, form a committee of influential men, and give to the movement the weight of their personal character. Then, through the aid of representative men in every department in the world's activity, an appeal is made to the rank and file for aid. If the subject appeals to the patriotism, to the enthusiasm of the masses, for a noble deed or for a great cause with which they are in sympathy, there always comes a response which proves that there underlies the struggle for pecuniary success a spirit of generosity, an appreciation of the ideal, which crowns the undertaking with success. But the appeal must come through no formal channel. It must have an air of spontaneity, which is the outgrowth of a common sentiment.

The enlightened mind seeks an air of freedom as naturally as water seeks its level. It is the mission of our denomination to present to the world a system of religious opinion which is in harmony with this characteristic of the human mind, and which at the same time rests upon a foundation of solid truth. Our views appeal as strongly to the enthusiasm which is always waiting to be aroused as did the cry which went up in former years for the emancipation of the slave, or as ever went up for the oppressed peoples of monarchical Europe. There is money enough in abundance to be had for the asking, provided that special cord is touched which will serve to awaken the necessary degree of enthusiasm.

There can be no question that the clergy of our denomination are fully competent to do their part in bringing about this awakening. It seems to me, if they accomplish this purpose, the work of giving practical effect to the enthusiasm which may be aroused should be left in the hands of the laymen, men of affairs, accustomed to treating financial subjects and acquainted with the best methods of accomplishing the object they desire. One method of preparing the minds of the laity for this new duty would be, I think, giving them a better chance to be heard at our National Conferences.

Any one at all acquainted with the quality of mind that is attracted toward the Unitarian denomination will readily appreciate that there would be no lack of persons who could ably represent the laymen's views; and it would seem that this would be as interesting and useful to the clergy as their papers and discussions certainly are to us, the laity.

Dr. Hale asked leave to report for the committee of ten appointed in 1897 to see what changes, "if any, in our

organization or methods are needed to deepen and extend the good influence we are exerting." Rev. Eli Fay, D.D., was chairman of that committee; and the other members were G. H. Ellis, Dorman B. Eaton, C. E. St. John, Miss P. M. Waldo, J. T. Bixby, A. W. Gould, C. M. Stearns, W. L. Chaffin, and Charles E. Murdock.

Dr. Hale read the circular issued by this committee, which was printed in the *Christian Register* of Sept. 14, 1899, shortly after the death of Dr. Fay. Dr. Hale added a few remarks, suggesting that the local conferences should be more seriously conducted.

Mr. Hitch of Orange, N.J., thought that one help in methods would be to have Unitarian churches kept open in summer, especially in New York, where it is impossible during the summer to hear a Unitarian sermon.

Rev. Russell N. Bellows said that he wished to emphasize the suggestions that had been made with reference to raising money for the American Unitarian Association. He thought that, with proper methods, there would be no difficulty in getting a hundred thousand dollars instead of fifty thousand. To do that, the money should be raised by business men, and not left to clergymen. He approved of the subscription plan. He thought ten dollars could be raised in that way in the smallest church.

Mr. Slicer said that the ministers of New York would be glad to have union services, and keep one of the churches open in the city, if it were possible, though the regular attendants were not there. Though there are not five families who belong to his own church there during the summer, he believed the church ought to be kept open.

President Hoar said that he agreed with Mr. Bellows that more money might be raised if better business methods were adopted. He thought there were plenty of people in all the parishes who have not yet substituted for the question which presents itself to every Christian man and woman, How much is it possible for me to give? that other miserable question which people sometimes put to themselves, How little can I get off with?

Rev. Loren Macdonald of Concord, Mass., said that the method adopted in his society had secured very large subscriptions in proportion to the size of the parish. The money is raised by a large committee, having the parish districted for that purpose. He offered the following resolution:—

*Resolved*, That the secretary be instructed to request all of the Unitarian parishes in the country to appoint in each a special committee of

men and women whose duty it shall be to see that each parish makes a proper contribution to the American Unitarian Association, and further request them to communicate to him the names of the committee so appointed. If in any case that communication be not received, the application shall be renewed, so that the names shall be received by the secretary of the Association.

Voted under suspension of the rules.

A brief description of the plan for raising money in use in the First Parish, Dorchester, and in West Newton, was given. The returns for both parishes have showed large gains since this system was adopted. Details of the plan can be learned from Mr. R. C. Humphreys of Dorchester or Mr. George Hutchinson of West Newton.

On motion of Gen. W. W. Blackmar the following resolution was unanimously passed under suspension of the rules :

*Resolved*, That the National Conference hereby declares its confidence in the wisdom and integrity of the officers and directors of the American Unitarian Association.

The Conference recognizes the Association as its executive arm, and urges the heartiest support of all Unitarians to the endeavor of the Association to diffuse the principles of pure and undefiled religion, and to upbuild in America a fellowship of free churches wherein good works shall be set above orthodoxy of belief.

A resolution looking to closer co-operation with Universalists was offered by Rev. Augustus P. Reccord and seconded by Mr. Slicer. Under the rules it was referred to the Business Committee.

MR. GEORGE H. ELLIS.—We are sometimes in the habit of criticising our laymen as not taking enough interest in, and not giving more liberally to, our Unitarian cause. I have in my hand a resolution which recognizes the gift of a lady who has given more money in the past few years for Unitarian work than any other layman or laywoman, and yet so unostentatiously that her name is hardly known to many of us.

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Conference and through it of the Unitarian denomination are hereby tendered to Mrs. C. B. Hackley, whose generous gift has made the establishment of the school at Tarrytown possible.

The resolution was unanimously adopted under suspension of the rules.

Recess.

## TUESDAY AFTERNOON.

In the afternoon two meetings were held, that of the Women's National Alliance in All Souls' Church and of the Unitarian Temperance Society in the First Congregational Church.

## TUESDAY EVENING.

The evening meeting was held in the First Congregational Church. The subject for the evening was "The Higher Nature of Man." Two addresses were given. Prayer was offered by Rev. R. N. Bellows. After the singing of a hymn, Rev. S. R. Calthrop spoke of the Higher Nature of man "In the Light of History," and Rev. C. F. Dole, "In the Light of Idealism."

## WEDNESDAY MORNING.

The Conference was called to order at 9.50 by Dr. Hale, the president of the Conference arriving a little later and taking the chair. Prayer was offered by Dr. Hale.

The Business Committee reported through the chairman, Mr. King, the following resolution, with the recommendation that it be adopted:—

*Resolved*, That the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches, now assembled in Washington, sends greetings to the Universalist General Convention about to meet in Boston, and rejoices in the widening influence of an organization which is honored as a fellow-worker in the cause of truth, freedom, and righteousness.

*Resolved*, That the Conference indorses the proposal of the American Unitarian Association for the appointment of a Conference Committee to consider plans of closer co-operation between the two denominations.

*Resolved*, That Rev. Edward E. Hale, D.D., Rev. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., and Rev. Samuel A. Eliot be commissioned to convey these assurances of good will to the convention.

Voted unanimously.

Mr. William Howell Reed asked for subscriptions for the amount (\$2,000) necessary for the expenses of the Conference.

A resolution with reference to a statement of religious purpose was offered by Rev. W. C. Brown, and referred, under the rules, to the Business Committee.

Three papers were then delivered on "Our Means of Helping to promote the Higher Life of Man," as follows: "How we understand and make use of the Bible in our Work,"—by Rev. Joseph May, LL.D., Philadelphia; "Our



Relation to Jesus," by Rev. William Hanson Pulsford, Waltham; and "How our Doctrine of Immortality helps," by Rev. C. E. St. John, Pittsburg.

Rev. Thomas R. Slicer called the attention of the graduates of Meadville to the need of a gymnasium for the school there.

An address on "Our Relation to Jesus" was made by Rev. James Eells. Remarks were also made by the president, Mr. Hoar, and Dr. Hale. The latter introduced Rev. Jasper L. Douthit as the apostle of Southern Illinois. In a short address Mr. Douthit described the work which has been carried on for some years, under his direction, at Lithia Springs, Ill., a tract of land of two hundred acres. Last summer about one hundred tents were set up there, with about a thousand persons living in them and with about two thousand attending the lectures and classes that were conducted through the summer. It is desired that eight thousand dollars should be contributed for the purchase of this property, all of which should then be turned over to the American Unitarian Association.

Mr. W. H. Reed, Mr. Adams of Chicago, Mrs. W. C. Gannett, Mr. R. C. Humphreys, and others favored the plan, and offered subscriptions. After some further discussion a resolution was offered by Mr. Ellis, who said that no one would be more glad to help on Mr. Douthit's project than he himself, but he thought it ought to be done on a business basis.

On motion of Rev. Leslie W. Sprague the resolution was referred to the Business Committee.

#### WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON.

Two meetings were held in the afternoon, that of the Unitarian Sunday School Society and that of the Young People's Religious Union, the latter followed by a complimentary reception and supper to the young people of the Union by the unions of Baltimore and Washington.

The speakers at the Sunday-school meeting were Booker T. Washington, Mrs. John A. Bellows, and Rev. T. R. Slicer. Miss Jeanie Deans of the Industrial School for Colored Youth at Manassas made an address in behalf of the school.

## WEDNESDAY EVENING.

The evening session began at eight o'clock in the First Congregational Church. Prayer was offered by Rev. J. C. Hodgins. The treasurer, Mr. William Howell Reed, asked for subscriptions to meet the expenses of the Conference. The various churches represented responded at once, and the amount necessary was practically subscribed.

The subject for the platform meeting was "The Practical Appeal of the Unitarian Church to the Twentieth Century." Four speakers took each an "appeal": Hon. George E. Adams, "To the National Life"; Rev. Paul R. Frothingham, "For Religious Reconstruction"; "To Christian Sentiment," Rev. Adelbert L. Hudson, Buffalo; "To Conscience," Rev. W. W. Fenn, Chicago.

## THURSDAY MORNING.

The three sessions of Thursday were held in All Souls' Church. The morning meeting was called to order at ten o'clock. Prayer was offered by Dr. Hale. The president said that he had received a letter from a foreign country asking for help for the oppressed Protestants in that country. He did not think it would be discreet to read it aloud, and by unanimous consent it was referred to the Business Committee.

The Business Committee reported through the chairman, Mr. King, as follows:—

*Resolved*, We would commend to the serious consideration of our churches the advantages of a better organization of our church life. To this end we heartily recommend:—

*First*, That each and every one of our churches shall give honor and dignity to its statement of religious spirit and purpose; shall make its statement simple, clear, and strong; and, having its membership involve no test of creed or sacrament, shall make it an expression of Christian purpose and a pledge of loyalty. The simple statement, "In the love of truth, and in the spirit of Jesus, we unite for the worship of God and the service of man," which is in use in more than eighty of our churches, is commended.

*Second*, That this or some similar statement be adopted by each church, or incorporated in the articles of organization of the society or parish; and that all persons in the parish be invited and urged to subscribe to the same, and thereby become members of the church.

*Third*, And we especially recommend also that the classes in the Sunday-schools, when their members come to maturity, be encouraged to publicly join the church after some definite preparation and instruction.

*Resolved*, That subscriptions toward the support of the work of Rev. Jasper L. Douthit in Illinois shall become payable only when a working

plan shall be formulated and agreed upon between the directors of the American Unitarian Association and Mr. Douthit.

On motion the report was adopted. On motion of Dr. Hale it was voted that the chair should appoint a committee of five, in whose hands should be placed the duty of receiving subscriptions for Lithia Springs and who should report at the evening session.

Mr. KING.—At the last meeting of this Conference the Council made a recommendation with reference to the ordination of ministers, which was not adopted. That resolution is now offered, with the omission of the words “after a call duly given has been accepted by the candidate.” The resolution will then read:—

*Resolved*, That it is the advice of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches that a candidate for the Unitarian ministry be ordained only by a church or at the request of a church, except that, whenever it is desirable to ordain a person for special service other than the pastorate of a church, then, by the approval of the Fellowship Committee, the faculty of a Divinity School or the officers of a Conference may ordain.

President Hoar asked whether it was the purpose of the committee to disregard the distinction that exists in many New England churches between the parish and the church.

Mr. Morehouse stated that the resolution was originally drawn up by a committee appointed by the Council, consisting of George S. Hale and Rev. George Batchelor. They had not intended to ignore the distinction.

The CHAIR.—Such a resolution would take from the parish of old Concord, Mass., any share or voice in the selection of a pastor, and would commit it to the church. It would do the same in the First Unitarian Church of Worcester.

Rev. George Batchelor said that undoubtedly the chair was right, and that ought to be changed. He was sorry to have the words omitted with reference to accepting a call, as that was a vital point in the resolution. Many of the troubles in churches had come from irregular ordinations. The object of the resolution is to define the usage of the Unitarian Church, and to make it possible to have some control of the men entering the Unitarian ministry who may be recommended to the churches.

Mr. Ellis moved to amend by the insertion of the words “or religious society” after the word “church.” The amendment was accepted.

Judge Morris moved that the words “after a call has

been duly given and accepted by the candidate" should be restored.

Mr. Batchelor seconded the motion. Voted.

The resolution was then adopted as amended, reading thus:—

*Resolved*, That it is the advice of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches that a candidate for the Unitarian ministry be ordained only by a church or other religious society or at the request of a church, or other religious society, after a call duly given has been accepted by the candidate, except that, whenever it is desirable to ordain a person for special service other than the pastorate of a church, then, by the approval of the Fellowship Committee, the faculty of a divinity school or the officers of a Conference may ordain.

Mr. KING.—At the last Conference certain rules were adopted by the Fellowship Committee, and they have been referred to our committee. They come with the approval of the Council. These are now presented for the approval of the Conference. They are as follows:—

#### RULES OF THE UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP COMMITTEE.

The Fellowship Committee elected by the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches, under the provisions of its Constitution and By-laws, and acting under the authority of instructions embodied in votes passed by the Conference and by the American Unitarian Association, has jurisdiction over the authorized list of Unitarian ministers published in the Year Book of the denomination.

This committee has power to cause the name of any person to be removed from the list, when it is satisfied that in conduct and character such person has become unworthy to continue to hold the office of a Christian minister in the Unitarian fellowship; but in no case shall unfavorable action be taken till a minister has had full opportunity to be heard in the matter.

The Fellowship Committee also has power to add to the list of ministers the names of those who, coming into the Unitarian ministry otherwise than through the theological schools of the denomination, are, in its judgment, worthy to be thus enrolled. All churches are hereby warned of the serious danger they incur by settling a minister whose name does not appear in the authorized list or who has not received the approval of the Fellowship Committee.

In deciding upon the fitness of a candidate for admission to the Unitarian fellowship, the committee will be guided

above all by such proofs of the moral earnestness and integrity of the applicant as may be discovered under a careful investigation. It may also take into account the amount and kind of preparation that have been made for the work of the ministry, and may advise with the candidate as to any further course of study that he may seem to require. Should he take a special course at Cambridge or at Meadville, the certificate of the faculty of either of those schools that he is qualified to preach will be received by the committee, and will entitle him to have his name placed upon the list of ministers. In all cases, however, the committee may, at its discretion, refuse to put the name of a student or candidate upon the list before he has been regularly settled over a Unitarian church.

Applicants for recognition as Unitarian ministers are requested to make known their desire to the chairman of the sub-committee having jurisdiction over the territory in which they reside. Each sub-committee, after thorough investigation, shall report its decision, together with all material facts in the case, to the secretary of the General Committee, who shall at once notify all the other sub-committees of the action that has been taken.

Unless within thirty days after the mailing of such notice objection to the finding of the sub-committee having original jurisdiction over the case is filed with the secretary of the General Committee, the action of the sub-committee shall be regarded as approved by the General Committee; and, in case of the acceptance of an applicant, publication of that fact shall immediately thereafter be made in one or more of the denominational papers over the names of the chairman and secretary of the General Committee.

Mr. MOREHOUSE.—These rules were drawn up by a sub-committee of the Council, consisting of Rev. H. N. Brown, Rev. George Batchelor, and myself. They embody the results of the experience of the Fellowship Committee for the past fifteen years, and, in our judgment, constitute a body of rules that we can follow with safety and ignore only with danger.

The rules were then adopted unanimously.

Mr. King asked leave for the Business Committee to sit during the session of the Conference, and leave was given.

Hon. CARROLL D. WRIGHT.—Before Mr. Williams, who is to be the next speaker, begins, I want to make a preliminary statement. This seems to be necessary on account of

the gift of Mrs. Hackley of her estate at Tarrytown for a school for boys, to be conducted under the general advice and superintendence of the American Unitarian Association, although the immediate management of the school is vested in a board of trustees named by the board of directors of the American Unitarian Association. This property, worth something like seventy-five thousand dollars, has now been deeded in fee simple to the American Unitarian Association in trust for the purposes of a school. There has been given also by the generous donor a sum of money sufficient to meet the deficits which may occur during the next five or six years in the maintenance of the school, which Mr. Theodore C. Williams has been selected to conduct. You all know how difficult it is to find schools where the sons of Unitarian families can meet with the best equipment for school work without being surrounded by more or less proselyting influences. It is the purpose here to make the school unsectarian, but where the broad sympathy of Unitarian thought will surround the boys who are placed there.

An address on "Religion and Education" was then given by Rev. T. C. Williams.

A paper on "Religion and Citizenship" was read by Hon. Adelbert Moot of Buffalo. This was followed by one on "Religion and Sociology," by Hon. Carroll D. Wright, and a brief address by Rev. Jasper L. Douthit.

The Committee on Nominations reported through the chairman, Mr. George H. Ellis, who moved that the secretary be authorized to cast one ballot for the Conference. This was voted. The ballot was cast as ordered, and the president declared the following persons elected:—

#### OFFICERS.

*President*, Hon. George F. Hoar, Worcester, Mass. *Vice-Presidents*: Hon. Carroll D. Wright, LL.D., Washington, D.C.; Gov. Roger Wolcott, Boston, Mass.; Hon. Dorman B. Eaton, LL.D., New York, N.Y.; Hon. George E. Adams, Chicago, Ill.; Hon. George C. Perkins, San Francisco, Cal.; Hon. Thomas J. Morris, Baltimore, Md. *General Secretary*, Rev. D. W. Morehouse, New York, N.Y.; *Treasurer*, Mr. William Howell Reed, Boston, Mass. *Council*, Rev. Howard N. Brown, Boston, Mass.; Rev. William W. Fenn, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Edward E. Hale, D.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. William H. Lyon, D.D., Brookline, Mass.; Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, New York, N.Y.; Mrs. Robert H. Davis, New York, N.Y.; Mrs. Paul R. Frothingham, New Bedford,

Mass.; Frank N. Hartwell, Esq., Louisville, Ky.; Hon. Francis C. Lowell, Boston, Mass.; Charles A. Murdock, Esq., San Francisco, Cal.

#### COMMITTEE ON FELLOWSHIP.

*New England States.*—Rev. William L. Chaffin, North Easton, Mass.; Rev. Austin S. Garver, Worcester, Mass.; Rev. Edward A. Horton, Boston, Mass.

*Middle States.*—Rev. D. W. Morehouse, New York, N.Y.; Rev. James T. Bixby, Ph.D., Yonkers, N.Y.; Rev. Charles E. St. John, Pittsburgh, Pa.

*Western States.*—Rev. William W. Fenn, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Mary A. Safford, Sioux City, Ia.; Rev. Franklin C. Southworth, Chicago, Ill.

*Southern States.*—Rev. George A. Thayer, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Henry A. Whitman, Charleston, S.C.; Rev. Arthur W. Littlefield, Louisville, Ky.

*Pacific States.*—Rev. Thomas L. Eliot, D.D., Portland, Ore.; Rev. Horatio Stebbins, D.D., San Francisco, Cal.; Rev. George R. Dodson, Alameda, Cal.

President HOAR.—The chair is deeply touched and gratified by the kindness of this Conference. I had thought it best that my name should not be continued among the list of officers. I dislike exceedingly to accept positions of honor which cannot be accompanied, and in some measure earned, by corresponding service; and it is exceedingly doubtful always whether my own time can be at my command consistently with other duties at the period of year when this Conference is likely to be held. But I have yielded to the desire of the committee, and I will endeavor to serve you for another year. [Applause.]

This body of American Unitarians brings to me peculiar and tender recollections. From my very earliest childhood I have looked upon the great champions of the Unitarian faith as the moral and spiritual heroes of the republic. I have seen the steps which this country has taken, not alone in physical development, in advancement in numbers and strength and territory, but in a constant rising year after year, and generation after generation, to loftier ideals, to a purer life, going on largely, if not chiefly, under the leadership of the men and women of our little household of faith. The great revolution described in Col. Wright's paper so clearly and so beautifully has been due to their stimulation, and especially to the writings of William Ellery Channing. It is

a touching and noble story ; and I thank God, in my old age, that he has given me to see in the country which I love so large a realization of the dreams of my youth. In the two great English-speaking nations, now growing so close together, this century has seen wonderful advancement in the obedience of those nations, of families and of communities, to the religion and the moral teachings of Jesus. Ecclesiasticism is going out, and the religious life is coming in. I thank God that my eyes are looking, day by day and year by year, on a better country and on a purer life. I thank God that I can declare as my last word to you to-day what was my first word when I took the chair, that I believe, and I thank God that I can believe, that the world is growing better,—that to-day is better than yesterday, and to-morrow will be better than to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. Ellis said that he disliked to follow such a word with matters of business, but it was business that meant the extending of that word to others. He announced that the next two numbers of the *Christian Register* would contain the proceedings of the Conference, practically in full. These numbers would be sold for \$5 a hundred copies.

The chair then announced the following persons who should constitute the Lithia Springs Committee: Messrs. George E. Adams, Chicago; James A. Norcross, Worcester; Mrs. Mary T. L. Gannett, Rochester; W. W. Fenn, Chicago; and George H. Ellis, Boston.

Rev. W. C. Brown read the following resolution, offered by Mr. Gilmore, which was unanimously adopted under suspension of the rules:—

*Resolved*, That the Conference heartily indorse the Young People's Religious Union, recognizing in it the means of guiding and expressing the religious life of our young people, and a vital help to the work of our churches.

The Business Committee reported through Mr. King the following resolution with reference to certain Protestants in Russia, which was unanimously adopted:—

An appeal on behalf of the Russian Protestants for sympathy and assistance having been laid before this Conference:—

*Resolved*, That this Conference expresses its sympathy with the Protestants of Russia, and its earnest hope that they, in common with the Christians of every denomination in every land, may be accorded the right to worship God in their own way with the same freedom enjoyed by every religious denomination here.

*Resolved*, That the request laid before the Conference for assistance for the Russian Protestants be referred to the American Unitarian



Association for such investigation and action as its directors may deem proper.

*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Conference be directed to communicate this action to the authors of the appeal.

Mr. King offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted :—

*Resolved*, That the thanks of this Conference be, and they are hereby, extended to Rev. S. M. Newman, pastor, and to the board of trustees, of the First Congregational Society of Washington, D.C., for the spirit of Christian fraternity in which they have extended the use of their church building to this Conference.

#### THURSDAY AFTERNOON.

The afternoon meeting was devoted to the interests of the American Unitarian Association; and addresses were made by Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Rev. Howard N. Brown, Rev. E. E. Hale, D.D., and Rev. S. A. Eliot. The benediction was pronounced by Rev. E. B. Leavitt, Washington.

#### THURSDAY EVENING.

The annual sermon was preached in All Souls' Church at eight o'clock, by Rev. Samuel M. Crothers, D.D., Cambridge.

REPORTS.



## REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

BY REV. E. E. HALE, D.D.

[The report of the Council was read by Rev. E. E. Hale, D.D., in the necessary absence of the Chairman, Rev. M. J. Savage, D.D.]

In the year 1864, in the last year of the Civil War, the directors of the American Unitarian Association found themselves without means to carry forward the great demands which were made upon them. The Unitarian churches were intensely interested in the practical questions connected with the war of emancipation. The condition of soldiers in the field, of newly emancipated slaves, the necessities of seamen, the pressure of poverty upon those border States from which the Confederate armies had been driven,—these and similar demands were made on individuals and upon organizations all through the North. It happened, therefore, that, while the Unitarian Association, under the lead of such men as Charles Lowe and John Ware, was as actively at work as it could be in the hospitals, in the camps, and in the army generally, the annual contributions to its treasury did not amount to five thousand dollars,—hardly enough to buy the ink, quills, and paper which they might use to advantage.

In this pressure the directors called an extraordinary meeting of their friends in Hollis Street Church in December, 1864. At that meeting, on a motion by Henry Purkitt Kidder, afterward president of the Association, it was voted that one hundred thousand dollars should be raised at once for the service of the Unitarian Association. Our great leader, Dr. Bellows, followed up this triumphal vote by moving the appointment of a commission of three clergymen and seven laymen to consider methods for the better organization of the Unitarian Church of the country, that Christians of that name and conviction might never again find themselves baffled so sadly in any united efforts for the extension of Christianity. This commission called a convention in the city of New York, which met there on the week of the great surrender at Richmond. That convention laid the plans for the Conference of our body, which has met, from that time to this time, at stated periods.

Dr. Bellows and his friends avowed distinctly their wish

to present the Unitarian Church of the country as a national body. They knew that at that time this church as an organization scarcely existed outside New England. In fact, the Appleton Cyclopædia, in a courteous article on American Unitarianism, published in 1863, says that the State of Massachusetts had at that time one hundred and sixty-four societies, out of a total of two hundred and sixty-three in the nation. That is to say, two-thirds of our congregations spoke with the New England shibboleth, and in that shibboleth spoke with the Massachusetts twang. Dr. Bellows said squarely, "I will not serve in any such holiday company"; and he and his made their preparations for this Conference on lines so broad and with an ultimate purpose so large that the Unitarian Church should, in a future not far distant, have centres and spokesmen as many and as strong in one part of the country as in another. So far have they come in his purpose that the Council, after serious consideration, have determined that the capital of the country is the place for the meeting of our general assembly. The number of our churches has increased faster than the population of the country, although we have not made the inroad which we should have made on the well-organized ranks of persons baptized in Europe by the Church of Rome. The Massachusetts contingent is no smaller than it was in 1864, although the majority of the people now in Massachusetts were born in the Roman Catholic Church. The increase of the Unitarian body as an organization in other parts of the country is so great that the Massachusetts contingent, which was then two-thirds, is now hardly one-third of the body of our churches existing through the nation.

It has proved, however, as certainly Dr. Bellows did not expect at that time, that the increase of the Unitarian Church is especially within the ranks of other organizations than ours. The theology of our body is no longer unpopular. It is often proclaimed from Presbyterian and other so-called orthodox pulpits quite as ably as our own preachers can proclaim it. With the advancing catholicity of the creed-bound churches, it is easier for conscientious Unitarians to join them or to remain in them than it was. A distinguished prelate of the Episcopal Church said, with truth, that the congregation in his own cathedral was made up of "Unitarian cranks"; and nothing is more common than that Unitarian families of definite religious conviction are received into Presbyterian churches on the very noble understanding that, if man or woman love the Saviour, no farther requisition can be made upon them. It is safe to

say that no such tolerance was possible in America forty years ago.

All the more is it necessary and desirable that Americans who believe in the right of private judgment, who believe in the equality of all men before the law, and who do not propose that feudal or aristocratic or ecclesiastical traditions shall govern the arrangements of churches or shall be listened to in the struggles of conscience, shall organize churches and carry forward missions as we do, for the promotion of simple Christianity.

It should be understood, indeed, as it certainly is not understood now, that any church—practical Christianity, summed up in “love to God and love to man”—is entitled to send representatives to this assembly. It may make its own ritual, it may administer its own sacraments, it may have a written creed or not have a written creed; but it belongs here if it wants to come. It will be remembered that by its constitution this Conference can pretend to no authoritative power. If the range of discussion in the three days before us sweep much more widely than is the custom with most ecclesiastical conventions, the reason is plain. This is not an ecclesiastical convention. It is a “conference,” unhampered by ecclesiastical lines, of those persons who wish to bring in the kingdom of God and who believe that that kingdom will be advanced chiefly by those persons who “accept the religion of Jesus, holding, in accordance with his teaching, that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man.”

At our last Conference, two years ago, our dear friend Fay urged, with his own impetuosity, the necessity of aggressive movement on the part of our executive, if we have any executive. At his suggestion a report has been prepared and printed by a special committee, to whose suggestions, as we trust, the delegates at this meeting will give careful attention. It has already been printed in the *Christian Register*, and it will be distributed here as an essential and important contribution to the business of our meetings.

The programme which is in the hands of the members of the Conference indicates the division of the days of its meeting which the Council has agreed upon. We have held to what has now become a custom in giving one day to discussions on the fundamental necessities of religion, one day to the practical demands which the year 1899 and the Republic of America make on religious men, and one day to a consideration of the reports of the Unitarian Association, and the other executive agencies to which our churches intrust

a part of their affairs. It is not for the Council to anticipate the discussion to which this report will lead. To its suggestions this may be added,—that our dear friend Dr. Bellows, who was so eager in the establishment of this Conference and Council, had at heart no new enterprise which he thought more necessary for the Unitarian Church of America than the establishment of itinerant preaching. He knew this country so well that he knew what admirable contributions to its Christian life have been made in this way by the Methodist Church. It has been eager to anticipate any demand for established congregations. It might be said that its distinction from that Congregational Church which planted New England is in the easy system by which it has been able to send out its apostles along the foremost of those who crossed the Alleghanies, who crossed the Mississippi, and who flanked the Rocky Mountains.

Some question has indeed arisen, rather as a matter of speculation, as to the possibility of using the light machinery of Congregational churches for missionary enterprise. Our friends of the evangelical churches certainly gave a striking answer to such questions when half a dozen boys, under the shade of a haycock in Williamstown, organized that American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions which sends now half a thousand preachers over the world and has established congregations under Congregational government in twenty nations. It may be worth saying, as matter of fact, that before the first generation of New England had died these pure Congregational churches, of whose number we are, had looked all such questions in the face, and had answered them by their mission. John Eliot, the first minister of the Religious Society of Roxbury, did not hesitate to assist in the ordination of Indian preachers, who were to go about from place to place to preach such gospel as they had in their own language. That generation had not passed before the people of Virginia were sending up to New England for men who would preach a gospel not tainted by any suspicion of popery or prelacy. And the first generation of men who knew what they meant by Independency and by Congregationalism were ready to assist in such enterprises. New England missionaries were sent to Virginia, to Bermuda, to the Carolinas, and afterward to Georgia. As soon as the Unitarian body organized itself in the American Unitarian Association in 1825, it began the custom of ordaining "evangelists" for duty in such places as Philippi and Athens and Ephesus were, when Paul first went to them. Our Fathers who sent out on such work William Eliot.

Ephraim Peabody, and Freeman Clarke, probably thought they had sufficient authority in the action of the First Church of Antioch, long before a diocese or a presbytery were ever heard of, when the Holy Spirit said to the preachers and teachers in that city, "Separate me Barnabas and Paul for the work whereunto I have called them."

But, while the principle is certain in the establishment of Congregational churches, the danger is evident, and has been felt from the days of John Cotton, that such churches, just in proportion to their prosperity, may not understand that no church liveth to itself.

Very likely there was grumbling in the First Church of Antioch when the Holy Spirit notified the leaders that Saul and Barnabas were to go away from Antioch, and that the comfortable residents of Antioch were not to have the weekly satisfaction of sitting under their preaching. All the same, however, they went; and we are in this church to-day because they did go. There was undoubtedly grumbling about Eliot's fanaticism in the First Church of Roxbury, as there would be to-day if Dr. De Normandie left his pulpit to the ministrations of some lay brother, while he went to the remnants of the Norridgewocks or the Penobscots or the Mashpees, to preach to them a gospel which they have never heard. But in proportion as any one of our congregations takes on the spirit of a newborn organization, and revives the eagerness of those first happy years when everybody who belongs to the church feels that he must do his share in the ministry,—in that proportion does that congregation enter into our common work, and determine that the gospel of free thought shall not be confined to any handful of congregations, but shall be opened up, in methods ecclesiastical or non-ecclesiastical, in all the centres of the land.

It is an open question whether the extension of free and undefiled religion in the next half-century may not depend quite as much on the public speech of people who are called laymen, meeting the people in the people's way and in the people's halls, as by an ordained clergy, speaking in the pulpits of churches. Five-and-twenty years ago a body of young men threw open the hall of the Cooper Institute in New York every Sunday for free addresses by free men on the great central subjects of life,—addresses on religion. It is easy to see that such addresses, where they were made by men known as men of science, or leaders in the law, or favorites in literature, or men successful in philanthropy, would challenge popular attention, and might meet the popular heart as preachers do not. For whatever reason, preachers have suc-



ceeded in making the average English-speaking people believe that sermons are dull. For reasons very easily explained, preachers are considered as men who hold a brief, who are ordained, not so much to say what they themselves believe or that the Spirit of God has said to them, as to say what a certain corporation pretends to believe, and considers it expedient to proclaim to mankind. If in this city, this winter, a course of addresses on the Eternal Realities could be delivered, in the largest public hall in Washington, by Mr. John Fiske, by President McKinley, by Mr. White, the leader of the Conference at The Hague, by the provost of the University of Pennsylvania, by the president of Harvard College, by Mr. Howells or Gov. Roosevelt, or a dozen other such men, who are leaders of the time, it is easy to see what an uplift such addresses, on the very foundations of life, on the eternal motive in men's affairs, would give to the thought and conversation on religion, in this city and in this country. It would not be necessary to select such men from the calendars of this or that ecclesiastical organization. In selecting them, the determination would be that capable men, whose own lives are founded on principle, and have they the power, speak to other men, and make them understand what life is and what life is for.

It is satisfactory to say that in the last two years, acting on that line of effort, we have succeeded in founding strong churches in Ottawa, Canada; Amherst, Mass.; Lincoln, Neb.; Erie, Dunkirk, Jamestown, and other smaller places.

An excellent opportunity offers itself at this moment for a step in the direction indicated,—of extending religious instruction through forms which are not ecclesiastical. Our distinguished apostle Rev. Jasper Douthit has secured the great camp-ground which for many years he has used for the great summer assemblies of Southern Illinois. Gentlemen or ladies who have visited the spot know how well adapted it is for purposes which may be called national in their extent. We have testimonies from every quarter of the good which has been effected in the summer meetings held around what was once called Lithia Springs: from Mr. Ballington Booth to the Rev. Samuel Jones the testimony is the same. A subscription of eight thousand dollars will place this admirable temple in the hands of the Unitarian Association who will use it from this time forward for the promulgation of pure and undefiled religion. The Council ventures the hope that, before this Conference adjourns, provision may be made for plans placing this sum in the hands of our executive.

The office of our biennial Conference is not executive. But it comes very near to being executive. The Conference, as Dr. Hedge said, "revealed the Unitarian Church to itself." This was true; and in that revelation we learned that the Unitarian Church is a body of men interested in action, and not interested in dogmatic discussion. When, therefore, this Conference gives a serious decision, expressed not in a by-vote pushed in at a corner, but after such serious discussion as calls forth the testimony of delegates from all parts of the continent and of every shade of opinion, that decision is followed by action. The American Unitarian Association has never forgotten that it is the executive body whose business it is to carry out the serious purpose of this assembly.

The Council wishes to express again its pride in the position which the *New World*, a child of this Conference, has taken. It ranks high among the theological and ethical reviews of the country and other Anglo-Saxon lands. We must express our satisfaction, also, in the stimulus it has given to our ministers and people, in the new thought which it has carried to those of other communions, and in the seed they have scattered. Such periodicals cannot be expected to be self-supporting; but the generous help which this quarterly has needed has been cheerfully given and carefully expended. The Council expresses the thanks of the Conference to the American Unitarian Association whose liberality carried the young review through its first two years of weakness, to the contributors to the two successive guarantee funds, and to those who, with the aid of the bounty of one large-minded woman, made its further continuance possible. The Council indulges the hope that some generous source may be found, which shall yield an endowment sufficient to relieve the friends of this enterprise from anxiety. Such an endowment would confer upon the cause of liberal thought over a perpetual and ever-accumulating benefit, and rear a monument of wise and large beneficence.

In the more popular form of the weekly journal, we have succeeded in establishing the *Christian Register* in such a form as gives to our body a proper organ. It is due to the loyal effort of Mr. William Howell Reed, our treasurer, that a sufficient capital was collected for the publication of the paper in its present acceptable form, without depending on the generosity of any single publisher. The effect of this spirited response for a necessity which was apparent is already felt in the new impulse given to all our activities.

But it must be remembered, and remembered here, that

the *Register* endowment, generous as it was, will fail of its purpose unless the whole body of Unitarians subscribe for the paper. Here is a matter to which each delegate here must attend. The price of the *Register* has been reduced by one-third to meet the purpose of the body, and the increased subscription must make up for that reduction.

The Council will introduce, at a proper time, a motion for the appointment of a special committee, from all parts of the country, to enlarge the circulation and increase the work of the *Register*. It may be desirable to provide a special missionary fund for its special circulation among churches and clergymen who are not in a position to know easily what are the plans, hopes, and beliefs of our communion.

By an oversight in the close of the last National Conference, no vote was taken on the resolution relating to ordinations, which had been submitted in order. The Council submits this rule again, with an amendment, and will ask for a vote on it at the proper time.

The Council will also submit a series of Rules for the Committees on Fellowship, which they have, with careful consideration, digested from rules presented at former meetings.

At the meeting in Hollis Street Church in December, 1864, at the moment when the assembly thought it had done a great thing in voting to raise one hundred thousand dollars for Unitarian missions in the next year, at the moment when Dr. Bellows had introduced and carried through a plan for a commission of ten persons to consider methods for the national organization of the Unitarian Church, our dear friend Eli Fay almost disturbed the harmony of the meeting by bringing in a third proposal,—that the Unitarian churches should before June raise one hundred thousand dollars for the re-establishment of Antioch College. He had his way, rather to the dismay, perhaps, of gentlemen interested in the other proposals. That sum of money was raised. It was paid to the trustees of Antioch College under the definite contract that, if that college ever humiliated itself by giving special favors to any sectarian organization, this endowment should revert to the Unitarian Association. But as these funds and more were raised in Unitarian churches, and only in them, this Conference for many years received delegates from Antioch College, and often received reports of its progress. We may say with a certain satisfaction that from the young men who went from all parts of the United States to that training school many came forth into our Unitarian ministry who have done to the

cause of pure and undefiled religion services which cannot be described. The majority of the board of trustees has always been made from persons who were connected with Unitarian churches. A generation has now passed, the college is no longer in leading strings, and the trustees have come to the determination to intrust it loyally and without reserve to such trustees as the alumni themselves may designate. At the present moment, nine of the board of twenty are loyal graduates of the college, chosen because they are learned graduates of the college without reference to their opinions on the fall of man, on election, on reprobation, on the vicarious atonement, or on the statement of the doctrine of the Trinity. At the last meeting of the trustees, when Hon. William A. Bell, the Superintendent of Education in Indiana, was chosen president of the college, it was determined to emphasize in the future the wish which Horace Mann always felt in the beginning,—that this college might be a special seminary for persons who are engaged in the education of the young. Larger in its range than the ordinary normal school, devoting itself to the great principles of psychology and indeed of life on which all education depends, it is the hope of the trustees that Antioch College may be now, as it was when it was founded, a central place of arms, where may be equipped and trained the officers of the great army which is to educate the future. We must not expect any longer to receive reports from the college at our Conference meetings; but we are glad to express our confidence in the plans which are formed for its future, and our congratulations that they seem practicable.

In more than one report of our predecessors has been expressed the uneasiness of those parents who find, when they send their children away to school, that they have sent them into some cloister of sacramental form, or of religion limited by the statements of centuries, which ought to be forgotten. It is not difficult to find a school where no religious impressions are given to a bright and energetic boy of fifteen or sixteen years of age. There are, alas! persons who are willing to conduct the machinery of such establishments, who seem to be indifferent to the truth that, at the ages when boys are sent to them, they are really forming convictions as to God and heaven and right which will determine their lives. Between the absolutely irreligious boarding-school and those schools which have won for themselves the nickname of "Rugby-and-water," or those other schools which openly acknowledge that their business is to bring lads into allegiance to a Presbyterian oligarchy or an Epis-

copal or Catholic bishop, it is often difficult for thoughtful parents to find the place to which they may safely send their boys.

This 'difficulty has been once and again examined in the discussions of this Conference on education.' It is, therefore, with great satisfaction that we are able to announce an arrangement by which it will be fully met for all who have been distressed by it. The plans have been carefully wrought out by which there has been established, in Tarrytown, N.Y., under the direction of Rev. Theodore Williams, lately of All Souls' Church, of a school of the very first grade, for the education of boys who are to be fitted for college or for the active duties of life. Mr. Williams leaves the pulpit for this more active ministry with all that ardent conviction which characterizes the man. The friends of the enterprise are gladly endowing it, so that the school shall not stand second to any other in the country, and at the same time parents who intrust their children to this school will be quite sure that they shall not grow up with an idea that religion is something outside of life, but that in its atmosphere and training they shall be taught that it is the privilege of boys and of men to live and move and have their being in their God. It seems to the Council very fortunate for us that this enterprise has been undertaken; and we are glad to commend the purposes of the incorporators, not simply to the churches in our own communion, but to all persons, in whatever communion, who feel that education without religion is hopeless, and who feel at the same time that, if there is to be any religion in education, it must not be the religion of dogma nor the religion of form nor the religion of memory, but the religion of the Holy Ghost, the religion of the Present God, and of his kingdom.

It has been the policy of the great ecclesiastical corporations to teach men and women that no person can enter the church of Christ unless he gives a loyal assent to the theological formulas of the Dark Ages. Persons who will not give that assent are generally denied the co-operation and sympathy of the great household of the children of God. It is our business to overthrow this arrogant superstition. It is our business to show that God works his infinite purposes by the hands of each and all of his willing children.

Ours is the church of those who love God and love man. It seems time that this church should be able to encourage and unite the company of such betimes, though there be no local congregation of others like them near their homes.

The Unitarian Church of America should have some

method of receiving into its company men or women who would else feel alone in their religion. To begin with the larger States, we might appoint a central office and superintendent, who should receive the names of all persons who wish to join us. They should, each of them, be willing to circulate the printed words of our gospel, to extend in whatever way its range. Thus, though there be not a Unitarian congregation in Virginia, the thousands of Unitarians in Virginia have a right to the sympathy and co-operation of the millions of Unitarians in North America.

Our Executive Board will meet the wish of the whole of our body if they will organize some such system of co-operation of those believers who feel alone to-day.

The several local secretaries, and especially the leaders of the Post-office Mission and the leaders of the Alliance, will be glad to bring together their lists of thousands upon thousands of lonely Unitarians who do not now know that they are in organic connection with the living church of those who love God and man. In such an effort we should call upon each of our separate preachers and societies to co-operate in bringing the scattered Unitarians of the country into sympathy with each other.

## ADDRESS OF REV. SAMUEL A. ELIOT.

*Mr. President,*— I come to you in some sense a stranger and unwonted to your methods, for my posts of service have been for the most part in distant parts of the country. If I speak "with the Massachusetts twang," it is the fault of birth, and not of residence; and only once before have I been privileged to enjoy the goodly fellowship of this Conference. I have read its records, I have felt even remotely its inspirations, and from the testimony borne here, alike by the presence of so representative and honorable a company and by the prophetic words of the speakers, I am convinced that the fine audacity with which this Conference began has not stiffened into too mechanical a routine, and that its horizon of expectation is as broad as ever.

Those of you who witnessed the origins of this Conference know, can tell better than I, hardly then born, what were the hopes and anticipations with which you set out and how far you have succeeded in realizing them. If to-day there seems a difference between what you dreamed and what you have achieved, that fact, while it must needs humble, may also stimulate. We are not here to make excuses for our failures nor to waste time in counting the laurels gained, but to take counsel together about the work that still lies before us, to enjoy friendship, to inspire courage, to vivify will, and, above all, to rejoice together that the way before us still contains difficulties to be overcome, problems to be solved, and duties to be done in the cause of pure religion and of public virtue.

Your Association salutes you, and is ready to render any account that you desire of its stewardship. This Conference is a deliberative body. Your Association is an executive body. It is the function of the Conference to debate and advise. It is the function of the Association to apply. It is the province of the Conference to discuss those problems of theology, education, and philanthropy in which are involved the welfare of Church and State. It is the province of the Association to turn acquisition into accomplishment, to transform knowledge into power, and to make aspiration culminate in will. The attitude of the Conference is receptive, of the Association aggressive. The one has to do primarily with the world within, the other with the world

without. In our Conference we are willing disciples. In our Association we must be ardent apostles.

Your Association thus opens before you your door of utterance. It offers you the opportunity for embodying your ideals and your hopes. It seeks your aid in transmuting purpose into act and turning dream to deed. Without the door of utterance the Conference would be exposed to that peril which constantly besets men of education and enlightenment,— the peril of becoming critics rather than the servants of religion and the Commonwealth. If once withdrawn into a cloistered and self-centred study, this Conference might easily settle down into the habits first of the mere observer or reporter of events and then of the indifferent or imbittered censor.

I have but little use for a merely didactic religion. Intellect may here decide and conscience rebuke, but still we need a more adequate dynamic for progress. Our ideals will evaporate without embodiment unless some passion for service kindles in us. I cannot but rejoice, then, that you bid me turn from debate over the perplexities of Ethics and Divinity to consideration of the public serviceableness which is, after all, the just test and measurement of our vitality. I cannot believe that even the most accurate religious opinions can ever alone constitute a pure and true Christianity. Pure Christianity demands not only right belief and receptivity of spirit: it demands imaginative vigor, a robust temper of service, a radiant love. I distrust even the morality out of which no heroisms grow. A good theology—and we have it—that attracts but careless allegiance seems to me worthless beside a poor theology that really inspires the strength of self-sacrifice. The tests of religious conviction are such as these: Does it kindle the fire of love? Does it light the blaze of righteous indignation? Does it run through society as a cleansing flame, burning up what is base and mean? Does it refine life? If it stands these tests, then, whatever the accuracy or inaccuracy of its opinions, it is no heresy; and, if it fails to stand these tests, is it not perilously near to being a mockery?

Yet do not misunderstand me. I do not forget that deliberate conviction must precede all useful activity, and I rejoice that in an age too much given to superficiality and haste this Conference is ready to address itself to the careful study of great intellectual and spiritual problems. The practical and the meditative life should balance and supplement each other. A religion that was all outward activity would be but a self-exhausting fire: a religion that was chiefly opin-



ion would be but an intricate bit of mechanism without any fire under the boiler. Neither the truth of our doctrine nor the mere quantity of our outward endeavor is a complete test of our usefulness. The scholar who has only the meditative power may find truth, but remain so wrapped up in contemplation of it as never to find the men to whom to impart it; while the man who has only the power of outward activity may find the men, but have no vision to declare to them. It is the faith that combines a truth and an affection which has immortal vitality. To furnish truth for men and men for truth, is not that the noblest office of manhood?

Do I need to say that in the conduct of the work of your Association both methods are employed? There must be a well-constructed engine, and there must be "the spirit of the living creature" within the wheels. It is a commonplace to say that the slow and hesitating advance of organic Unitarianism is largely due to its virtues. By the very force of our honorable traditions, by the very nobility of our inheritance of self-respecting independency, our churches have been too content to stand alone, and have failed to develop any adequate warmth of fellowship. Our independency has too often degenerated into an exaggerated and sterile individualism. This Conference, and, because the fellowship of work is a stronger tie than the fellowship of speech, in still larger measure your Association, are our protests against isolation. By the terms of its constitution your Association stands, first of all, "to promote union, sympathy, and co-operation among liberal Christians." And your Association solicits the increasing interest of Unitarians in transforming this expression of purpose into a reality. A lonely faith is practically impossible save for the strongest spirits. If we are to find any joy or power in our religion, most of us need the warm and healthy companionship of like-minded friends. We need to recognize that behind and about us and before stretches the cloud of witnesses, that thousands have tried to achieve what we still struggle toward, and that still other thousands will take up our unfinished task when it drops from our hands. They will take it up unspoiled by our insufficiency, and inspired, perhaps, by our brave failures. Your Association seeks — how inadequately, no one knows better than I — to provide this possibility of continued service, gathering resources, concentrating efforts, with organized impulse, with unbroken vitality, pursuing the ideals that ever journey before us. I have no fear that we shall ever develop a too precise organization. Our churches are too honorably jealous of their liberty ever to surrender it to the keeping of even the

most trusted leaders; but I observe that the enemies of religious liberty are compactly organized; and, for the very sake of the freedom that we cherish, ought not the believers in religious liberty to be equally well organized? How long shall we be content to remain "a headless democracy drifting to victory"? Must we confess that disciplined order is impossible for free men, and possible only to those who are willing to surrender their mental freedom and subordinate their personal convictions to the rule of pope, bishop, or presbytery?

Shall we not recognize that only as we learn to combine our efforts shall we discover even to ourselves the dimensions and possibilities of our faith? Must we not have more cohesion among ourselves if we are to give wider diffusion to our principles? Shall we not remember that organization magnifies a hundred-fold the power of the individual, and offers a leverage on thought and life that only the most remarkable individuals can win for themselves? Shall we not use every effort to develop in our body a sound, healthy, rational *esprit de corps*?

But let us never mistake machinery for power. Organization will wait on inspiration. We can invent no automatic mechanism to turn our knowledge into life. Only by the consecration of the individual can organization be made effective. Let us lay down our tracks of progress, let us devise the mechanism through which our thought and hope may speed; but let us not forget that the only source of power is in personal conviction, devotion, and self-sacrifice. God's way to men is through men. The gospel is impotent unless it is incarnated in human souls. The great religions of the world have won their triumph, not through outward organization, but through the idealism of individuals. Christianity itself is not a matter of politics or creeds: it is just the self-perpetuating power of an example. Christianity is not a system of doctrines: it is just the testimony of a life. "Personality," said Bunsen, "is the lever of history." It is vain, said one of our own leaders, to try to make a better world except by the antecedent creation of consecrated people. "The only salvation is through saviors, and saviors are people who have sanctified themselves for others' sake."

On the one hand, then, I ask you to see to it that your Association does not become a body without a spirit; and, on the other hand, see to it that it shall provide an adequate channel through which your sympathy and helpfulness can abundantly flow. If we have any precious treasure of truth,

any vision of a better commonwealth, we hold it, not as a luxury, but as a trust. We must not seek to serve ourselves, but to strengthen and purify those principles of religious liberty and civic order which underlie all that we call civilization.

Informed by these ideals of service and maintained by your generous aid, what can your Association be reasonably expected to do for the glory of God and the good of man? It should provide for the prompt and efficient application alike of the money aid and of the intellectual and spiritual gifts of those who believe in the principles for which we stand. It should give to men and women who are disposed to help their kind the most adequate assurance that their helpfulness shall be fruitful. It should encourage that finest form of public spirit, the purpose through intelligent endowment of "doing some perpetual good in the world." It should be able to give the assurance that all permanent benefactions intrusted to its care shall be preserved as lasting memorials, and made useful in advancing centuries. It should be eager and untiring in diffusing good literature, in influencing public opinion, in anticipating the gradual alterations in the social and religious habits of the community, and accommodating its work to the changed conditions. It should welcome the co-operation of other Christian bodies, and seek to promote the unity of spirit which lies beneath all differences of opinion and custom. It should aid in founding and maintaining the churches, schools, and colleges which are the guides of higher civilization. It should cherish those institutions which are the perennial fountains of moral and spiritual power, wherein fresh minds may explore the boundless realms of truth, where a cheerful faith may bring peace to troubled souls, and where generations of youth may learn of righteousness.

What can the members of this Conference do for your Association? They can realize that its work is made possible only by their loyalty and their intelligent and liberal support. The measure of the Association's efficiency is simply the measure of the confidence and aid of its constituents. The action and reaction between the Association and its members is constant, prompt, and sensitive. The Association is a democratic body, and is a faithful mirror of your earnestness or your indifference, your ardor or your heedlessness. It is for you to determine whether its support shall be adequate or meagre, whether its administration shall be wise and faithful or careless and incompetent, whether it shall merely continue to exist or shall be filled with new

and enlarged power of blessing. It is for you to contribute the individual service, the personal influence, the sense of direct responsibility, the appreciative word, the fruitful suggestion, the helpful hand, which shall steady and stimulate to new endeavor.

I ask you to see to it that your Association is not merely a desirable expediency, nor an accident of religious history, nor a legal title to a good inheritance, nor a vain assertion of ecclesiastical authority, but that it is a living entity, an embodiment of a patriotic purpose, the expression of a moral ideal. Thus only can you hope that your message will have the persuasive energy which shall convince and transform your fellow-men.



## ESSAYS AND DISCUSSIONS.



## THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF GOD.

---

### IS GOD YET PERSONAL AND IMMEDIATE?

BY REV. T. R. SLICER.

Geology tells us that twenty million years are necessary to account for the highest organized life on the earth. Man is therefore very old; but the gods are ever young, for the reason that the God-made must be junior to his Maker, and the making of gods has been the chief industry of the human creature. Man did not at first know himself to be a man: he only knew himself as invaded from all sides by impressions which flung wide the doors of his senses and propped them back, so that forever afterward they stood open to the external world. As soon as cause was discovered by him as part of his mental outfit, and "because" was one of his first apprehensions,—if not one of his earliest words,—he looked to the further end of this long procession of impressions for sense causes which should be sufficient for all their effects in him. When man became man,—curiously enough indicated in the folk story of the creation of woman,—the man-fashioned God became a necessity to his thinking. He did not know how he came to be; but he must have come from some being like himself, for the sensations at the roots of life are logical. That he should have thought himself so originated, and that the help, meet for him, should be made out of himself,—a rib taken from his side, fashioned into something like himself, his correlative, his complementary force in subduing the world, his mother of all living (as she came to be called),—only goes to show that he was playing the God, as he afterward played the master, to this inferior creature made out of his stuff.

Anthropomorphism, God as man-fashioned, is a late product among the objects of worship. It is not necessary to run over all the stages through which this anthropomorphism passed: from the unsightly and disgusting idols, which conveyed by suggestion fear, strength, cunning, and every other attribute of which man was afraid, and, therefore, must conciliate; or representing fecundity, many-breasted, as in the



Asiatic opulence of imagination was set forth; or passing into forms of beauty, in which the young god represented what the Greek youth would be, and the divinely endowed with heavenly charm represented what the Greek youth would have. All of these fluctuations are fides of the imagination in the human mind. They are the *persona*, the masks, which the Ultimate Reality puts on. That Mind which is behind all the minds, that Reality which is behind all the show of things, moves ever upon the mind of man to try to solve the tragedy of human life. Man seeks to solve the actual tragedy by constructing concerning it a drama. He writes the play, and appears upon the stage as partner in its performance with the God who prompted the scene. The play is not always the same, though the tragedy is constant. The play shifts as the point of view of the observer is changed; and the mask, the *persona*, which God puts on to meet the requirements of the conscious tragedy in the human mind is flung aside and replaced by another so soon as the human mind requires the change. For ever man must have gods, and ever they must be in relation to man.

The problem set us to solve therefore is whether the Ultimate Reality behind all these shifting forms is personal; and, since these shifting forms are related always to the worshipper, to determine whether they are related immediately or whether media must intervene to make them real.

*Man hopes that God is yet personal and immediate.*

The proof cannot be marshalled here in detail. A method only can be indicated, and a way of looking at this subject suggested. For all else time is too brief and the occasion inopportune.

In order to determine in any degree what the Divine Personality may be, a moment's inquiry must be directed to the causes for the declining conviction as to the personality of God. The earlier scriptures of all religions had no difficulty with anthropomorphism: it was a foregone conclusion that man should see the archetypal pattern of himself on the throne of the world. This was largely because he had carried his thoughts of government upward, establishing conditions in Walhalla, in Olympus, in Heaven, of the kind of government that he would like to have on earth if circumstances would allow. The moment God came to be magnified to immense diameters he ceased to be natural; and the "magnified and non-natural man" had to be provided with terrors which should act to secure that, being magnified, he should be non-natural, and to win the atten-

tion of the worshipper who was divided between fear to flee and fear to stay. Out of the non-naturalness of this pseudo-infinity grew up the contradictions in man's mind concerning God, who ought to be like himself, and yet ought to be large enough to include all those who were like himself, with a margin to spare in which he should be accounted God, as greater than all these, stronger than all these; and so magnitude began to lose definite form and to have dim edges against the background of the firmament, and the throne grew so large that it occupied the whole horizon. It became necessary to farm-out whole regions, to secure cabinet and official council,—“seven shining ones,”—hierarchies, angels and archangels, and all the host of heaven. Then a kind of Malthusian necessity fell upon the heavenly state, room had to be made for the growing powers, and the fall of the angels vacated a section of the heavens. There was room for a new theology.

Here, indeed, was a division in the attention of man. He could no longer be wholly occupied with the desire to propitiate God, because he was partly occupied in the effort to escape the devil. It did not occur to him at first to solve the difficulty by inquiring what an infinite God would be like in whose realm there was a rebellious province, and how internal wars could be made to comport with eternal peace; but, surrendering himself to the seduction of the pictorial Dualism, man stepped far enough away from the contending powers of light and darkness, of heaven and hell, of God and demons, to see the conflict waged on his own account. Then suddenly he became aware of the conflict in himself, between flesh and spirit, between what he would and what he ought, between lust and love, between the torrents of impulse and the tides of life, between a gravitation that was sub-terrestrial and a gravitation that was more than celestial. Thus aware, he began to inquire about his own nature and the nature of the world. His puzzle became a world-puzzle; and it was no accident by which the great psychologic problem of Faust found its finest expression in the drama of Goethe, who stood on the very threshold of a new era opening in human thought, in which physical science should challenge man to show whether the world was not built on the very lines of his own life, and whether in the widening horizons of his thought there was not a demand to push away the confines of the world, indefinitely in time, immeasurably in space, and superlatively as to causes,—whether the problem that man had been working out was not one so large that it required a larger area on which to state it.

The world itself challenged man to say whether his crowding necessities, jostling his surging aspirations, had space enough to work out the drama of his life upon the stage already provided.

We all know the sequel. The cabinet world had its top taken off, its sides spread away; the humble earth joined the procession of the planets; the exalted sun took its place among the suns; the special creations of the past were shown to be the fruit that had dropped from the tree of life; the ripening of one age, when its fruit was gathered, showed the pushing bud of the age that should succeed; and a finished world, with its God-at-ease, was rolled back like a scroll that had been read, and a transcendent universe with its God to seek took its place in the order of man's thought.

Now began that tireless struggle for the recovery of God. Men said we have a universe so great that, if God's throne is set in it, that throne will be dwarfed to a microscopic point to him who prays from the extremity of this heaven. All the securities of life had to be reinvested. A man-fashioned God was not large enough to administer the business of this growing estate, and man must have a God to match the world he had discovered. And so a certain inflation of pride took possession of the human mind in these later times; and, until man had discovered a God great enough to make the world, man himself became elated with the world which he had discovered. And we all recall that arid belt, that desolate tract of sterile thought, in which the dust of a rising materialism only stimulated the thirst and anguish of the struggling spirit of man. Religion despaired. The conventions of scientific minds shouted under the very walls of the Church, "Where is thy God?" In this little corner of the universe called the earth, this mere wafer set upon the parchment of the sky, they passed resolutions in which they declared that all the unsurveyed tracts of space, of which we guessed many things, conveyed but one thing surely: "There is no God." There was a renaissance of Atheism.

A strange thing happened when Agnosticism was born. It was looked to to account for all things except God, and it fulfilled the expectation of its advocates. It was a living faith in the sense-perception of things that it could touch; and it declared for all things solid, substantial, and material. And, when men began to inquire of it what it had to say about things transcendent, sublime, and spiritual, there was no answer; for this thing born out of the human mind had been born with but one sense, the sense of touch, and it

could hear nothing, see nothing, and could only speak by signs, and men turned again to blow with their pale lips upon the ashes of their deserted altars, to see if perchance there were left in the air that hovered over them answer for any kindling flame. I recall to your minds Dr. Martineau's statement: "By this treaty of partition between science and religion, natural forces were installed in full possession of the cosmos in time. . . . When it appeared that no commencement could be found, that cosmical time goes back through all that had been called eternity, that for the prefix of an Almighty fiat no vacancy could be shown, the natural forces seemed to have secured the system of things all to themselves, and to leave no room for their first appearance in succession to an earlier power.

"Faith, terrified at the prospect, vowed for a while still to search somewhere for the crisis of their birth; and, while inexorable Discovery penetrated the past, taking the centuries by thousands at a stride, she kept beside it upon the wing, watching with anxious eye for the terminal edge which looked into the deep of God, till at last, weary and drooping, she could sustain the flight no more, and, to escape falling into the fathomless darkness, took refuge in the bosom of her guide, not to be repelled or crushed, as she had feared, but to be cherished and revived." ("Seal of Authority," p. 19.) But a weary period of perplexity intervened ere this was true.

What was in this answer which an ordered world made that it should disorder the thoughts of men concerning ultimate realities? The difficulties were few, but real. The first lay in the confusion which the imagination had suffered in the presence of unmeasured immensities. We were so busy trying to recover our standard of measures that had been dropped into the sea of things that we forgot that all measurements must find their true triangulation at some point of the zenith, as well as at points upon the surface of the earth. We were so troubled that we could not look up. The machinery of life ran so swiftly that we could not sleep: we had lost even dreams. Indeed, we had no space, in this new, crowded universe, with its seventy-five millions of worlds, — we had no space to "rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him."

*Second.* We had thought of man meanly as fallen from his perfection: we now thought of man meanly as unable to rise from his fall. We talked about laws as though they were active, creative agents instead of being the expression of an inexhaustible, creative Mind. The mind of man we sought

to account for in terms of convulsion, nerve centres, more or less phosphorus and blood. We sought to measure the sweep of life by some system which would give us the rhythm of our sensations; and the result was that, when we footed up our column of discoveries, there was left out almost all that makes up life.

*Third.* Still another difficulty lay at the root of our mistake. We had misconceived what man is. We had declared man to be an individual to be dissected piecemeal. He was a specimen in a laboratory, he was the result of a calculation, he was the last stage in a process of evolution; and, by a curious omission in our thinking, we forgot to account for the man who had selected the specimen, who had made the calculation, and who had discovered the world process of which he himself was the last expression. He could not be the last expression, for he was still calculating. If all the universe had gone sterile from that day; if there was never to be another birth in time; if no poem was ever to be written more, nor any music set to themes new and inspiring; if the slides had been shut over every telescope, and there was never to be another star discovered; if all invention had stopped, and the creative faculty in man had come to naught; if the last refinement of life had crumbled into dust,—this indeed might be the Last Judgment, and man the last exuding drop from the essence of being. But none of these things was thought. Their inquiry as to what man is was made up of an infinite curiosity, of an absorbing desire, of a relentless will, of an inexorable ideal, of a haunting vision, of a deathless affection. So that, as we could not determine what man was in terms of sense, so also it became impossible to determine what man was in terms of thought. It was not even possible to satisfy the relationship of man to man in terms of moral life. Somehow or other, there seemed to be pressed in upon our minds that in the sounding of a chord upon the keys of life the interval was as important as the note. What fills the interval, we said? and Physical Science, passing by, not able to give any answer to our spiritual passion, still said,—as one who would not disturb the thinking of her votaries,—“There is no such thing as empty space.” What fills the interval, then, we said, between man and man? What is it which so fills the interval as to produce a humanity? What is the subtle medium by virtue of which we declare for the solidarity of the race? The planets swing in their atmosphere, but the planets are tied together by the ether. The nerves bridge like strings over the framework of the human form; but the nerve

influence speaks crosswise, from string to string, like the answering music upon the strings of a harp. Minds are not even apart: they speak when they utter nothing, and are aware of the inarticulate. And what shall be said for love, from the mere comfort of the child pressed against its mother's heart to the inclusive benignity that dreams of universal peace? Love does not depend upon any of its elements, but is shot through and penetrated, bound together, submerged in one inclusive medium, for which until then no sufficient name had been found.

For all these things the word "Man" is not enough. He had been beholder, participant, victim and victor by turns, in the age-long struggle, to show that "the all-powerful was the all-loving, too." He gradually rose to the conception of the fact that man is not individual and related, but personal and identified with that organic whole of which he is a part which can be in no wise spared. His individuality was absorbed in the whole of what he calls humanity; his individual rights were taken up into an organism that he calls society; his tides rose and fell, but never left the sea of which they are a part. Man has to account for himself in some term larger than his individual rights, necessities, and interests can furnish.

Here, in my judgment, we get the true meaning of the word "personality." This is the rise of man to a recognition of his share in the sum of mind. So profoundly does this impress him that, when he says Mind, he does not mean all the minds there are in sight or even all the minds there are on the earth. He measures himself by infinite reaches in the past, since the first voluntary motion of the lowest organized of all the creatures on the earth showed that it had begun to take its way alone, so that the stretches behind him of what he is pleased to call infinite distance palpitate with mind.

At one time he is told that in millions upon millions of years his earth will be gathered into the burning centre of the sun, or at another that the sun shall grow cold, and his earth shall freeze beyond the possibility of sustaining life; and at once he begins to wonder what mind is doing in all the worlds that have not yet come to their full flower of life-producing power. And, still again, he cries out for some subtle bond that unites worlds together, and dimly feels that the universal mind is the fecund soil out of which thought grows, and being is produced, and relations are established, and will starts out. So for a while he consoles himself that he has discovered the Infinite, and that the Infinite is per-

sonal ; but this identification of himself as personal with the personal Infinite has lost from the personality of God location, immediateness, and all those conditions in which the individual shared but in which mind as person only exists. But nothing has happened in religion which has not happened in society, in nationality, in a word, in humanity. Society is not a group of people simply. In its most frivolous form, it is bound together by a common delight. In its most serious form, it is girded by a common purpose, though the organism we call society at its extremities may be unconscious of this purpose. The heart of it beats central, and floods the extremities with the same vital fluid which moves in the conspiring mind and in the determining will. Society has ceased to be individual, a collection of atoms, a mere pile of interests, a jostling crowd, and is "an organism in which every cell has consciousness." "The injury of one becomes the interest of all"; and poison deposited by ever so little a puncture in any cell of this organism registers at last in the quality of its blood. In other words, society has personality. The standard of civilization is found not in the added testimony of all the individuals, but in the co-ordinated impulse of the whole body. This is personality in society.

So also in nationality. The first two contending wills in a patriarchal system out of which the tribe is to grow is individualism at the beginning of history. The tribe begins the work of subordination. It cannot conquer its neighbor until it has conquered itself. The federated tribes not only shout together, but the six nations of the Red Men are allies of the White. Now begins to assert itself the identity of interest. They no longer seek to exhaust the soil, despoil the forests, consume the game. They now husband their resources, because nationality has risen above its appetites and hungers for a future. Lay your hand upon the map of Europe. The borders of the nations bristle with their threatening armies, but these armies have no power to change the map of Europe. The map of Europe is changed by treaty. The single quill that is dropped from an eagle's wing is raised against the charge of battalions, against triple alliances, congresses of nations, diplomatic conventions. International arbitration is but the groping of the passion for national existence toward the consummation of universal peace. In the nation itself patriotism has passed beyond the condition of a tribal virtue, has long ago escaped the assertion of a provincial vice. But more than this appears in that Passion for Country which has ceased to be

individual, political, partisan, special, and, standing before its own flag in a foreign land, sheds tears of delight, as it would shed its blood in a passion to save the nation's honor. Nationality is personality. It speaks a language which all civilized peoples can understand: it denounces in terms of death those who are traitors to its own ideals; and its charge against the traitor is not simply that he has betrayed his trust, but that he has exalted his individual will above the common good. He is a part of the machinery that has dropped out; he is a human brother that has run amuck; he is stricken with the disease of hatred of the common good. He is not content to die alone, but must infect with his contagion the national life; and the personality of the nation is offended by the individuality of his protest.

An ordered herd can never be a commonwealth; for national life has common weal for its desire, co-operation for its endeavor, patriotism for its creed, loyalty for its communion, and writes over the altars of its sacrifice, "Here we lay our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." The personality of national life forbids monarchy as its final form and stamps anarchy as its relentless foe: it is the merging of the individual in the national person.

So, also, in the contact of man with the universe. He no longer stands apart to see it go. Whatever is, as part of the universal life, is in him. He is a microcosm, registering the tides and measuring the spaces of the sidereal heavens. No flash of light falls from the remotest star but his spectrum turns its detective eye upon the flame. He learns the first lesson of natural science when he discovers that all he knows he is made aware of, not by virtue simply of what he sees, but by virtue of its relation to the background against which it is set. He begins to build his creed concerning the universal when he separates from his dogmatic utterances the individual and special. All the hurrying confusion of modern thought begins to range itself before the challenge of his ordered mind. One day he wakes to the conviction that the unity of science lies not in its materials, but in its methods. On another day he whispers to himself the secret of the Protean changes which leave the world never the same as form, but always the same as reality. And one scientist says to another, "Is it true that there is a correlation of forces?" to which the other answers, "It is true, because there is a conservation of energy."

Gradually the aspiring will of the seeker is humbled before the asserted order of the things sought. He apprehends it all only in terms of mind, and all knowledge is the com-



pared apprehension of these terms of mind one with the other. He beholds individuality against a background of personality. Individuality is the effort. Uniformity is the purpose. Personality is the co-ordinated result. When the effort fails or falters, it is re-enforced from behind. It blooms diversely as flower because it is nourished duly as root, but the nourishing soil is the same. It was a tremendous discovery in the science of human life when it was declared: "I am the vine: ye are the branches; but my Father is the husbandman." The greatest and the smallest spring from one soil, and are tended by one nurture. In a universe which is mind in motion, spirit in expression, purpose in act, love in full flower, the discovery of the nurture and care of God is not more a consolation in religion than it is the inspiration of knowledge. "There is but one energy, and all forces are modes of its manifestation," is said one to another by men who rise from prayer to the confidences of life.

Now what does this mean? It means that the show of things has risen from the substantial ground of being. It means that the moving panorama of the world is devised, painted, set going, and apprehended in terms of mind; that we behold not things so much as we behold thoughts that have become things, in order that they may register themselves again as thoughts. For, if the human mind does not secrete the world, at least it absorbs it. And, when we say of God that "he has thought the universe through," we are simply declaring that the process which is a fact in human experience seems to that human experience now infinite in extension. Observe that this is conscious experience of human personality, in which all substantial things float as in the sea that includes them or into which they flow as tributary to new creations of the mind. This human personality that declares the world in terms of mind is not thought, it is not calculation: its only scepticism is the protest of the constant against the unusual. It is none of these things.

*We rise thus to a higher statement of man's personality.*

The perceiving mind does not argue nor debate. It reflects, it absorbs, it is, it knows. Whatever traffic may go through the gates of sense must be laid down here for the essential personal mind. This is the centre of tribute, this is the distributing centre of our trade with the world. Minds may differ in their thinking, may wrangle in their debate, may suffer for their scepticism, may make discoveries by virtue of it, and all these are special, individual, and peculiar; but perception, apprehension, conception, and reflec-

tion,—all that is built up that is common to the race and felt by the race in unison,—this is not individual nor special nor peculiar. This is the very substance of being, this is the personality of man. Again, the phraseology of the ancient religious utterance becomes applicable to every school of science, to every arena of debate; for with new meaning we utter, "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." Faith is not a proposition. It has been defined by one of our own God-conscious souls as the conviction that "there is something in the universe which corresponds to my best"; and by an older soul, conscious of God, it was declared, "It is the substance of things hoped for, it is the evidence of things unseen." So that the perceiving mind asserts its relationships, and its own personality claims kin with the inclusive personality.

"O heart I made, a heart beats here !  
Face my hands fashioned, see it in myself !  
Thou hast no power, nor may conceive of mine ;  
But love I gave thee, with myself to love."

We have said that this appeal to consciousness in the presence of material immensities is not thought nor speculation nor debate. Here a light is thrown upon the personality of God. God does not think nor debate, nor devise schemes by which he will subdue reluctant material to his will. Thought involves comparison; debate supposes argument; a scheme is built up little by little. But the Eternal Mind does not take out of its stores of thought an exhibit: it overflows the actual from centre to rim of being, and is there, and knows. In some vague way the wandering Hebrew, puzzled by the burning intervals between oasis and oasis of his march, makes the great discovery that Deity is not occasional and local, that Egypt is not alien, nor Canaan native to God; and, when he is asked the commission by virtue of which the peasant shall stand before the king, he is able to say, "*I am* that I am hath sent me unto thee." Here is no interval that God does not fill, here is no distance God does not span; and the inequalities of life shall flow together when the cup of being brims. It is the dim groping in terms of consciousness for a Being who always is and who never has to come, who always has been and therefore never shall arrive. It is the impact of the ever-present on the occasional; it is the assertion of the rights of the individual as part of the inclusive whole; it is the beginning of that great doctrine of the Unity of God, based in the integrity of mind.

What does this, then, force upon us as a conclusion that may not be averted? If God does not think, because he is the mind which knows; if God does not come, because he has never departed; if the phenomena that bloom upon the soil of reality draw their nourishment from roots deep set in being,—then my little individual anxieties,—the things I think when I bend over the crucible in which conflicting elements are to be fused,—these have no share in being that does not think nor speculate nor reason. Our contact is not thus with God, else were he not *personal and immediate*. But holy emotions, sanctities of aspiration, the sacramental loves of life,—these are the only point of contact which may be called immediate between the Infinite Person and the conscious personality in man.

The struggling soul matches one argument against another, trying to join the edges of its apprehension of the reality of things, seeking to fix a dial upon which it may register the discoveries of its experience; and, when it has done its utmost, it then descends into the deep places of religious emotion, and finds the wells of life deep and crystal clear, here is the centre of the divine affections. It only can know God in terms of love. "Canst thou by searching find out God?" is an inquiry as ancient as human failure returning from its search. It has its answer for all time in that beatitude, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

There is but one description for love: all loves fly one way. It is the keynote upon which the divine love is composed. When our life becomes divine and sounds the note, the universe answers. Is it any wonder that the Alexandrian School should have devised a thought of God lifted above the anthropomorphism of the Semitic mind? It is no wonder that a Father of the Church should have called the Fourth Gospel "the heart of Christ," or that a localized Jehovah should have been substituted by the Eternal Logos, the varying speech and utterance of the invariable Absolute.

Does anybody believe that a mere revival of Judaism in terms of temple, holy city, stereotyped ritual, and inviolable law, could furnish forth a world religion? The ethical passion of the Jew, in which the heart of man cried out for the unity of life, and reminded the world from every hut in Palestine that "Jehovah, God, was one Jehovah," went crying through the ages until it met its answer in the Greek faith, in the doctrine of spirit, in all spirit of art, spirit of literature, spirit of Greece, spirit of the ideal republic, spirit

of the gods, Zeus and his spirit, Olympus actual and Olympus ideal; and this haggard ethical passion seized upon the rounded beauty of the Greek spirit, and found the answer of individual desire in the conscious personality of the Logos, "which was in the beginning, and was with God, and was God." The Christian Church is no more built upon the tribalism of the Jewish faith than it depends upon the individuality of the Jewish prophet. I do not know whether Jesus ever said, "God is Spirit"; but I am sure that those who had caught the secret of his love for God and man had to say it soon after him. It is a matter for critics to determine whether the utterances of the Fourth Gospel are literal quotations from an individual mind. It is far likelier that they are the conscious impact of divine affection on the necessities of life. Until the universality of religion finds its expression in the immanence of God, "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all," this is the most tremendous discovery that religion ever made. It is not the declaration of sovereignty nor of fatherhood. Long before that time the word "Father" had passed out of the functions of creation into the higher sanctities of love. It is the discovery of God not simply in all things, but transcendent. It is the discovery of God not as overshadowing, but immanent. It is the discovery of God not as separate even by his sanctities, but immediate because of our communion,— "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Thus the origins of Christianity provide the language of modern thought. He who sees most of God now can say no more. He who sees other than this sees less than God.

In this aspect of God as personal and immediate the ordered world is the procession of his life,— the multiplying worlds are the registry of unexhausted mind; law is the gradual assertion of that normal order in morals which finds its archetypal pattern in eternal justice; sin is the attempt to establish in terms of will a contradiction to the will eternal. It can never be: it can only be attempted; and the pain and anguish are like ugliness; it is "dislocation from the life of God," which is beauty. And so without knowing it they are doing the will of God who declare against sickness and deformity and hideousness of all kinds; for the mind which has "thought the universe through" has thought it through in terms of beauty. And so they also are striving for the same end who declare against envy (this is individualism which would have more than its own) and hatred (this is individualism which does not love the other)

and lust,—for this is not order, but inordinate desire; and no man looking up into the heavens, and seeing how they palpitate with God, can fail to add, "In all worlds love must be better than hate."

We stretch our hands upward in prayer: we would embrace the immediate God. We fall upon the earth in adoration: it is holy ground which pulses with his life. We feel as though our hearts would break for the sorrow of the world, for it is missing the vision of the eternal. We kindle not from below, but from above; for the downfall of the immediate God has become immanent in our consciousness. We would not ask him to grant us anything, but to be near. We have forgotten the art of petition. We turn from supplication as from something individual and not personal; and prayer is divine affection seeking its own. The flower is opening because the sun has risen; the earth is warm because the sun is shining; the banks are full because the snow is melting. It is summer in the soul. The universe is no longer matter and spirit, but spirit registering its will in terms material for us still in the body. The universe is not so many worlds more or less, but *conscious personality*. From centre to rim it has one will. Its life is not a rising and falling tide of vitality: it is an inexhaustible wealth of love. The universe is a Conscious Personality to the conscious personal worshipper. It can be no more and no other while he remains personal, conscious, and adoring, God is to him immediate. This is the limit of what man can, because it is the measure of what man is.

There has come into religion a new motive,—the assertion not of the individual, but the adoration of an inclusive personality. The old heroism, by which the martyr refused to deny his Lord, is substituted now by that finer loyalty of the devout soul to the order of the universe which is no longer individual, but personal; and he cannot deny that great other without the alternative that he has repudiated himself. This is that personality, like an ever-present ideal, declaring to our conscious souls, "He that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul."

"I report, as a man may of God's work—all's love, yet all's law.

... Each faculty tasked  
To perceive him, has gained an abyss, where a dewdrop was asked.  
Have I knowledge? Confounded, it shrivels at Wisdom laid bare.  
Have I forethought? How purblind, how blank, to the Infinite Care;  
Do I task any faculty highest, to image success?  
I but open my eyes,—and perfection, no more and no less,  
In the kind I imagined, full-fronts me, and God is seen God  
In the star, in the stone, in the flesh, in the soul and the clod.

And thus looking within and around me, I ever renew  
(With that stoop of the soul which in bending upraises it, too)  
The submission of man's nothing-perfect to God's all-complete,  
As, by each new obeisance in spirit, I climb to his feet.

Do I find love so full in my nature, God's ultimate gift,  
That I doubt his own love can compete with it? Here the parts shift?  
Here the creature surpass the Creator,— the end, what Began?  
Would I fain in my impotent yearning do all for this man,  
And dare doubt he alone shall not help him, who yet alone can?

I believe it! 'Tis thou, God, that givest, 'tis I who receive;  
In the first is the last, in thy will is my power to believe.  
All's one gift: thou canst grant it moreover, as prompt to my prayer  
As I breathe out this breath, as I open these arms to the air."

## RECENT TENDENCIES TOWARD ANTHRO- POMORPHISM IN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

BY PROF. CHARLES N. TYLER, ITHACA, N.Y.

Religion is both the impulse and goal of all human progress.

Throughout the march of the race, while its forms are manifold, its essence is one.

He who seizes its essence, in psychological rather than in historical study, will regard with serenity and charity all the forms it has assumed in all parts of the world and in all the passage of time. The sectarian, however, will continue to exalt the form above the essence. By him morphology will be ranked of more importance than ontological study. The devout student will discern in all religions the effort of God to find expression of a cosmic purpose of Love. He will study with sympathetic interest all movements which seem to be regressive in any age remote or modern, as being, possibly, a form of progress; for the course of development is not a rectilinear, but a winding course, necessitated by difference of religious capacity, by geographical position, by social temperament, and by the conflicts of the peoples with each other and the stern forces of nature. Even the long dark period of mediæval Christianity, a single chapter in the historical development of the religious capacity of man, a progress which has been continuous on the planet for an incalculable time,—and even that age of gloom in which Christianity assumed an iron rôle, and was organized into a world-kingdom,—may have been, in the larger perspective, necessary to found the future life of the modern peoples and to the liberation of modern thought. Who can assume to be wiser than Providence, and affirm that mediæval Christianity, with all its anthropomorphic conceptions of God and the world, crowding as it did all nature and life with miraculous interventions, profoundly ignorant of the universe and its laws, was not an indispensable link in the chain of progressive destiny? We are not permitted by reason to regard that period as a great mistake. Primitive Christianity, with its softness of temper, its aloofness from the world, politics and war looking only for a heavenly city, could never have vanquished the warlike German tribes.

The apostles could not have done the work of mail-clad bishops and pontiffs.

As believers in development, we can no longer denounce the past in the strain of an indignant reformer of former time or in that of some fanatical herald of the renaissance.

Now, believing in the divine method of development, we are surprised to see in certain circles of religious thought an apparent return to mediæval conceptions of the nature of God. The anthropomorphism, or, to use perhaps a better term, the anthropopsychism, of the past ages seems to threaten a revival. The new ritualism in England has provoked a hesitant encyclical from Canterbury.

An American scholar, who is still firmly orthodox in theology, having ventured upon a cautious, not to say timid, application of the divine law of psychical progress to the Hebrew Scripture, has sent consternation into the camp of conservative religion.

These phenomena may seem to indicate an arrest of evolutionary progress, or what may be better termed the advance of man's religious consciousness under the touch of the Divine Spirit, liberating him to the discernment of higher spiritual ideals.

But the patient thinker will not mistake the reflux as an arrest of the advancing wave.

Progress may be saved from one-sidedness by fluctuation; and, when an excessive emphasis is laid upon the Immanence of God, a counter-emphasis of the Divine Transcendence may be needed.

The stress laid upon the cult and the revival of the æsthetic form in Anglican worship, the spasmodic effort once more here and over the seas to fortify dogma, may seem to indicate a lapse from spiritualistic to fetichistic modes of thought and feeling. Be it so, but we must remember that primitive fetichism itself was not wholly a degeneracy until it sank to a coarse idolatry. It checked a tendency to vague amorphous spiritism, which, though a higher stage of religious philosophy, could not satisfy the religious want. To follow out the analogy for a moment, I hope, will not be an irrelevance.

Students of primitive religion do not indulge an excessive confidence in their psychology of the origin and essence of religion; yet there is a general and confident consent that anthropology, by a wide induction of facts, has shown that the earliest form which religious feeling and thought assumed was that of naturistic animism. Religion did not spring from animism, but was dominated by it as an early term of



thought. By this we mean that man adored the Power or Agency as being one and the same with the physical phenomenon itself. Thunder, lightning, sun-power, were just the visible agents, and agents only as visible.

Whether primitive man was a monotheist or a monist, as Mr. A. Lang and Mr. Jevons contend, whether he had at all times or only in exalted moments a vision of the unity of the manifold agencies as a Supreme Agent, I will not delay to consider. The point is that in this earliest simple philosophy of religion there was the belief in a nature agent not yet separated from the physical appearance.

Then came an immense discovery. Under the touch of the Infinite Spirit there occurred what we might term an explosion in the religious self-consciousness of man. However it came, whether by visions in dreams of his ancestors or of ghastly battles with his foes or wild beasts in which he seemed to leave behind his recumbent body, he now separated matter and spirit. In the first stage of this discovery religion took the form of polyzoism to distinguish it from the more advanced spiritism.

Thus flashed upon him the vision of all spirits of earth, sea, and sky, who could at will become incarnate in the storm, the cloud, and the bowlder. Vast stride of the soul to spiritism, but fraught with danger! Spiritism has sundered the agents from fixed phenomena, sent them away pell-mell in absolute independence to roam everythither. Thus spirit is seen to be the essential thing in advanced beings. Already our doctrine of Divine Immanence is implicit in spiritism. The permanent spiritual ground of all changes is on its way to recognition,—the purer conception of God as spirit, whom we must worship in spirit and truth. But the soul of man can hold no communion with a rabble of vagrant spirits, and demands friendly juxtaposition in some fixed object of wood or stone, some crag or tree or distant hill. Reacting from a pantheistic spiritism, fetichism performed a service, by charms or threats imprisoned again the spirit agent in a fixed place and form, as an amulet about the wrist or a totem before the hut, within reach of the worshipper. This is the primitive anthropomorphism, or zo-omorphism and polymorphism; and it meets a great want. And so this word "fetichism" may reproach our modern thought. Of Nigritian origin, it may be applied, not only to the Polynesian taboo, the American totemism, but also to the use of amulets, the worship of the bones of saints, the holy coat of Trèves, the kerchief of Saint Veronica, the crucifix, and even the order of church service and the books of Scripture. Fetichism was innocent

so long as it strove to bring the Divine Spirit nearer to man. It was baleful when the object in which it was persuaded or forced to become incarnate was worshipped at last in place of the spirit,—in a word, when it became pure idolatry. Then it ceases to challenge our respect. Idolatry is never the original form of religion. And so in our own day it is hard to differentiate a rich symbolism which religious and æsthetic feeling have created from idolatry itself. The national standard, the pillared senate house, the old ship of war, became in a sense, to some minds, fetiches. And yet fetichism, though a step backward in primitive religious philosophy, was a corrective of a pantheistic polydemonism.

I have thus by your indulgence made this discursion to show that an anthropomorphical tendency in modern religious thought may not always be an arrest of progress, but in the end minister to it. Thesis, antithesis, synthesis, seems to be the law of progress.

We could wish that progress were always right onward. But movements which test our charity or disturb our Christian and philosophic serenity may be necessary to a final and higher synthesis of religious ideas. "The English Revolution," says Prof. Goldwin Smith, "produced several great men; but we cannot afford to get up a revolution every time we want a great man."

We may not like these arrests of thought, but we may derive consolation from the belief that they are a part of the providential order.

Religious progress is to be psychologically rather than historically studied, as history enables us to turn our searchlight upon the psychic phenomena in man for many centuries indeed, but not into the dark and blackened abysm of time. It is to be expected that in our own age we shall find primitive stages of thought side by side with the conceptions of a more liberated consciousness.

If we are impatient with survivals of animism and even fetichism in certain circles of our Christianity, if we discern in rites and formulas of belief a mental habit which belongs to mediæval and even primitive times, let us remind ourselves that even advanced religious thought is, of necessity, in the higher sense anthropomorphic. Science cannot interpret nature except in terms of man's psychic life; and force is only a word for will, and law for ideal succession. "God is conceived by means of the highest human psychic life." The most rational religion cannot do without symbolism. We must take leave of religion altogether, "when we do without symbols, images, and figures, even if only expressed in words."

The Infinite can be known only in relations and terms of the finite. We must abdicate all knowledge of God or know him in our finite way. It is no hardship to be forced to be anthropomorphic; for that is to remain finite, to continue to be man, to think as man, to feel as man. We must forego all efforts to form a conception of the Infinite; for, to do that, we must become the Infinite, or God himself; and there cannot be two Infinite Beings.

The question is then, Shall we surrender the higher anthropomorphic conceptions to the lower unworthy, primitive anthropomorphism which in some schools of thought obstinately lingers?

True charity will not suffer us to regard those who occupy the lower steps on the stairway of developing religious consciousness otherwise than with that hopeful interest that characterizes seniority and maturity of thought. Even Goethe worshipped Jesus together with the sun. He was not a stranger to the feelings of the ancient worshipper on the hills of Iran who could say,—

"Indian-like,  
Religious in mine error, I adore  
The sun, that looks upon his worshipper,  
But knows of him no more."

The forms of belief and worship which prevail with us are charged with the elements of Aryan-Semitic and Chaldean religion. The Divine Spirit has not been absent from the peoples, and amidst all progressive change the permanent essence of religion has been liberated to higher consciousness and expression.

Who can be oblivious of all that was tender, consoling, and truly sublime in the Christianity of the Dark Ages? Who can fail to see that they who still cling to the old theologies possess, in common with those who hold advanced ideas of God, much spiritual life, a love for humanity, and radiant virtues?

Perhaps, however, the word "reaction" is too strong to characterize the hysterical efforts to discredit the scientific study of the origin and growth of the sacred books and the new impulse to revive the cult of Rome.

It is rather the cry of fear wrung from those who half yield to the current of progress, but are too timid to launch into new seas upon new voyages of discovery of truth.

It is, then, in no spirit of assumption of superior knowledge that the plea is made for a hopeful sympathy for religious minds, whom we are forced to regard as at a lower stage of developing consciousness. All honor to them for the prog-

ress already made, for the scrupulous deliberation with which they have parted with many anthropomorphic prejudices! and I prefer to think that the plaintive and sometimes intolerant hesitation to advance may be inspired by loyalty to the truth, as they have more slowly discovered it.

Meanwhile progressive thought may also lay claim to sincerity; and its motto must be *Nulla vestigia retrorsum*, on pain of eternal injury to the soul.

As Genseric spread his sail in quest of perhaps an unrighteous conquest, and with unscrupulous piety exclaimed, "whithersoever God will take us," so he who ventures upon the sea of truth must in a humble trust abandon himself to the currents of divine reason, fearless of man's censure, and conscious of devout purpose, say also "whithersoever God shall lead me."

Though the primitive barque was a log or dug-out, and in an ideal evolution became a galley, then a sail-winged ship, and then the steamship, we cannot be asked to give up the latest means of navigation and cross the seas in the archaic bottoms.

Nor, while we refuse to rob the child or the youth of the forms of thought in which the immature life must find expression, shall we be wise or right to cling to these elementary manifestations of that potential life which, ceasing to grow and change, is at once smitten with death.

Religion is the unwearied pursuit of the ideal good, of which God is the supreme realization. "Gravitation," says Mr. Emerson, "is in every blow of the woodman's axe." The immanent divinity in man, the infinite Holy Spirit, is urging the soul from the first moment up the heights of character, which in endless succession stretch before the gaze of the human spirit. This is not an evolution by a mechanical law, for we do not tolerate the view of a necessary mechanical impulsion; nor is it such an evolution of the absolute thought that man is but an iridescent bubble on the stream of the infinite consciousness, but it is the self-conscious advance of free finite wills in filial relation to the infinite Good Will, both living in the realm of reason.

As, then, religious progress is psychological, not mechanical or compulsory, it cannot be expected to march in regimental line, but, as the soldiers express it, *en échelon*, or in column; and not any two even of the foremost seekers of spiritual truth can be at the same point of arrival, on the way to the worthiest conception of the Divine Character.

I am quite aware that thus far I have contributed little to the philosophy of present conditions of non-progressive relig-

ious thought. I have only defended that temper of indulgence toward a belated attitude of mind which has strikingly characterized this honored branch of Christianity which has graciously asked the present speaker to give his views of the matter.

Turning our attention now to certain reactionary tendencies in thought which may yet for decades call for the exercise of a patient considerateness on the part of earnest students and lovers of religious truth, I must confess my amazement that so invincible a reluctance still exists to admit the results of scientific and devout study of the origin and development of Old Testament scripture. The Founder of Christianity and the apostles, if living in this age, might be impeached for heresy. Jesus and Saint Paul dealt with Scripture in the freest manner, as having pedagogical value, as of historic interest mainly, as teaching only half-truth, or truth as adapted to an undeveloped spiritual consciousness, or as teaching even error. The decalogue of Moses contained commands of a lofty nature, but the decalogue of the laws of Manu is far nearer to the spirit of Christ's teaching. The laws of Manu declare that immortality is inseparable from a life of virtue, for the good man is already conscious of being immortal; but of immortality Moses makes not the slightest mention. The ethics of Gautama are ethics of character: the ethics of Moses have a more temporal and political outlook. It would seem that the Master, had he known the teachings of Buddha, would have found nothing to reprove save the despair implicit in them. Even the Brahmanic doctrine of loss of personality by absorption in absolute being sprang from the desire to attain ideal perfection. The tender regard for all animal life, the horror of evil as retarding the progress toward the Infinite Good, would have been commended of Jesus; and we may believe that their Brahmanic pantheistic philosophy would have met with a patient hearing and tender reconstruction.

The Master was himself a true evolutionist, teaching the kingdom as a leavening of thought and life; and he substituted forever, for the legal imperatives of the olden time, the ideal imperatives which afford an infinite perspective—love for command, the ideal realization of personality in place of cowering fear of a supreme authority.

The battle, then, over the Mosaic authorship has for present Christianity little, if any, of vital interest.

As indicating stages in the progress of early religious consciousness, the archaic material in the Hexateuch, sifted by reverent scholarship from the contents of the Exilian fabric, may interest the Christian archæologist.

Even the high spiritual note struck by the great prophets in the eighth century is not a note of universal sympathy. The tribal feeling is not yet surpassed. Flashes of ideal insight do indeed light the sky of life, nor does religious feeling even now surmount the purity, even sublimity, of some of their conceptions of Fatherly goodness; and we are surprised at the suddenness of this development. Compared with the Semitic superstitions and fetichistic survivals amidst which the prophets lived, this expansion of thought and feeling attests the indwelling divinity in the soul of man. The question of the relation of Moses to the Pentateuch is of no more importance to the religion of Isaiah than the supposed foundation by Cæsar of the White Tower in London to the existence of the British constitution.

Even the auroral gleams in the age of the prophets which herald the rising of the sun and the teachings of the Master are but midway stages of evolution of the divine purpose, to be remembered with grateful archæological interest, as the code of Alfred was a step in the progress of jurisprudence down to the Victorian age, interesting chiefly to the historian. That modern bishops and laymen should rest the destinies of Christianity upon the Moosaic question would seem to be as unreasonable as to fear that the cathedral of Canterbury or York minster will fall unless we determine the name of the architect or of him who laid the corner-stone.

And this panic is based, I think, upon the anthropomorphic habit of thought, which clings to a theory of inspiration which, dating from the Reformation, is not scriptural; for it is based upon the conception of God as external to nature and man, as creating the latter devoid of religious capacity, as treating him mechanically as a thing, not a person, and by external command and constant interposition in the realm of order, manufacturing history. The question always recurs, How could man or the race have had a religious career without a pure religious capacity, which is itself the Divine Revelation?

If in some quarters there may seem to be a regressive movement to Latin theories of atonement, I cannot regard it as of general significance. Here and there a soul weary of the struggle of thought, constitutionally diffident of one's own judgment and ready to accept the pontifical opinions of others, may think by going over to the celebration of the mass to find lasting repose. From the time of the great Augustine to Anselm and New England theology, one theory has followed another, neither of which resembles that of the pre-Augustine period. As fortresses one after another are

flanked by an advancing army, and fall without assault, so these schemes fade into neglect and oblivion as religious thought has marched on. Conservation in certain zones of faith, like that of the Southern portion of our republic, stands resolutely at bay upon the old belief that salvation is an objective, not a subjective fact, though by happy inconsistency many are made to live pure and good lives in spite of this anthropomorphic belief in an external salvation.

But one rarely hears even from conservative pulpits a studied defence of the forensic or objective theory, and such a discussion would cause a flutter of impatience even among those who silently stand upon the old ways.

Salvation, it is more and more felt, must come through self-development and self-realization as the only conceivable redemption; nor is this a rejection of grace, but the result of grace conceived as the divine impulse in the constitution of man.

Our Lord himself may, without irreverence, be said to have been Aristotelian; for he taught self-fulfilment, without which salvation is impossible. Saint Paul's rabbinical theory was a historic incident, which could not wholly bury under this thought of his Master.

Jesus teaches not the "right to bliss," to welfare and repose, but a right to character, to self-realization.

It was his unique doctrine that we are *not saved* from divine reprisal, nor from without, but from within, but saved from the lower sensuous self to the ideal or higher self, which is always to become the more or less perfect expression of the Supreme Reality.

This advancing self-realization, this never-ending Santa Scala, leading upward toward Infinite Goodness, is the Master's idea of salvation. It can be achieved only by walking after him the Via Dolorosa, the path of suffering. I conceive this to be the great secret of his religion, and perhaps Madame Swetchine is right in saying that resignation is the essence of religion.

Prof. Paulsen tells us that Albert Lange, the author of *History of Materialism*, deemed it of vital importance that we look not upon life wholly as optimists, but that, to grow in good character, we should recognize suffering as essential to virtue and religion. In conversation with Ueberweg he expressed the desire that certain hymns should be sung by the people; and to Ueberweg's impatient question, Which hymns? Lange, who was much inclined to scepticism, promptly answered that one at least should be adopted,—namely, "O Haupt voll blut und wunden." It is a startling and pathetic

declaration of Prof. Royce, "In you, God himself suffers, precisely as you do, and has all your concern in overcoming this grief"; and if we ask, Why does he suffer? the same writer answers, "Because without suffering, without ill, without woe, evil tragedy, God's life could not be perfected. . . . It is a logically necessary and eternal constituent of the Divine Life."

Whether evil is, as the present Master of Balliol, Prof. Paulsen, and Royce contend, a part of the very constitution of the world and necessary to the realization of good, one thing is certain; suffering is the friend of the soul; and whoever gazes at the ideal, and strenuously pursues it, must be made perfect by trial, as it behooved the Captain of our salvation to be made perfect through suffering.

We recognize as truly great only those who have passed through conflict and suffering. It was Tennyson's grief over the loss of Arthur Hallam that produced the "In Memoriam." It was the exile of Dante that made possible the "Divina Commedia." It was the sorrow and tragic death of Lincoln which has enskyed him as a saint in our political firmament.

"The symmetries of character," says Dr. Martineau, "the requirements of perfection, are no provincialisms of this planet. They are known among the stars, they reign beyond Orion and the Southern Cross, they are wherever the universal spirit is. Jesus was an incarnation of this ideal of perfection; and in us is the ideal to become incarnate. And, as man cannot in finite time perform the work of realization, he must be immortal, that the work may go on in infinite time." A man is immortal till his work is done; and the work of man as a moral being is never done. The morality is another word for the immortality of man.

Bishop Brooks finely said of Jesus: "All doing of his work is ripening of his nature. Jesus in the still night, far off upon the solitary hill-top, Jesus in the broad daylight, dragged by the hooting mob to Calvary,—both of them are Jesus saving the world. Christ escaped the perplexity of many of the questions with which our lives are troubled, as the eagle flying through the sky is not worried how to cross the rivers."

The true salvation of men is subjective, is self-fulfilment. We need not fear of being shut up in the self; for no egoism can exist without altruism. "Only through society," says Mr. Green, "is man's personality actualized." He who seeks his higher self seeks the welfare of others as part of his larger self. "Our highest good is the highest good of others.



‘To thine own self be true;  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man.’

The inner life of the individual is deep and full just in proportion to the width of his relation to other men and things; and his consciousness of what he is in himself as a spiritual being is dependent on a comprehension of the position of his individual life in the great secular process by which the intellectual and moral life of humanity has grown and is growing.” (E. Caird.)

What were Luther’s mission and Wesley’s (asks Prof. James) but appeals to powers which even the meanest of men might carry with them,—faith and self-despair,—but which were personal, requiring no priestly intermediation, and which brought their owner face to face with God?

To live this strenuous life, aiming at perfection, is to bear the cross, to suffer and die in order to live. “Die that you may live,” said Goethe. “Suffering,” says Paulsen, “to secure character, is the secret of religion.”

Thus the anthropomorphic view of the sufferings of Jesus, which have darkened the portrait of God and filled life with gloom, is outgrown. As we are free to pursue the ideal of perfection and feel the eternal obligation to do so, salvation can come in no objective fashion. Not even omnipotence can make man good unless he makes himself so. The divine, not external to, but in the soul, in its very constitution and acting through the laws of our psychical being, is the ground and possibility of self-realization. Sabatier has pointed out the fundamental conflict of modern religious thought, the autonomous *versus* the heteronomous; *i.e.*, the divine law of man’s constitution as one of self-realization *versus* authority, tradition and the conception of a God as outside of man and the world.

No mere command of God, no impact of power from outside, can make a sinner into a saint. It is man himself, divinely constituted, and by virtue of those divine ideals which, like semaphores, beckon him onward, not from distant hills of the world, but from heights of his own conscious self-realization,—it is this man feeling the divine impulse to self-fulfilment who must save himself. No mechanical device, no vicarious external passion, can make him pure and good. Work out your own salvation, for it is God who worketh in you. “Suffer me,” says Jean Paul, “to believe that this world is for the imitation of God and Christ, and the future for the exact knowledge of the same, and that one who would rather prove the godhead of Christ than to

obey his precepts is like the servant who spends his whole time in proving the nobility of his master, but gives him neither love nor obedience."

Salvation begins with self-realization as we walk in the footsteps of Him who was faithful unto death. Immortality must begin here. Neither character nor an immortal life can be given to him who does not already possess them.

The source of the obsolescent dogmatic, it is obvious, is found in primitive conceptions of the personality of God. Under what heavy burdens has piety staggered, because God has been regarded as like the man in the next street, to use the words of Mr. Matthew Arnold!

The old view of the Divine Personality has been productive of many hurtful dogmas.

But here, again, the reaction forward from the false to the true anthropomorphism is not wholly free from danger. In moving onward and away from the lower views of God's personality, it would be a violent procedure to deny that there is a more highly conceived personality; for that would be to cast away—as the Germans say—the child with the water of the bath. "Human and divine personality stand or fall together."

Personality is not only the beginning and end of metaphysics, and of science as well, but religion can hardly live in the thin air of a universe from which divine personality is eliminated. To give up divine is to give up human personality, therefore, to naturalize wholly and demoralize man by reducing him to become the product of molecular change: hence an irresponsible thing. Neither an idealistic nor a materialistic monism can safeguard religion.

The real personality of man and that of God is the Ilium to be defended, in order to get under way either in philosophy, science, or theology. I cannot persuade myself, in order to explain the origin of evil and to gain a unitary view of the world, to refund the free personality of man into an impersonal Absolute, which can be no less than necessitated in its manifestations, to the consequent extinction of all human responsibility.

The dualism of God and man as persons is a better account of the rise of evil. Nor does the view of Dr. E. Caird, Prof. Paulsen, and Prof. Royce, that evil is of God and in the constitution of things, as necessary as the shadow to the light in the picture, and without which virtue is inconceivable,—this view does not reach unity, but only carries the dualism over into the Divine Being himself.

The Supreme Personality may be regarded as superhuman,

but still homogeneous with the human. The divine cannot surely be inferior to the human personality. The capacity for thought, for feeling, and willing, regarded as an infinite capacity, is the highest conceivable attribute of God.

To say that God is but an Unknown Force is to degrade him below man, to derive the greater from the less; for man who can think, love, and freely act, is a higher fact than gravitation.

Meanwhile a true psychology, and religion as well, assure us that there is an ideal self toward which we consciously strive, and which is an ever becoming expression of the personality of God.

In this strenuous idealistic life, it is always evident that the actual gives way to advancing realization. We are forever arriving at perfection, while we can never wholly arrive.

I confess, then, that for me to surrender God's personality, as one of love, reason, and purpose, is to enter a realm of metaphysical gloom, where not only religion, but all reasoning, must be finally surrendered.

And I find in all subtle contentions for Impersonality at the heart of the universe, not far away, naïve implications of Personality, either in the reasoning process or in the results of the process. Individuality is mistaken for personality. As individuals, we are finite. As persons, we partake of the Infinite. Absolute Personality is not necessarily finite. To say so is to decide in advance. The ideas "Infinite" and "Personal" are not a contradiction.

And perhaps, as loyal to reason and common sense, we may accept as the final word the expression of Lotze: "Perfect personality is in God only. To all finite minds there is allotted a pale copy thereof. The finiteness of the finite is not a producing condition of this personality (that is, is not anthropomorphism), but a limit and hindrance of its development." I should rather say of its manifestation in us rather than its development.

I would by no means imply that they who advocate the impersonal view are irreligious. The heart has its reasons where the head can give none, and God holds moored to himself many a reasoner who seems to himself to be lost in the mist.

Having thus defended the belief in the Supreme Person from the charge of making God an exaggerated man, I recognize the extent to which a lower conception of the Divine Nature has rested like a nightmare upon much of the theology of the centuries past.

In patience let us await the fuller liberation, conscious

that our children may have to lament the thralldom to which, in our imperfect estimate of our religious duty and possible achievement, we are still subject.

We have seen, I think, that there is a true and false anthropomorphism. The question is in order. Shall we, as finite beings, cease to interpret God's character in finite terms and by the use of symbols?

Language itself is symbolic; and, in the highest flights of reason, we must use words of objective and sensuous origin. "Language," says Jean Paul, "is *ein Wörterbuch erblasseter Metaphern*,"—a dictionary of faded metaphors. Will religion ever reach a stage when symbol and metaphor will be needed no more? Is there to come a religion of the abstract and silent sort which will need no ecclesiastical form, no worship in temple or cathedral, no formulas of belief? How much of the phenomenal and external, which we yet retain, is to be left behind us in our progressive realization of spiritual life? Will the time come when, with the Germans, we can say, "I can out of religiousness accept no one of the concrete religions nor any concrete religion"?

Would not this be simply to fly above our finite conditions, a ceasing to be man, to think as man, to feel as man? How angels or archangels may think can be of no earthly interest to us here below. To be compelled to think, feel, and will, in any transcendent fashion, is a thought to make us shiver. If, as Victor Hugo says, man is the tadpole of an archangel, we must still use the faculties of the tadpole. I confess to feeling at times weary of sermons, impatient of infelicitous public prayer, weary of the conscientious but intolerant demands of the social piety which often invades the sacred liberties of the soul. In my weakness, perhaps sinfulness, I sometimes think that seclusion is better for me than public worship.

But I recall the words of Balzac: "A religion is the heart of a people. It expresses its sentiments, and exalts them in giving them an end; but, without a God visibly honored, religion exists no more. In consequence, human laws have no vigor. If the conscience belongs to God alone, the body falls under the social law. Is it not the beginning of atheism to thus efface the signs of religious sorrow, not to indicate strongly to children who do not as yet reflect, and to all those who have need of examples, the necessity to obey the laws by a manifest resignation to the orders of Providence who strikes and consoles, who gives and takes away the goods of this world? Religion is certainly a bond, and certainly the cult of religion constitutes the only force which

can bind together the social classes and give them durable form."

But the question returns: What is essential religion, and what is anthropomorphic, to be left behind? Is not religion just the love and pursuit of goodness, and is not God the ideal of supreme goodness? Whoso neglects goodness and lays the whole stress upon the means of attaining goodness is in reality an atheist. He who makes a fetish of the priestly dignity, the form or the rite, the authority of councils, the theological statement, or substitutes the æsthetic rapture experienced under lofty domes or in long-drawn aisles and before storied shrines for the strenuous good life, is not less than an atheist. Perish all but divine and human goodness! Even the wave of emotion that fills the souls of a kneeling throng may not be religion. Better for the world that no cathedral had been raised, no council of prelates ever gathered, no bishop or pontiff been enthroned, unless moral goodness, that eternal quality of God, had found some expression. Goodness first, last, and forever. It would seem that something else, some extra-human property called holiness, something I know not what, has been expected to come down from God, and, like a plaster, to be applied to man, doing away with the necessity of possessing this subjective quality of moral goodness. The study of history is profitable. There have been many good bishops, and councils have been composed of men who loved God and their fellow-men. But it must be confessed that both in ancient and modern times church senates have convened which have been a scandal to the world. It was Gregory of Nazianzen who said in agony of spirit, "It would seem as though a herald had convoked to the assembly all the gluttons, villains, liars, and false swearers of Europe."

To such men did Christendom find itself indebted for much of the anthropomorphism which has retarded religious progress. And how often have cynical voluptuaries and haughty prelates directed the destinies of the Church and formulated creeds whose empire over thought has been disastrous!

The Emperor Constantine presided at one of the councils of which modern churchmen speak with reverence approaching to awe. The emperor himself had murdered his nephew, his son, and his wife. Bad as he had been, he was shocked at the conduct of theologians who were devoid of moral goodness, and were atheists at heart, who yet drew up a statement of doctrine to be binding upon the Church for centuries.

It was called the robber council. The Right Reverend Bishop of Constantinople knocked down and trampled on the Right Reverend the Bishop of Alexandria, and kicked him until he died.

Am I wrong in saying that all the great minsters in Christendom might better sink in ruins, all apostolical successions be shown to be a fiction? Roman and Greek ecclesiasticisms and Protestant sects might better never have existed, all systems of theology constructed by Augustine and his successors along the ages have never been thought out, than moral goodness cease out of life. Save all others and let goodness fail, and they are of no worth. They are but means to the great end, the moral and spiritual good. Happily, goodness and love have dwelt secure in millions of hearts who knew little of speculative dogma.

Is there any higher object to contemplate and pursue than the moral goodness of God? Was not the whole aim of Jesus to make men moral, and is not morality another word for goodness, and is not the perfect goodness the name of God?

The life and sacrifice of our Lord were essential to the founding of a kingdom of goodness. Publicans and Magdalens were taught first of all to sin no more, to restore ill-gotten gains and save and love the neighbor. Dogmatic tests assumed higher importance, as time went on, than divine moral conduct.

Again and again we are forced to ask, Did the Christ come for any other purpose than to show us how to become good and to animate us in the struggle to realize that ideal?

Did he come to arouse religious feelings only, which may exist without goodness?

Was he content to attract to himself those who should *for a moment* think it possible to love him without being good and leading a good life? Goodness is the supreme quality of God, the ideal of all religion, the unfolding purpose of God in the history of the world.

To think the good and love the good and do only the good is to become more and more godlike.

Mr. Arnold is right, and religion is morality touched with emotion. It is spiritual-like, the strenuous effort toward self-realization, or likeness to God, the sublime peace and joy which can never be known apart from good conduct; and conduct is not three-fourths, but the whole of life, for moral life with its far gaze up the heights of goodness, and clearer discernment of the Supreme Goodness, becomes spiritual love. Morality and religion are the same, in various stages of realization.

The essence of religion is found in strenuous pursuit of ideal goodness, and is inseparable from suffering; for to rise from our "dead selves to higher things" is to bear the cross of Christ after him along the ways of life. Not a crown of gold, not happiness even, is the end of strenuous living, but the good character, which is already conscious of immortality before the crossing of the bar; for eternal life is independent of time and place.

How inferior, then, in importance is ecclesiasticism, or dogmatic theology, to this plain secret of Jesus and of universal religion, that the end of being now and forever is to subdue the lower to the higher self, the sensuous to the spiritual! The cross is the law of eternal progress; and I can accept in this sense the saying of Prof. Royce, "The eternal world contains Gethsemane." I look back through the ages, far past institutions of religion, far behind the age of Jesus, and I discern the cross in the lives of the Gautamas who have strenuously pursued the ideal of goodness. I behold the cross as borne in daily life, in the later age, by the pious Antonine, whose meditations I have been unable, from my youth, to read without moistened eyes.

Surely, the religion of the future, the religion which pursues the ideal of goodness incarnate in Jesus, can never become an abstraction, on the one hand, nor lapse into insincere formalism, on the other.

To die unto self and live unto the higher self; to be true to the vision of supreme perfection revealed by the Christ, and followed by him, the man of sorrows; to animate our fellow-men; to accept suffering as the divine method of growth in character; to know to the end of time that Master and Saviour who is the captain of our salvation, walking with bleeding feet at the head of the column,—this is not an anthropomorphic, nor is it an abstract, religion. The primitive symbolisms may be left behind in the march of the soul; but the concrete yet eternal ideal of the religion of Jesus will inspire both philosopher and peasant, does no wrong to the true conception of the nature of God as infinite goodness, and is not too high to be apprehended by every sinning and sorrowful member of the race of man.

## THE HIGHER NATURE OF MAN, HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

BY SAMUEL R. CALTHROP.

The soul in history! The record of the passage of the soul of man through all the roads and byways and wildernesses and quagmires and gloomy forests and rocky passes and rough ascents of the world, till it comes at last to the

“Shining table-lands  
Where God himself for aye is moon and sun,”—

this is our splendid theme to-night. What poet of the soul, though all-entranced with his thought, could ever dare to feel that he could do aught but catch some few faint glimpses from afar of the pathos, the heart-break, the splendor, the final triumph of that journey!

To-night I shall simply attempt to draw four straight and parallel furrows across this mighty field, which is the world; for along the path of those four furrows the higher nature of man has marched to victory since time began.

I. The beginnings of the kingdom of God must be looked for in the animal world, long ages before man arrived on the earth. In the first chapters of Genesis in the great Bible of the world, it is written that the first poor cockle living among the seaweeds of the primeval ocean, that sheltered her little ones inside her own shell, and kept them safe folded from harm in her own soft tissues, bore within that shell the sacred germ of mother-love; and when the first weak and timorous hen-bird forgot all her fears, and with splendid courage, born of mother-love, fought against the cruel hawk in defence of her young, then, indeed, the heart of God himself had begun to descend into his world, conquering and to conquer.

Science, poetry, and religion are just beginning to write these wonderful chapters, which have as their theme the divine impulse moving in the breasts of the animal world, creating perception and feeling as it moves; evolving by slow degrees, through the eagerly consenting and co-operating wills of the animals themselves, organs fitted for the comprehension and reception of the forces that are forever working through earth and heaven. Keen eyes, quick ears,



sensitive nerves, are already organized, prepared for man when he shall come at last. Of old the dark saying went forth that in the body of man the fulness of the Godhead would be pleased to dwell. Already is the wondrous mammal body prepared, with its amazing complexity, its astonishing adaptation to the earth it is to govern, its million, million avenues of perception and feeling which life — animal life — has slowly builded. Dissect the body of a rat, and you will be dull, indeed, if you cannot perceive its amazing likeness to your own. Thus, and not otherwise, was the saying fulfilled: "A body hast thou prepared me!" It is wrong thinking, and wrong feeling also, to suppose that only the animal appetites and passions belong to the body, and that all the higher manifestations of life belong exclusively to the soul. A complete human body clothes completely the developed human soul. The vocal chords can vibrate to the divinest emotions. Who would not have loved to hear the embodied tenderness in the voice of Jesus as he uttered the Beatitudes? The healing touch in the hands of Jesus gave fit expression to the compassion he felt for all suffering. The million million changes in the convolutions of the brain are competent to translate into word-pictures the thoughts of the highest archangel.

The simple truth is that the grand lines of the body were already laid down in the animal ages. Savage man, barbaric man, civilized man, have all worked on those lines; and even now the complete human body is not yet builded. Mankind are still at work building this living temple of God, but long ages must elapse before its final dedication and consecration is fully prepared.

But what a house for the soul is already gained! Already the creative Spirit, working in and through and with the co-operation of trillions on trillions of animal and human organisms, has attuned every finest fibre of the human body to the life of the world, has strictly related every sense to the sensible objects in the world, has correlated every nerve to the thousand thousand things that cause it to vibrate, has matched eyes to light and ears to the waves of the air, has made ready the subtle brain tissues, with their millions on millions of most sensitive molecules, to report the impressions made upon them by millions on millions of objects, and, above all, has attuned the whole bodily structure to the incredibly complex emotions of human society. Well said the Psalmist: "I will praise thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made! Marvellous are thy works, and that my soul knoweth right well!"

Be sure, then, that any system of thought or plan of life that ignores or insults the body is doomed beforehand to miserable failure.

II. The book of Exodus in the Bible of the world is the record of the passage from the animal to the human. This amazing journey was taken by primitive man. That journey was long, indeed; and it took weary ages to perform it. Had it not been accomplished, mankind could have had no future, and man's soul no history. As the acorn is the mighty oak in germ,—as all its immense possibilities of strength, stature, and duration, its mighty trunk, its broad arms, its million leaves, are all imprisoned in one tiny ball,—so all the virtues, powers, potencies of the soul of man, and all the possibilities of human progress, were contained in germ in the prehistoric man and woman.

Let us try to go back, with minds full of the tenderest sympathy, to those times so far removed from ours, in which our forefathers struggled in the dark with the demons of fear and ignorance that strove to slay the man-child before he was born.

Words cannot paint the unfathomable ignorance and the million haunting fears, born of ignorance, which beset and bewildered and sapped the courage of prehistoric man. He dreaded the lightning and the thunder; he dreaded the heat and the cold; he dreaded the gloom of the forest and the solemn stillness of the mountain. Above all, he dreaded the dark. Night to him was full of horrors. The wild beasts howled around his cave, his human enemies stole noiselessly through the dark to leap upon him and his, while innumerable superstitious terrors made his hair stand on end and his heart tremble. How knowledge and light and leading ever began at all seems an almost insoluble mystery. Leave out the divine guidance, the eternal Heart of Pity, the tender heavenly guardianship, the Everlasting Arms folded over, around, and underneath the primitive man, his unconscious child, and the mystery would be utterly unsolvable.

What do we see just as the long night is passing at last, and just as the early day dawns upon that primitive world? First, man has already discovered that he is a social being. That savage man who refused to share his tools, his spoils, his cave with others, died, and left no descendants. The first law of the everlasting gospel was pressed upon the early men with tremendous, with compelling force. "No man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself." The first great school for social duty was the tribe. The unstinted praise of his fellows came to a man when he did some deed

that helped or saved or glorified his tribe. To watch, to fight, to die in its defence, that was beautiful, was heroic. That heroism was the parent of all heroisms to come. Expand it, and it becomes patriotism. It is Leonidas and his glorious three hundred smiling at death. Expand it yet further, and it becomes man's duty to his race. It is Howard plunging into all the filthy dungeons of the world, in search of the souls of his brothers. Expand it to the uttermost, and it is Jesus on the cross, tasting death for every man, past, present, and to be. The tap-root of the first great human sanctity goes down deep into the buried soil of the primitive ages.

Time fails to tell of the primitive arts born of the needs of the early community: of the chipped flint of the first tool-maker; of the first bone-needle on whose point millions of angels of promise stood; of the first drawing made on mammoth's tusk, prophetic of the art to be; of the first flute made out of a reindeer's bone, whose maker was the true Jubal of the grand old Genesis legend, father of all those that play upon the harp and the organ. Only the main issues can be even touched upon here.

The second of the two great sanctities developed by primitive man, and strictly akin to and correlated with the first, was the sanctity of the soul and its continued life after death. The spirits of their ancestors kept watch and ward over the highest welfare of the tribe, and it was an added inducement to every man that a brave deed done for the tribe met their approval; and it took away the terror of death to feel that, if worthy, he himself would be permitted to join their sacred company.

It is wonderful to discover that no savage tribe exists that has not a forefeeling of the life beyond this life. Ages before the dawn of history man had discovered that he had a soul, or rather was a soul, and that, when his body fell to dust, his soul lived on. O man of science, student of the life of primitive man, be sure that you are on the wrong track if you strive to solve him without his soul,—if you seek to explain away his deepest insights,—if you resolve into mist and dream the fruits of his most terrible struggles, of the imperious yearnings of his heart to feel and know that his beloved dead are not lost, “not spilt like water on the ground,” but still live and love in the land whither his own footsteps are surely tending.

The environing facts of the universe forever press upon all men, demanding recognition. This central fact pressed upon the brain and heart of the primitive man, and his

simple yet well-grounded faith in the abiding sanctity of the soul was the result. The eternal Goodness surrounded the bereaved hearts of our primitive fathers, and gave them peace. "Whoso is wise will consider these things; and he shall understand the loving-kindness of the Lord."

III. The evolution of the human race is absolutely continuous, and goes on from generation to generation without a single break. The ancient classic civilizations proceed on the lines the primitive man had laid down. The road keeps widening, the speed of march is greater, but the direction is still the same. Of old the wild beasts forced their way from the Hudson River through the Mohawk Valley to Syracuse and the salt licks there; the Indians widened their track into a trail; the early white settlers widened it into a corduroy road, and later on into the old coach road between Albany and Buffalo; and now the great New York Central, with its four tracks, carries its passengers along the self-same route sixty miles an hour. It is a picture in little of the march of man's soul across the world.

The tribal organization of primitive times is still distinctly seen underlying the ancient civilizations. Israel, to the last, found the old tribal bond too strong. The genius of David made Israel a nation for a few brief years. Soon the tribes part, never to unite again. Greece, with all her genius, failed in nation-making from the self-same cause. Rome alone succeeded in the mighty task. To Rome, then, as its best and completest example, let us look for the next stage of development on the primitive lines. Rome, then, by slow degrees expanded the sanctity of the tribe, the grandest human unit of the primitive world, into the sanctity of the State, the grandest and most complex human unit that even yet has power to move in united force and passion many millions of men.

Side by side with this, and strictly parallel to this and the sanctity of the soul, which he kept inviolate, the Roman developed a third and kindred sanctity, the sanctity of *the home*. Primitive man had made many attempts at this, but in Rome the home stands at last complete. The Roman owed it to the State to marry, for the State needed new defenders when he was gone. He owed it to the guardian spirits of his house; for the altar sacred to them was the family hearth, and that altar needed a priestess as well as a priest. A Roman marriage was a sacred thing. Ten witnesses were always present, representing the State. The priest, after a solemn invocation, gave the bride and bridegroom a sacred cake to eat together, the sacramental pledge of their mutual

fidelity; and then the bride pronounced the fateful words, "Where thou art Caius, there am I Caia."

It was the new husband's duty to see that his bride was taught at once the secret rites by which his own household gods were worshipped, for on the very next morning it was her duty to pay to them fitting homage. To illustrate this: You are a daughter of Marcellus. You inherit, therefore, the worship of the household deities of the family of Marcellus. But you marry a Claudius. You have now become the priestess of your husband's house; and it is his duty to instruct you, without a moment's delay, in the ceremonies by which the household gods of the Claudii are worshipped. The one secret, which he never dares to ask and which you never dare to tell, is the secret worship of the Marcelli. That goes with you to your grave. Whatever dowry your father gave belongs to you and your husband. But he cannot give you his landed property; for that belongs to the house of Marcellus, and is made sacred and inviolable by the spirits of the ancestors of the house whom you no longer worship. "The property goes with the worship." Thus the rights of property were sacred rights.

The supreme importance attached to these private *sacra* can be judged by a few salient instances. When the Gauls had burned Rome and were besieging the Capitol, the day came when it was the duty of Fabius Buteo to worship the gods of his house. Clad in pure white and all weaponless, bearing his offerings in his hands, he set forth alone. The hosts of Gaul wondered as he came; but, when they saw his sacred errand, they stood aside, and he passed unharmed between their serried ranks, and, his sacred office ended, returned unharmed as he came. The awe of the spirit-world fell on them also.

When, in Rome's greatest agony, Fabius Maximus, the great Delayer, was warily avoiding a battle against the invincible Hannibal, and enlisting time on the side of Rome, the day came when he, too, had to give special honor to the gods of his house in Rome itself. He knew, and all knew, that he risked the very existence of Rome itself in so doing: — a risk that was barely averted. But all men agreed that he was obliged so to do by the most sacred and awful of obligations. During the second Punic War the Delphic oracle advised the Romans to sacrifice to Hercules, as the strongest of the gods. But the secret of his worship was confined to two families in Rome, the Potitii and Pinarii, who, before Rome was, were present when Hercules himself sacrificed the oxen of the sun on the Palatine Hill. The

Pinarii, however, came late on that occasion. Ever after it became their duty to come late to the place of worship. (Their descendants are now as the sand on the seashore for multitude.) So the Potitii alone knew the whole ritual; and the consul summoned the thirty adult males of their house, and offered them a great sum of money for their secret. They accepted, and in one year those thirty men were all dead. Their sacrilege killed them!

The fourth great sanctity, surrounding, interpenetrating, dignifying, guarding, enforcing, the other three, is the supreme sanctity of the divine. The vague awe, the incipient worship of the Power manifested in and by the universe of the primitive man, is now developed into a complete and rounded whole, which includes all things visible and invisible. Heaven guards the State, and also judges it. A treaty was a sacred act, performed in the sight of Heaven as witness. "If the Roman people, O Jupiter, greatest and best," said the officiating priest, "fail to perform their part of this sacred treaty, then do thou, with thy thunderbolts, strike them as I strike this hog." And, at the word, with the sacred flint-stone he crushed the victim's skull.

The word *fas*, divine right, was pregnant with meaning to a Roman. *Fas* guarded the rights of the poor man, the stranger, and the slave. "Tell the senate," said Jupiter to a poor workman in a dream, "that the great games must be celebrated all over again; for I saw a dancing I did not like." Awe fell on the senate, when they discovered that on the morning of the day sacred to gladness and thanksgiving a master had whipped his slave across the forum. That one cruel act tainted the whole festival. But you say, "He was a polytheist." Yes, it was in this fashion our forefathers felt their way to the Divine. But they were grateful for sun, moon, and stars, for spring and summer, for vintage and for harvest, for the immense bounty that crowned their days. Their gratitude found its way to the heart of the Eternal. If in all these things we are less grateful than they were, then just so far are we further from the source of blessing than they were.

The Roman house-father in the best days of the republic, the days of Fabius and Scipio,—a citizen in the noblest sense, every fibre in his body belonging to his country; priest and lord of a well-ordered, dutiful, and happy home, his wife its honored priestess, his children its jewels; filled with a loving awe of those guardian spirits of his house whose blood flowed in his own veins; filled with unutterable reverence for the powers of heaven, who guarded his fields

and blessed his seed-time and his harvest, who guarded the State and gave strength and courage to its defenders, the powers that punished the wrong and rewarded the right in this world and in the next,—this was the strongest man on the planet; and, therefore, to him, by right divine, came power over men.

But when the gathered wealth of the East, its soul-destroying luxury, its abandoned self-indulgence, were poured into Rome like a flood; and when the subtle Greek scepticism, the deadly foe of all noble faiths and enthusiasms, undermined and turned into ridicule the Romans' most sacred beliefs, then a sudden and appalling decadence in the Roman character set in.

In the first five hundred years of Rome no divorce had ever taken place. But now an age of license began. Divorce became the rule, not the exception. Men and women absolutely refused to be married with the old sacred rites which made marriage indissoluble. The sanctity of the family being gone, the sanctity of the community—the sacred duty to Rome—soon began to follow; and each selfish noble strove to clutch all that he could for himself, regardless of the general ruin.

The belief in man's soul, and its continued life after death, became to the cultivated Roman a fable, and the presence and guardianship and justice of heaven a myth; and the four great central human sanctities, which bind men into communities, were gone. Under such conditions a successful republic was impossible, and a military despotism of necessity took its place. It is a solemn warning to all time. It is a warning to ourselves to-day, for this is just what will happen everywhere under like conditions. A few noble souls, as a few did then, will vainly strive to stem the torrent. But they will only save their own souls, unless power from Heaven is given to them to restore the lost sanctities in the minds of their fellow-men. May God save France, our beloved sister republic, in this her hour of sorest need! for just this danger threatens her very existence to-day.

Now what saved society from utter wreck? It was partly the infusion of new and uncorrupted blood by the Teutonic races. It was largely the re-enforcement of the old sanctities from a higher standpoint, which was brought in by Christianity. The Stoic philosophy, the sworn foe of the shallow Greek scepticism, saved a noble few. It was Christianity which brought in a truer life for the many. When we think of the wonderful personal influence of Jesus, and of the purity, the simplicity, the all-embracing character of his

principles, the surprise at first is that the ardent and apostolic zeal which carried them with such astonishing rapidity all over the Roman world did not completely regenerate it. But, when we look more closely, we shall find that this treasure, as always, was in very earthen vessels.

First, then, let us ask: How did early Christianity deal with the first great sanctity developed from man's very beginnings? How did it emphasize man's duty to society?

The religion of Jesus was eminently social. He had not much to say about the other life. He generally took for granted that man keeps on now and ever living in the midst of the eternal love. His emphasis is always laid upon man's duty of loving his ever-present Father, and on man's duty of helping, loving, forgiving, his ever-present brother. Salvation, to Jesus, is right and beautiful and secure and constant relation between the individual man, his God, and his brother. Thus is the social instinct of the primitive man and the social passion of the classic civilizations enlarged and glorified, given the whole world as its field, and the race of mankind as its tribe. It is just here that early and mediæval Christianity, which we must perforce study together, won their greatest, their purest triumphs. The great apostles of Christianity thought of the world as their country and of mankind as their fellow-citizens. Their hearts overflowed in tenderness toward their beloved pagan brothers of all lands, "for whom Christ died." It was the first complete and rounded note of human citizenship. The names of Paul, of Aidan, of Columba, of Cuthbert, of Bernard, of Francis and their peers in the glorious company of the apostles, are unforgettable by the grateful heart of man.

It is one of the great tragedies of history that early Christianity was soon forced into an unnatural conflict with the State, largely through mutual misunderstanding. The Emperor Trajan, for instance, was a man of infinite good sense. All that he wanted to be assured of was that the Christians were loyal citizens, ready to defend the grand Roman civilization and Roman peace from the barbarous hordes and alien peoples which were pressing upon its borders everywhere. He writes, in answer to Pliny's inquiries, that he is to attend to no anonymous accusations, and that, if any one comes forward publicly and accuses the Christians, he is to pay no heed, provided the Christians will simply swear allegiance to the emperor. Trajan had no exaggerated sense of his own personal importance; but he well knew that he represented, for the time being, the majesty, the safety, the permanence of the vast Roman empire, which guaranteed peace



and civilization to 120,000,000 souls. But, unfortunately, the time-honored ceremony and sign of declaring allegiance was the throwing incense on the emperor's altar, which to the Christian appeared apostasy from the most high God. If only Trajan could have met a Christian of good sense equal to his own, the two could doubtless have found some way for the loyal Christian to affirm his allegiance without violating his conscience. But this was never done, and thus there came an ever-widening breach between the Roman State and millions of its best citizens. The sense of the sanctity of the State, and of their solemn duty to reverence, serve, and defend it, was lowered in all Christian minds. It is quite possible to trace the injurious effect of this throughout the Middle Ages down even to our own times.

What of the second great sanctity, the soul? Early and mediæval Christianity took the primitive faith in the soul and its immortal life, purified, ennobled, and enforced it, cleared it of many superstitions, and opened to it far grander outlooks into that upper world of light. For the guardian spirits of the home it gave the watchers of the angelic hosts, and the church triumphant in heaven sympathizing, praying for, and working with the church militant on earth. Here it did not destroy: it fulfilled.

But it confused and bewildered the minds and consciences of men, when it stubbornly insisted that correct belief in the doctrines of the Church *about* Jesus was the sole passport to heaven, and that conduct, character the most divine, the most Christ-like, without that would be refused admittance.

What of the third great sanctity, the home? Early Christianity brought back to the Roman world a sexual purity unknown to it for centuries. Suddenly in the midst of the almost universal corruption there appeared hundreds of thousands of chaste women and pure-minded men. This was, indeed, an immense, a marvellous contribution toward the regeneration of society. But it also spread abroad the mistaken and degrading notion that the celibate life was essentially holier, nearer to God, than the married life. The beginning of all this is in Paul's Epistles; but it goes on with more and more fatal exaggeration, until our noble Saint Bernard of Clairvaux, one of God's truest saints, longed to make every man a monk and every woman a nun, and so force God to make a premature end of the world! The sure and sad result was that for long centuries the very noblest men and women did not marry at all, and so defrauded the centuries of their very best blood. It was the most tragic instance of noble human energy misdirected, and so harming more than it helped.

What, again, of the fourth, the all-pervading, all-including sanctity of the Divine? Early Christianity brought into the Roman world the grand Jewish monotheism, tempered by the loving, filial spirit of Jesus. The just and holy God who governs the world is our loving, our tender Father in heaven. Just as far as it taught this mighty central truth, it brought blessing to weary hearts everywhere, and nothing but blessing. But they mixed this up with the false and degrading thought that man is living in a world which God has cursed from the beginning, and that the world and all in it will speedily come to an end. Perfectly sane human life on the earth is quite impossible where such a belief prevails. Here, as far as loving gratitude for the bounty and beauty of nature is concerned, early and mediæval Christianity fell far below the reverent and thankful attitude of the Roman of the better days.

We now arrive at our own times. How do we stand to-day? And what is the outlook for the twentieth century?

The four great sanctities of human life still abide, and will make themselves felt, if not in blessing, then in bale. Reverence for them will still make a nation strong. Disregard of them will still make a nation weak. Weaken the sense of duty to society and the State, and society and the State will feel the loss in every nerve. Weaken the sanctities which guard marriage and the home, and its citizens will soon become morally corrupt. Weaken the faith in the soul, and the immortal life which belongs to it, and the majority of men will assuredly begin to say, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Weaken the sense of the all-pervading, all-including, all-supporting divine, and the very foundations of human society will be shaken.

What, then, of the first great sanctity, society? Here there is room for much encouragement and some congratulation. Man's duty to man is being emphasized and felt as never before. The poisonous notion that man's special business is to save his own soul and secure his own private selfish happiness in the other world, is beginning to be seen to be outrageously unsocial, to be, indeed, the one cardinal sin against all society everywhere in this world or any other world; and the poisonous notion of a private selfish happiness in this world is seen to be just as bad. We are beginning to feel that man is bound indissolubly to man for weal or for woe, and that the gospel of Jesus is pre-eminently the social gospel, destined to right all wrong that man has done to man, till at last the coming centuries shall hear a mighty voice from heaven, saying, "The kingdoms of this

world are become the kingdoms of our God and his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever."

What of the third great sanctity, the home? A woe is on us, we shall send down a curse to the twentieth century, if we do not reaffirm and re-enforce this abiding sanctity. Man's higher life will have little chance if this great duty is forgotten. The devil keeps on whispering his ugly, his dirty lies into every boy's ear; and every dictionary the boy uses helps the filthy work. The young student of Aristophanes is brought face to face with all the varied ingenuity of Greek nastiness; and even the Hebrew lexicon, key to the chastest by far of all ancient literatures, will suggest words enough. For all this God's plain truth is the only antidote. Servant of God, it is thine to sing aloud the song of songs in such tones that all men cannot but listen.

"Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm; for love is stronger than death. Many waters cannot drown it." Over it the dark river of death hath no power; for it demands and predicts the life eternal for its full development. There is nothing in the whole world so beautiful as the abiding love of a true man for a true woman, with one exception,—the abiding love of a true woman for a true man. Upon this firm foundation the home is builded, both in earth and heaven; for God's heaven itself is builded on millions on millions of earthly homes, where love abides. Around such homes the Eternal Love himself keeps watch and ward, and himself brings his little ones in his arms to make them fairer yet. For such a home let all noble youths and maids work and pray. "He that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure."

Stand on yonder height, and view the whole landscape below and around you. All that your eye rests on is the result of sex, is the offspring of love; for love forever builds and rebuilds the world. Through love the grass grows, the flowers bloom, the forests rise. Through love the fishes swim together in the waters, the birds pair and build their nests, the flocks and herds gather. Through love man lives, homes arise, cities are builded, nations flourish, and mankind grows to power. If love, immortal love, could die, then silence and barrenness would enwrap a dead and voiceless world.

What of the sanctity of the soul?

The twentieth century will make short work of the old materialism, which asserted that human thought and feeling and self-directing will were simply functions of the material

brain,—a peculiar result of the combination of the oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen molecules of which it is composed. The twentieth century will know that *nothing can give what it has not got*. There is not a scintilla of evidence that either nitrogen, oxygen, hydrogen, or carbon has got a particle of consciousness, a particle of capacity to direct motion from within. If four people or four million people have no oranges, then the whole of them massed together cannot give me a single orange.

But many true and noble believers, in an age like this, which is just beginning to think fearlessly in every direction, are giving too much occasion for the enemies of man's soul to blaspheme by giving out their thinking before it is quite matured.

Professor James, in his admirable work on Psychology, kindly allows his readers to continue to use the word "soul" if it is necessary to their peace of mind. But he assures them that the word is entirely useless to psychological science. That means, I suppose, that *psyche* is not wanted by *psychology* at all. The scientific statement, according to him, is that each human unit is a continuous thin thread of consciousness. He is a believer. He has faith that the Eternal Goodness will never snap that thread. But consciousness is a state, not a thing. There cannot possibly be a state of nothing. Consciousness is a state of that ineffable something which we reverently call the soul.

A similar error runs through much of our modern thinking. I lately read in an occult novel, inspired by I do not know how many Mahatmas, this emphatic statement made by the Arch Mage: "Brothers! All is vibration. We are vibrations!" Beloved Mahatmas, vibration is not a thing. Vibration is always and everywhere a state of a given thing. The vibration of the E string of a violin is the vibration of the E string. All its different vibrations are each and all so many different states of the E string. Take away the E string, and you can no more have any vibration whatever of the E string than you can have the Cheshire cat's grin without the cat.

"God himself," says Stradivarius, in George Eliot's noble poem, "cannot make Antonio Stradivarius's violins without Antonio." Spiritual vibrations without the human spirit to vibrate are equally impossible.

The same error underlies the Buddhistic philosophy, in its American editions at least. Nowadays we are often assured in very learned phrase, full of Hindu words, which are really not any better than English ones, that there is no

such entity as an immortal human soul. What survives through endless transformation is the Karma, or chain of consequences. But Karma is only a very, very, very complex series of modes of motion, the first one propagating the next; and the next, the next; and so on. Once more, there cannot possibly be a mode of motion of nothing. Any possible Karma, then, which continues on and on, unbroken and undiminished through countless ages, must *reside* in an enduring and immortal spirit-substance, which carries the vibrations of Karma wherever it goes, or the Karma would assuredly melt away into free space, dying, dying in ever enfeebled ripples of Karma, until at last the last faint trace of Karma ceased to exist.

The truth is that the second world-sanctity, the soul, and the fourth, the all-including sanctity, God, are so welded together that they cannot be torn asunder. "Because I live, ye shall live also," saith the Power and the Life and the Love Eternal. God has no death to give. Omnipotence itself cannot give what omnipotence has not got. God has only life to give, and more life and more life forever and ever. God has only himself to give; and himself he gives freely, gives "exceeding abundantly, above all that we can ask or think."

The whole of the science, the whole of the religion, of the twentieth century, will be founded on one all-including verity; namely, that one infinite and eternal Substance fills all space, without one single smallest vacuum. The men of science of the nineteenth century have confessed themselves unable to bridge the chasm between the molecular motion of the brain and human consciousness. It never will be bridged until it is clearly seen that consciousness, or the *sense of continuity*, belongs only to *continuous Substance*. Now, since continuous Substance absolutely fills all space, and since the earth passes through space eighteen miles a second, then continuous Substance either passes through me at that rate, depositing consciousness as it passes, but changing the conscious substance fifty thousand times a second, so that my consciousness is simply an illusive form of the infinite Consciousness,—that and nothing more; or I am myself composed of continuous Substance, and the infinite Consciousness, though in perpetual, in absolute contact with me on all sides, passes above, around, beneath me, giving and receiving thrills of mutual recognition and mutual joy and tenderness, imparting life and hope and courage and purpose as it passes, but never robbing me of myself, of the consciousness which makes me what I am and which secures my permanence. When once

this is fully understood, will there be any doubt whatever as to which of the alternatives is true?

Doubtless, it takes more knowledge of science and philosophy than most men as yet possess to fully grasp the immense cogency of the great argument I just hint at here. The majority of men must still be content to grasp and hold with firmest faith that great argument of the heart which has given peace and hope since human time began. How grandly yet how simply did Jesus put it to the Sadducees! You read in the book you reverence, "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. You say that they are now nothing but dust. If there were no God at all, they would also be nothing but dust. As far, then, as they are concerned, the difference whatever between God and no God at all is less than a hair.

How splendidly Paul puts it! Jesus has risen, because he is man. If man does not rise, Jesus has not risen; and, if God is such a God as to care nothing whether Jesus, the brave, the beautiful, the pure, the tender, and the true, is alive or dead, then man cares nothing whatever for such a God.

That argument is valid yet to all who understand that man is part and parcel of nature, and that man's heart is just as much a product of nature as his head; who understand that the distinct, imperative verdict of the heart, repeated millions of times in millions of human beings, and always and everywhere with substantial accord, is just as valid as the conclusions of the head. My heart has decided the question long ago; and so will every true man's heart if he will only trust it.

The end of the nineteenth century leaves man face to face with God. We are just beginning to learn to depend upon the material universe which God hath builded as a house for his children to dwell in, to know the wondrous sureness of its laws, to know that those laws are subservient to no man's, ay, to no God's caprice, and to know, above all, that man's mind is born to read and to interpret those laws. The spiritual universe is fast giving up its secrets, hidden to all, save a few, since the world began. It is at last seen that truth, right, and love are the only keys that can unlock its sacred doors; that no man, no church, can bar those doors against the simplest soul that holds those keys. To all such the Eternal Spirit saith, "Behold! I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it."

Brothers and sisters, you and I and all men are the off-

spring of the living God ; begotten, not made ; being of one substance with our Father, from whom all souls spring, in whom all souls live and grow forever and forever. We must get accustomed to living in the midst of God, in the midst of beauty and wisdom and glory and power and love immense, incalculable. Casting behind us all unfilial fear, let us rather rejoice to feel that our Father's infinity and eternity are ever around us, and that in him we have our immortal being.

“ When last beneath the midnight stars I trod,  
An awe fell on me from those depths afar,  
Vast silent spaces round each separate star,  
Fathomless distances, filled full of God !  
Heaven beyond heaven, without bound or bar.  
And thus my lips : ‘ Thy love I dare not claim,  
Infinite Heart, whose pulses, like a sea,  
Strike shore of sun or star, yet onward flame  
Unspent, unbroken, everlastingly ! ’  
So spake I, by infinitude oppressed ;  
Yet ever, wrapt in peace for thought too deep,  
Like some small sea-bird on the waves asleep,  
My steadfast heart, all unawares, did rest,  
O Father, on the ocean of thy breast ! ”

## IN THE LIGHT OF IDEALISM.

BY REV. C. F. DOLE.

Let me try to translate the words of my subject into the simplest possible terms. What do we mean by idealism? We shall get at our meaning best by means of a contrast. Let us see what the opposite of idealism is; that is, materialism. I do not mean speculative, but practical materialism. In this sense materialism is that habit of thought about life which rates all values and worth in terms of visible things. The materialist says: "I believe in what I can see with my eyes, what I can weigh and measure, what I can buy and sell." To live successfully, according to this view, is to succeed in getting things,—property, position, titles, power. It is also to be enabled to enjoy as many things as possible,—food, drink, all kinds of sensuous and physical pleasure, whatever makes the nerves titillate with delight. To have free access to great treasures of material things, to give the body all the joys that the senses and the appetites crave, to get for yourself and to hand down to your children whatever power and influence can lay hands upon or unlimited money can purchase,—this is what thorough and consistent materialism purposes as the chief end of life. Is not this plausible? Are not millions of men striving with might and main for this end?

It would be unfair to suppose that materialism has no use for ideas. It is extremely ingenious in turning ideas of all kinds to its master purpose. It claims a patent of its own upon inventions, discoveries, and the marvels of modern science. Ideas make, produce, foster, and perpetuate wealth. You measure an idea as you measure a stick of timber, by the money for which you can exchange it. What is the use of the magnificent bridges that span the Mississippi? Are they intended to be looked at and admired? Are they mere illustrations of certain propositions in geometry and numbers? No! they are to bring corn and pork from the farms of Kansas to the great seaboard cities. They are to help transport emigrants and passengers. The physicist experiments with electricity in the laboratory. Is it to stir men's souls to reverence marvellous and divine power? Surely not; but that man may fasten his wagons



to this power, bring new belts of land into the market, and add to his rental values and investments.

It would be a mistake to suppose that materialism does not care for art, beauty, and music. Here are so many avenues to new kinds of delight, here are so many appeals to the senses, here are new values to be created and new forms into which material may be wrought. How much can the singer earn with her voice or the actor with his art? How many thousands of dollars can the painter get for his picture? Through how many editions will the new story run? In the thought of materialism these are the characteristic tests of success in music, art, and literature.

Do not imagine that materialism has no morals or that it despises the ten commandments. How would you preserve the costly fabric of human society or safeguard the growing riches of huge cities without elaborate systems of laws? The shrewd materialist is exceedingly conservative of conventional moralities. They add to the wealth of the world: they can be translated into dollars, they are made the means of producing dollars. Do not fear that the materialist will throw away the laws that conserve property.

I have a purpose in describing materialism at full length. We cannot know idealism without knowing its colossal rival and opposite. I go on to say that materialism is not without its ideals. It is pleased to paint a millennium of its own, where all shall live in palaces, ride automobiles, sail in yachts, and traverse space in aerial chariots. The world to come is a paradise more sensuous and more respectable than Mahomet ever conceived. Materialism pictures also a painless world, out of which all kinds of disease, noxious animals, and inimical microbes have been expelled by medical and hygienic science. Teeming billions of civilized people will crowd the earth.

Materialism has many religions, some of them hoary with age. You might even say that it is buttressed by religion. Religion makes men contented subjects and laborers here, in hope of a heaven beyond. The painted windows, the candles, the incense, the processions, the gorgeous millinery of religion, add to the richness and luxury of life. The religion of the materialist practically bids men live this life as agreeably as possible, get gain in this world, measure values here in things and dollars, and then promises them, if there is a God and a future life, to insure them salvation, paid for on easy terms.

I do not refer only to distant churches, such as the Greek or the Coptic, or to the high ritualism that is winning its way

in modern America. I was told lately of a certain Unitarian church, that its ruling standard is in dollars and things. I wish we could believe that this is an entirely exceptional instance. It is the rumor in the town that this church had got rid of an excellent minister because his poverty was disagreeable to certain well-to-do parishioners. The chief man in this church was said to be almost worshipped in his community. "Why?" it was asked: "was he generous?" On the contrary, he was mean. "Was he public-spirited?" No, but the reverse. "Was he a man of high integrity?" No. But he was rich, and people worshipped success. Here was outright materialism under the guise of the Unitarian name.

Materialism has a philosophy, but very few of those who live the materialistic life care to face or profess it. Consistent materialism has no God except matter and force. It has no permanent standards of any sort. Force is always changing its form of action. Matter is always changing its aspects. Materialism teaches that all man's thoughts, his feelings, his loves, and his aspirations, are simply functions of the changes of matter, like the turn of the kaleidoscope, the passage of a chemical mixture into the shape of a crystal, or its resolution back again into the original gaseous elements. At the end of the life of each man is the grave. At the end of the life of the earth is the icy death of the planet. This is all.

We get on easily with materialism as long as we take a superficial view of life, while the sun shines, while health is good and our friends are about us, while no serious strain comes upon our habitual morality, if we happen to be prosperous and not too sympathetic with the misfortunes of our neighbors. But materialism asks and answers no profound questions. The intelligence that comes with dawning manhood is haunted with these wondering questions. What is the use of living at all? For what end does the universe move on its æonian courses? Why must we strive, when strife becomes tiresome? Why must we observe costly moralities and resist tremendous temptations? Why must a man, with his single chance in this busy life, stand at his post and be cut to pieces, if need be, for duty or truth? What fixed standards, models, guides, are there in art, music, or conduct? Shakespeare makes Falstaff say: "Can honor set a leg? No. Or an arm? No. Or take away the grief of a wound? No. What is honor? A word. What is that honor? Air." Why is not Falstaff right? Materialism does not even profess to answer these questions. It has no word to offer whereby

to hearten a man to difficult duties. The sense of *ought* in its view is only the creation of human convenience. It will last with the individual and with the race as long as convenience requires it. Morality is simply a fashion, changing its forms from one age to another.

We are ready now to see what we mean by idealism. We see why idealism is demanded. We see what majestic needs it meets and what grand questions it answers. We see a whole new range of life to which it lifts us. Idealism is the science of values. Whereas materialism brings us all kinds of stuff and things, idealism tells us what these things are good for, shows their relative uses, co-ordinates and distributes them into their places, and builds with them after an orderly plan. Whereas materialism practically treats men also as things, tools, machines, idealism calls men heirs of God, coworkers with him, creators. Whereas materialism takes short views, idealism takes long views.

Suppose a multitude of savages landed on a rich island, and exploited its wealth and its fruits. By a sort of blind instinct they heap together, squirrel fashion, whatever they can find. They pick fruits and nuts, more than they want. They trample down the shrubs and tender grasses in their eager haste to get things. They gather piles of stones. They find minerals and pretty shells. They struggle and quarrel with one another. They destroy things almost as fast as they acquire them. Let us suppose that a civilized, enlightened, and educated man appears among these struggling savages. Let him be the ideal man,—the Christ of our imagination,—wise, kingly, friendly. Let us suppose these people make him their leader. He brings a scheme or thought to interpret this hitherto wild and childish life into significant terms. He knows the uses of all the things which the people had ignorantly gathered in heaps from the woods and the seaside. He has a plan to build houses and towns and a commonwealth. He gives every one intelligent, interesting, rewarding work to do, and shows him what his work will accomplish. He makes the people sharers and partners in realizing his great thought.

So, in fact, idealism comes as king into the materialist's world. Idealism finds men gathering stuff, with a crude, helpless, animal instinct of accumulation. The idea and emphasis with all is to get. One brings sensuous pleasures. "See," he says, "what I am getting." Another has a hoard of money: another is covered with badges, honors, and titles, social, military, academic, professional, the latest degrees of the Masonic order, possibly even the D.D.'s

and LL.D.'s of the University. The materialist's world is a lumber yard. Each man is working with an eye to his own choice hoard or collection. No one is scrupulous as to whether his pile of things wholly belongs to himself. To make the pile grow is the aim of each. Many are quarrelling over their rights or trying to get property away from their neighbors. The idealist, the builder, master of life, appears on the scene. Whether we have collected gold, iron, wood, hay, straw, or stubble, he shows us where our product belongs in the grand hierarchy of actual values. He brings a plan into which every life and its work fit. He purposes to take every man into his service, and make him a sharer in the joy and glory of his comprehensive thought.

The idealist has a new standard of success. Success is not in heaping things together: it is constructive. Thus idealism pronounces Isaiah, Socrates, Jesus, to have completely succeeded; but it finds Belshazzar, Alcibiades, Herod, and Caiaphas — the rich and foremost men of their day — to have utterly failed. We only remember their names, as we name the prehistoric mammoths, types of life forever set aside.

In proportion as things are real, enduring, and precious, we find that they elude the tests of our senses. Force eludes our science. What is it? Who ever sees it? Matter itself at the last analysis eludes us. The realm of thought is the most real world. All things are translatable into the terms of intelligence. In other words, all things resolve themselves into and ascend up into forms of the invisible. What is real honor, — not the honor which is bought like a bauble by wealth or granted by a king, but the kind of honor for keeping which many an unknown man has starved and died? What is justice? I do not mean the mere legality which courts or majorities can give and take away, which rich corporations can purchase, which a strong nation can enforce over a weaker people, but that righteousness, higher than all human law, eternal in the heavens, which brave prophets in every age have stood alone to proclaim. Here is an invisible reality, mighty, most precious, swaying the world. Who can see, weigh, or measure the power of love? I do not mean sensuous love, the mere outward form or symbol: I mean loyalty, devotion, a sentiment, yet so real and inspiring that at its breath men will desert all and follow it. It is unseen, but unpurchasable and infinite as God is. He who is possessed by it is beyond price. Nations bow at the name of one who, they believe, realized and incarnated it. Idealism deals in these values of invisible realities. It asserts that all visible things only serve these higher values, lead up to them, symbolize them.

We all begin with thinking of bulks and magnitudes. You impress us with the size of the world and the vast spaces of the stars. You overpower our minds with the grand sweep of the geologic periods. Materialism deals in quantities. The idealist takes up these primary school lessons in quantities, and turns them over into new lessons in qualities, fragrances, proportions, essences, realities. Wonderful is the magnitude of the solar system. More wonderful than all the solar system was the first spark of conscious life in the protoplasm and the amoeba. Wonderful are trees and mammoths and the seas filled with all kinds of fish. Far more wonderful than all the huge processes of nature was the first human baby, whose tiny brain held the promise and potency of Newtons and Darwins, who should comprise all nature in their thought, measure the heavens, grasp the idea of infinity. We are impressed at first with the weary labor with which events come about. But our growing intelligence catches at last the ideas which give events their significance. No matter, we say, how long and costly the preparation was for the drama. The single hour when the drama culminates is worth the cost and toil. Men spend their lives to meet certain glorious moments. The centuries plod and labor; generations travail in pain. A single beautiful life suddenly flowers out of the world's hitherto dreary cactus-tree; and, lo! the whole course of human history is illuminated. Wherever divine life — that is, infinite, purposeful love — shines upon the earth, a gleam of this reality, the light that has played for a moment at a time on the face of your wife or your mother, the smile that you have seen in your child's eyes, words of poetry and snatches of song, have been and are daily more than all the dark earth was worth before these gleams of the Eternal shone into it.

. In the world, as the childish or materialist mind sees it, bent upon stuffs and quantities, there is much that is always being thrown out as rubbish. What materialist can make anything of pain, suffering, disappointment, and death? Here is so much stuff written over to the side of sheer loss. Idealism turns all things into higher uses. There is nothing common or unclean. There is no real waste or rubbish. Whatever exists now becomes the necessary material for the making of the invisible values, for manhood and womanhood, for the setting forth of the radiant gems of righteousness, for the growth of humanity, for truth's sake, for the development and expression of love, the supreme prize of the universe. The Christ story is the everlasting witness that all so-called losses may be changed to gain. As the roots of the water

lily take hold of the dark mould of dead stuff at the bottom of the lake, so there is a deep law whereby, from age to age, love takes hold of pain and evil, and makes beauty and glory and life, whereat the world wonders. Granting that the master Workman, the arch Idealist, seeks to express himself in noble and divine lives, what possible world can you conceive better fitted to accomplish this end than our earth is, with all its marvels of contrast, with its sublime labors and cost,—yes, with its mystery of death which men have learned to face with a serene and mighty hope?

People often misunderstand idealism. They imagine that the idealist, if he is consistent, ought to set aside and despise material values,—houses and lands and treasures of beautiful things, salaries, emoluments, legacies, the possessions of the millionaire. Or again, going to the opposite extreme, they suppose that he must in his secret heart desire these things supremely. The idealist simply sets all such things in their order. They are good. He values them, but he deals with greater and more obvious values. Other things give him far more joy. Friendship, love, peace of mind, insight and spiritual vision, the sense of the living God,—these are the perennial sources of joy. What are all the census lists of the coming year worth, unless the billions of American property stand for happy homes, well-governed cities, a just and high-minded people? We say to France, Better burn all the stores of Paris than to commit an outrage upon one innocent man. We say to America likewise: Better burn all your ripened harvests than to be slaughtering your fellow-men in a needless and blundering war. We say that we can afford to go hungry better than we can afford to hurt the moral texture of our people's souls. The millions of our wealth have their only substantial foundation in the bed-rock of integrity, both private and national.

Why do you believe in such invisible things? some one may ask. How do you know that justice, truth, love, are worth more than all the visible wealth of the planet? Who can prove such magnificent propositions? We cannot demonstrate the most patent truths to the man who does not see them. How can you show the beauty of the Parthenon to the man who is content with the ugliness of the Boston Court-house? How can you demonstrate the superiority of the "Moonlight Sonata" to a man who prefers to hear the latest street jingle? If a man actually has his price and confesses it, how can you make him worship at the story of Socrates? Yet every one has at least some native instinct for

the values that idealism prizes. Who in this hero-worshipping year will avow that he never has a thrill of delight in hearing the deeds of the heroes? Who does not venerate standards higher and nobler than he himself perchance follows? There are hours when we are all idealists. We hear the heavenly music, we see visions of the divine goodness. We know that we are not brutes: we hold ourselves to be men, of the unseen, divine, spiritual nature, sons of the master Idealist, whose thought and love called us into life.

Let us assume, then, that we believe in idealism. This is to say that we believe in God, or in Love at the heart of the world. This is to say that we believe that we are living in God's world, a divine universe. This is to say that we hold truth, justice, love, to be supreme. I for one can see nothing else worth believing, Take this faith away, and I do not see what we are here for, — least of all in Washington for a religious convention. Let us seriously ask in the light of our faith, our religion, — that is, of idealism, — what we make of the higher nature of man. Let us rather ask what we make of the whole man.

It is common to think of man in true dualistic fashion as constituted in two parts, body and soul, a lower and a higher nature, each separate from and incompatible with one another. A natural antagonism and conflict has been supposed to be involved between these opposites throughout this mortal life. In the light of our idealism this conflict disappears. Is there conflict between God and his world? Surely not. God manifests himself in and through his world. The outward nature exists to communicate God. So man's body, so far from being opposed to his spirit, is the material with which spirit works, in which spirit dwells, through which spirit — I mean that which knows, thinks and loves — expresses itself. Is the ideal man, true son of the arch Idealist, a formless and bodiless man? Does he approximate toward his ideal through fasting and emaciation? On the contrary, he is the man whose body, in its strength, in its admirable balance of faculties, in its fineness of nerve and brain organization, in the delicacy of its senses, in the nobility of its features, is made to serve Intelligence, Conscience, Beauty, Good Will, God. The bodily service proclaims by its obedience, its harmony, its excellence, that a son of God dwells in it. Is not this your ideal Christ? Call it by what name you choose; it is certainly the highest modern idea. We all know grand men and gracious women who embody it.

In this thought many kinds of sensual temptations largely

or altogether disappear. The good man to-day is not trying to keep his body under. It is none of his business to fight his appetites. He has better and larger things to do. He sees now the uses of every sense and appetite. These are not selfish uses. They are not merely to keep him alive or to perpetuate the race. They are not so narrow as to be only for his own delight. They all subserve the higher terms of manhood, and not his own manhood, but a nobler manhood for all the world. The true man does not simply feed: there are animals that surpass him in that respect. But he eats and drinks, in order that out of a well-nourished brain high, sane, and pure thoughts may be evolved, that firm nerves and manly power may render deeds of skill and enterprise, but never for the individual alone.

There is no conflict between the lower love and the higher love. In the ideal marriage there is harmony. The instant that true love takes its seat, sensualism and lust have no room to stay. The most complete joy goes with the purest love. The keenest perception throughout all the senses and appetites goes with the self-control or temperance which good will, dominant in the life, commands.

We need to make these things very clear in education. In every town and every college, young men of fine parts daily are stooping to mean, base, and unclean living, against their consciences, against their nobler instincts, almost against their own wills. Convert these youth into idealists; show them real values; lift their eyes to see the grand meanings and possibilities of life; make them understand what they are here for; engage them to march at the bidding of Justice, Truth, Love; fill them with noble public spirit,—and vile things will straightway become impossible. William of Orange lived the gay life of a courtier till he heard Holland call him to become her savior. Then the world changed its face. So our youth find new heavens and a new earth the instant they fairly see the shining ideals of the divine humanity.

To multitudes of people the world seems a fierce battleground of competition. What other way, they ask, can we live unless we struggle? Life is "the survival of the fittest." It is said to be the law of the world. In the light of idealism you see the same world, you note the same facts as before: your trade, occupation, or profession, remains the same; but all the conflict has ceased. You make your survey, you control the forces of life from a new, different, and higher point of view. You live in a larger world. There is no human being whom it is your business now to antagonize, to wrestle with and pull down. You are here as one of a



vast industrial and social organization. Your business is to grow crops, to make tables or shoes, to transport passengers, to distribute products, to accomplish works of art, to make laws or secure justice, to educate and civilize. You have no quarrel with other men: your business is constructive. It is not for you to interfere with other men's work: do your own work better, turn out the best possible product. "I shall starve," you complain. I do not believe it. The world too badly needs faithful servants to let them starve. But it is not your affair, any more than it was Jesus' or Paul's or Socrates', whether men let you starve or not. Your affair, as an idealist, a son of the spirit of God, is to do your amplest and most efficient service, "not to be ministered unto, but to minister."

"But I shall never become rich," you say. "I shall never be able to have anything for my family. There are all manner of beautiful things that I am made to want. How shall I get them unless I lay hands on them wherever I find them? Yes, unless I push and crowd on occasion to possess my fair share." This is precisely what the little children say at the party or picnic. You hardly blame the children who know no better, who have no idea of the unbounded resources and wealth of the host. But the host asks a favor of you who know him. He asks you to set the tables and lay out his provisions; he asks you to bring order out of the confusion; maybe, he asks you to serve and wait on the others. In short, he asks you to help him carry out his hospitable plan, and trust him for the rest. No matter if you go hungry for a little while. Is it not better to be the friend of the host, and stand in his confidence, than to demean yourselves to push and scramble and waste?

It follows that, in the light of idealism, all anxiety, apprehension, and fear pass away. If this life is a drawn game between the forces of good and evil, I am anxious about the outcome. I live in nervous tension. What nameless disasters may not threaten my household, my nation, the whole complex movement of civilization? But I am an idealist. Truth, Justice, Love, I find, are the most solid and enduring realities. I have entered an immortal realm. I follow the commands of the infinite and victorious Goodness. I may suffer, I may be suffocated and blinded at times with the dust of the marching host, and not see my way more than a step at a time. But I cannot be anxious. Let me keep in line, let me push on, let me do my day's work as well as I can. I carry visions in my mind of the beautiful mountain peaks, whose glory it is our glory now and then at least to behold.

You see how, in the light of idealism, we become new and stronger men. We have a changed attitude and outlook in respect to every question of human conduct. We become not less practical, but more largely practical, inasmuch as we now see with a comprehensive clearness how means and ends are related together. Shall I tell a falsehood or speak the truth? If I am on materialist ground, I shall often fear to tell the truth: the truth will seem inexpedient, against my interest, my convenience and comfort, my popularity. As an idealist, the truth appears at once as that which is forever and universally expedient; it is good for every one; it is that which binds us all together.

Shall I believe in democratic institutions? Shall I hold that all men are my brothers? It is a tremendous faith. As a materialist, I do not believe it. It looks as if the weaker men and races must be pushed to the wall. It looks as if practical conduct was always to seize and hold what each stronger man or race can. But idealism gives me a longer vision. I see all that I saw before, and I see more beyond. I see that there is no power so mighty as justice, no gravitation like conscience, no influence of the planets so sweeping as love. Beyond the little circle of the family, beyond the bounds of the clan and tribe, beyond the limits of the nation, I see the divine lines of the divine brotherhood of humanity. In men of all races and colors I see the deep signs of the divine likeness. As an idealist, I become a believer in the rights and duties of all men, like the rights and duties which ennoble me.

We can turn the light down, and then we all become materialists. But when we face toward God, and a certain sublime light shines upon us, we, the same men as before, in the same world, handling the same matter, are idealists. Do not think the idealist is a man who lives in a solitude or a closet. He is the man who lives in this present world, and uses it as if it were God's world.

These churches of ours, as we near the close of the century, are confronted with the most splendid challenge that ever man's ears heard. The long, costly history of religion has brought these churches — the daughters of liberty — for a little while at least to the van of the hosts of mankind.

"Have the elder races halted?

Do they droop and end their lesson, wearied over there beyond the seas?

We take up the task eternal, and the burden, and the lesson,  
Pioneers! O pioneers!"

Have the elder races halted? Do they droop, and end their lesson, etc.? Generations of men, prophets and heroes and seers, push us forward and lift us up (we never could have come so far alone) to catch sight of what God means for his world. Grand thoughts come to us, freed of ancient superstitions. Wonderful ideals gleam before our faces. Noble commands are laid upon us. Do we or do we not believe in this divine universe? Are we God's sons and daughters, heirs of the eternal life? Do we hold Justice and Truth, Mercy, Pity, Peace, and Love to be the only real prizes of life, the values for which all things else exist? Will we live and work, then, by the light of these ideals? Yes, will we lead in the van as God bids?

Let us not answer too hastily. Let us be sure that we mean what we say. Let us count the cost of keeping our vows. There are great, pressing needs in our world. Never was there such call for chivalry, for generosity, for fearlessness, for unhesitating faith. Even here in America we are only on the verge of true civilization. If Christianity is to do the will of God, who ventures to call this yet a Christian people? Not in cities alone, crowded with foreign-born populations, but in the little towns of purest Anglo-Saxon stock, the crying need is for courageous public spirit, for allegiance to public duty. Selfishness, mildly tempered with sentiment, runs the government of the nation: Not patriotism, but party success and the rewards and honors of office, are to-day the moving forces in American politics. Will we cleanse our politics and teach our boys and girls what it is to be patriots? Eight hundred to a thousand millions of dollars yearly go for alcoholic drinks. Few family circles do not know some victim of this form of tragedy. We cannot be idealists and let this vast problem alone. Idealism does not thrive in an atmosphere of self-indulgence. Laborers and employers face each other with the old pagan distrust, and jeopardize great public interests with their quarrels. Do we purpose to lose money rather than follow the unbrotherly methods which make such quarrels? The South resounds with the stories of cruel lynchings. How much do the great Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches in the Southern country believe in the idealism for which the name of their Christ stands? Are we or are we not truer believers than our Southern brethren? Our nation is engaged in a bloody struggle with a distant people who have never done us a wrong. It is a bold man who will dare to say, in the light of idealism, that the American government has no grave blame to bear for this sorrowful war. What ought we

to do as idealists,—that is, believers in eternal justice, committed to be, first, last, and always, men of friendliness and humanity?

These are the precise practical questions which touch idealists to-day. We do not live in the skies: we are set here in this world for a single purpose,—to incarnate our religion in flesh and blood, to build all material civilization into the beautiful and enduring forms of the realm of thought and spirit. Do we honestly believe in and trust the visions of God of which we are accustomed to speak in our churches? Let us be materialists, if we dare. But, if we are idealists, let us not be fools or cowards. Let us do the things which the master Idealist bids us do. Then only may we have a right to sing with the poet:—

“Through love to light! Oh, wonderful the way  
That leads from darkness to the perfect day!  
From darkness and from sorrow of the night  
To morning that comes singing o’er the sea.  
Through love to light! Through light, O God, to thee,  
Who art the love of love, the eternal light of light.”

## HOW WE UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE, AND USE IT IN OUR WORK.

BY REV. JOSEPH MAY.

What the Bible has been to the Hebrew and Christian peoples, for generations so many, who could briefly intimate?

The repertory of moral and religious suggestion, the fountain of inspiration to conduct, the symbol of faith, for the most enlightened, effective, and progressive races of mankind, it has been held as their choicest possession, worshipped, sworn by, made a fetish of, made the instrument of oppression, as also it has been the agent and emblem of religious and even political freedom and independence.

It is not too much to say that the Bible has been, by far, the one *most* remarkable and characteristic fact of Occidental civilization. It has been a most powerful cohesive agency at the very centre of life in the peoples that have cherished it, giving stability to the great forces that mould national character, producing a deep homogeneousness under the diversities of generic traits, conserving in all the primary conviction which is the root-principle of life in peoples as in individuals,—the sense of God and of human relationship to him. Try to imagine the history of the Western nations without the Bible! It is impossible; that history could not have *been* without the pervasive influence radiating from this source.

When we recall what the Bible has been to private hearts, what it has been in the public culture of religion, the impression is almost overpowering. Of what solace has it not been to the afflicted, the world-weary, the doubtful of heart! How it has smoothed the pillow of death! How have its mighty utterances nerved the champions of right, of freedom, of progress! How it has rested on every pulpit of Christendom, moulding the thoughts and inspiring the hearts of the preachers of religion! How it has lain upon the fireside tables of countless homes, the emblem of faith, the standard of appeal, the refuge in trouble!

If there is providence in any of the affairs of human life, we must see it in the causes which have shaped and pre-

served this singular agency of culture for the highest elements of our being. Imperfect as it may have been, misused as it has been, they are not wholly wrong who would call it the most precious treasure of our civilization.

For into it have been gathered, in it are preserved, in rich abundance and in striking forms, expressions of the religious sense the deepest, sublimest, and most moving that men have been gifted to make. About it have clustered, through the centuries, the countless associations which give beauty and pathos and uplifting power to religious and moral thought, and which link our present emotions with those of by-gone generations by chords which thrill with human sympathy and heavenward aspiration.

As a mere outward *thing*, the history of the Bible has been interesting, even romantic, beyond description. Through what vicissitudes its various portions must have passed before they were united in it! Whose were the laborious fingers that traced its ancient letters? Who were the diligent chroniclers that gathered up its histories, collating, editing, re-editing, the scanty materials of those primitive days? What were the personalities of those who framed our actual canons? What events has the Bible not witnessed, in what experiences has it not mingled, throughout its marvellous career!

Of such things I cannot linger to speak. Suffice it that the influence of the Bible upon thought and life, upon the welfare and happiness of its peoples, has been incalculable. The good it has wrought has been measureless. The evil of which it has been made the instrument has been scarcely more measurable.

It is a part of my duty to-day to remind you of the mischief which *Bibliolatry* has worked,—the mistakes, the ills, the wrongs, which have resulted from men's supposing and maintaining that they have had in their hands an infallible compendium of religious and moral truth; a verbally inspired authority, superior to the reason and conscience of the individual, to which he must privately bow his thought, and which any sufficiently potent organization, in Church or State, might use for its own purposes of moral or practical coercion.

It would be difficult to determine to-day which is the most remarkable,—the general freedom, activity, and fruitfulness, of the minds of Christian men and women, regarding all secular topics, or the continued repression of genuine thought, the mental paralysis, in which relatively to religion the sects still hold their members through the bibliolatrous

principle ; with the false and dangerous moral judgments they base upon the examples of barbarous personages described, in the ancient books, as directed by God himself in their thoughts and acts.

To the inspirations of the Bible may indeed be credited a great proportion of the highest flights of spiritual aspiration and moral nobleness, past and present. It is a simple fact, patent to every one, that a false conception of its authority justifies to-day some of the worst lingering barbarisms of our social life. Until slavery was abolished by the irresistible force of civilized moral sentiment, it was easily upheld by references to Scripture. Still, aggressive war, almost more flatly in contradiction to the express words of Jesus, almost the worst remaining blot on civilization and foe to its progress, is defended and inspired by reference to the characters and ideas of men who slaughtered each other a thousand years before Jesus was born.

It might be shown that the recent deplorable outburst among our own people of the military spirit, for which the clergy have been so largely and blamably responsible, would not have been possible but for the support which the most anti-Christian spirit of war receives from parts of the Bible which Jesus expressly rejected as outgrown in his time, and which he condemned as guides to conduct. Had the spirit of Jesus and his ethical thought really dominated our country or our mother-country, surely neither of the wars they are now waging would have been begun.

The Bible will continue to be a rock of offence, a stumbling-block, a source of error and evil, so long as it is not intelligently understood, rationally and discriminatingly used.

To bring the world to see it as it is should be one of the greatest services we could render to mankind.

And, first of all, is to be pointed out — what all know, but what old associations, the mere matter of outward form, continue to obscure — that, shall I say it abruptly?, there is no such thing as the Bible at all. Indeed, I always feel some compunction when I use the expression "the Bible," as I have been doing. Immense harm has come from men's regarding the miscellaneous body of writings actually comprised in it as constituting a literary, a didactic unit,— a book. We shall never use its contents in a proper way and with right results until we are entirely accustomed to the fact that the Bible is a library of many independent works, each of which is to be judged on its own merits, the proper authority of neither to be confounded with that of the rest. Our fathers very commonly used a

better term, "the Scriptures." Yet even our word "Bible" is a plural word, disguised in its English dress (meaning "books," not "book"). What we bind together in the Bible is a literature, extensive for its period, and highly miscellaneous as to dates of origin, subjects, authors, moral quality, spiritual value.

You know all this so well that I almost apologize for rehearsing it. But, while we know it, we do not—certainly the Christian world does not—feel it as it should. In fact, the great orthodox world, while admitting the formal diversities of the contents of this literature, nullifies the observation by the assumption, crude, unsupported by any proper testimony, untrue in fact, and dangerously misleading, that it is peculiar in the mode of its origin, its parts composed on different principles from those which govern the development of other literatures,—the whole a consistent didactic unit, the word, not of the men who wrote its pages, but of Almighty God, dictating its actual form.

What we Unitarians are in a position to see, what it is our primary duty to the Scriptures to declare without ambiguity or reserve, is that this whole assumption is false, delusive, and dangerous. However unjust their topics or the suggestions of any of them, these writings all arose in the same way and lie before us for examination on the same principles as do the literatures of every other nation; to be investigated with the same freedom and thoroughness, to be criticised as to their form, their ideas, their spirit, exactly as all the others. To assume otherwise is to offend the spirit of truth at the very outset, and does a grievous injustice to the Scriptures themselves. It vitiates the whole process of inquiry, and so distorts men's posture of mind that it is thenceforth impossible for them to see and appropriate the real truth which is before them. I declare solemnly that, owing to this false primary assumption of a peculiar quality in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, this literature has never yet really been known to the world, nor have its real values been appropriated. The doctrines of verbal inspiration and of the arbitrary authority of the Biblical letter over the reason and conscience of mankind have sealed tightly the only avenue of access to the truth which is in them.

"The letter *killeth*,"—well said Saint Paul.

The prime duty toward the Scriptures, then, of a body like ours, which has asserted the imperial freedom of the mind in the prosecution of truth, is to remove all such obstructive associations and present these writings to the world in the simplicity of natural products of the minds of



men working normally amidst the conditions of their lives in each generation. We cannot be too distinct, too frank, too bald, if you please, in the performance of this duty. Let us see clearly and affirm emphatically that *books* cannot be inspired, writings cannot be inspired,—only human souls can be inspired. Inspiration is the reception of truth, under the universal, pervasive influence of the divine Spirit of Truth, present in all the facts of life, accessible to every soul of man. Every true soul, in every nation, that opens itself to truth, is inspired thereby; and the word it utters will be the agent of inspiration in others, if—and only if—it arouses others to discern, to accept, and to incarnate the truth.

And this is as true in any other country as in Palestine,—as true in the nineteenth century as in the first or any age before it.

What now is the value to us of this Scripture literature? How shall we use it and make it useful to others?

The general value of this composite literature is that it exhibits, through a period of over a thousand years, the development of a people of whom *religion* was the peculiar endowment and interest. Great races have mostly manifested each some peculiar adaptivity to the apprehension of particular modes of truth. In Judea the religious idea was the characteristic and dominant one. This deep root, planted in human nature, gathered nutriment from the spiritual and moral materials offered by every race with which the Hebrews came into contact; and the Bible literature is a microcosm of the process. It is the record of a nation's spiritual development, and that nation the one from which we are ourselves religiously derived. Present ideas and faiths cannot be justly understood without adequate knowledge of former stages of thought which have led up to them. The Scriptures are a treasury of such knowledge, in which the most primitive elements have their place, and become of exceeding value. These records, composed centuries later, disguise the early facts; but it is fortunate they do not altogether hide them. The pious historians invert the order of development, and place at the beginning religious conceptions and moral ideals to which the nation only attained through long centuries of struggle and education. But their materials, which they misunderstood and misarranged, being rearranged and illustrated by patient scholarship, reveal to us a process of evolution as distinct and as suggestive as that we observe in any other race, peculiarly religious in quality in all its stages, and issuing upon very high levels of moral and religious apprehension. A primitive polytheism

merges in a monolatry (the worship of one god, chosen from many), which persisted for centuries. The name of Yahweh typifies the long upward struggle of their best early conception, out of which came at last the pure monotheism of the great prophets, and which led at last to the wholly spiritual ideal which became perfected and remains for all time exquisite, inspiring, gracious, in the thought of the last and greatest of Israel's prophetic line,—Jesus of Nazareth.

To trace such a process, to appropriate its suggestions, is, let me next remark, a work of *study*, not merely of casual and superficial *reading*. To place such a literature as this in the hands of uninstructed persons, to be read in detached fragments, with only common intelligence as their guide, and, above all, with minds perverted by the assumption of its peculiar and supernatural character, is to nullify its real values, and to engender innumerable absurdities and blank falsities of thought. So complex a body of literature must first be *studied and studied about*. We are fortunate, in this late day, that the instruction needed for its right understanding is now being provided even for the common reader. The researches of great scholars, adapted by capable accessory hands, now render it possible for the wayfaring man to pursue the path of Biblical study without danger of erring grievously therein.

With this preliminary work of instruction sufficiently done, we have before us the second branch of my topic,—how we Unitarians shall use the Scriptures in our own work. There are three channels in which that work naturally flows,—the direction of private reading, use in public worship, and the instruction of the young.

The two former of these are covered, so far as I can now refer to them, by what I have just said. Our maintenance of the principle of perfect mental freedom, our rejection of all authority but that of truth, our reverence for truth in all its forms, as the one sole object of desire, peculiarly qualifies us to sustain and promote the wholly unreserved, scholarly researches of competent Biblical students, and prepares us, measurably, to assist their labors by extending popularly a just apprehension of them, by vindicating the motives of the high scholarship of our day, and helping it to make its way throughout the world. We are in a position to help make the surpassing interest of Scripture study known to our contemporaries. I conceive it to be one of our highest responsibilities to do so.

In this work the spirit of our age is assisting us. Although their fundamental view remains unchanged, yet prac-

tically a more rational appreciation of the value of the Scriptures begins to pervade even the evangelic bodies. Shackled as they are by their false primary assumption of the supernatural quality of these writings, they pursue the work of criticism, in a halting way, and distribute no little subsidiary information to their people. No doubt this is having a wholesome effect, and preparing the minds of many for the results of unembarrassed and really thorough scholarship. I doubt if, among the orthodox, many of their youth are now set to "read the Bible through," so many chapters a Sunday, stumbling over the hard words, with no ray of intelligent comment to enlighten their way. The utility of the perusal of Leviticus or Lamentations or the Revelation, or even Jude and Romans, by the average young person (or older one), begins, no doubt, to be questioned, or at least qualified. Orthodox parents come to feel that the gross immoralities referred to in the Pentateuch, the brutalities of the wars of Joshua and the Judges, cannot safely be left to idealize themselves in the minds of the young, so as not to vulgarize and harden them. The larger part of the Prophets has little edifying power for the ordinary reader, and almost as much is really true of the Psalms. The old idyllic stories, the legends of the Patriarchs, the story of Joseph, the romantic tale of Ruth, the story of Samuel, the story of Daniel, and such a gem of parable as the book of Jonah,—passages like these can never lose their beauty and power to entertain, and they contain their diversified moral and religious suggestions. Religious self-culture can never spare the great epic with which Genesis begins, nor the twenty-third Psalm, nor the nineteenth, the one hundred and third, the twenty-seventh, the forty-second, and numerous others; nor the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, nor the fifteenth. I cannot even begin to speak of the Gospels, wherein the presence and thought of Jesus are as a vein of pure gold, running through the dull strata of common thought in which his professed followers consent to live. They are as precious pearls which, for the most part, we trample on, and turn and rend each other.

Ah, the loneliness of Jesus, still, in a world which adores, but not follows him! I seem to see him weeping over it, as once he wept over the city that he loved. I seem to hear him say, in the words which the little leaflet of Oxyrrhyncus ascribes to him, "I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh I was seen of them; and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them."

In regard to him,—this supreme personage of Scriptural

history and practically, for us, of all history — in the understanding and illustration to the world of his character and his thought, remains the highest and most exigent practical service we are fitted and called to render, the most peculiar and the most inviting one. A solemn responsibility, my friends, descended upon us with the apprehension of the normal humanity of Jesus. We became, I may say without exaggeration, the sponsors of a new revelation to the world. I am not quite sure that we have justly discharged it, or even apprehended it as clearly and profoundly as we should. It is my anxious fear, indeed, that we have not here been making the progress that we should. As I recall the activity and the leadings of our thought a generation or two ago, I feel as if we had not justly "fulfilled the promise of our dawn." The negative work, the merely critical work, we may have adequately performed. The constructive work, the profound apprehension of what that great man Jesus really was, the presentation of him as he was, of the searching truth that was in him, here we seem partly to have failed. We do not appear to have addressed ourselves to the high task with all the energy and devotion we should have manifested. We seem to have partly lacked the insight or the aspiration to take the higher steps in the interpretation of a mighty soul to which we have been providentially called. Is it because this great work requires not only critical perception, but fulness of spiritual life in ourselves? Is it because of such deficiencies that Jesus does not appear to be, genuinely, the *leader* in our thought that he imperially deserves to be?

On some sides (by a reaction which is natural when a great upward impulse partly fails) there seems even to be *retrogression* among us. There are some signs, I fear, of a tendency to revert to the sentimentalisms and mysticisms in which it has always been easier to indulge than to respond, manfully, to the rigorous demands of Jesus's thought and the high challenge of his character.

If such misleading, debilitating tendencies do anywhere exist among us, let us arouse ourselves, my friends, and cast them off. A measureless, noble service lies before us, if we will be true to it. Returning with open hearts and true minds to the diligent study of this mighty personality, let us recognize him as he was, let us respond to his call upon us; and by the clearness of our thought and speech, and by the fidelity of our practical discipleship, let us reveal the true Jesus to a hungering world.

The question of introducing *the young* to this great body of Scripture literature is certainly very difficult. In general,

I would say of it that whatever we do is to be done fully in the spirit which I have tried to intimate,—of giving them fundamental ideas wholly consonant with the results of the best scholarship of our time. The young are entitled to the privilege of being *started rightly*. The encumbering load of ancient, discredited traditions and interpretations is not to be laid on their tender shoulders. At least, let them be given an intelligent general idea of the nature of the Scriptures, their peculiar and great value, the significance of the history they have preserved to us. Above all, defend them, by clear instruction, against the notion of the supernatural origin and arbitrary authority of the Scriptures,—a notion so pervasive in Christendom that even our own youth actually imbibe it extensively. Guard well their reverence for all sanctities, but especially guard—and educate—their reverence for the supreme sacredness of *truth*, both of fact and of thought.

Alas, under what disadvantages does the attempt to instruct our children in the Scriptures labor! If the task could be intrusted to their day-schools, it might be more hopeful. But at present it could not there be done without tincture of an unsound theology and of the ancient false conceptions of the Scriptures. It seems to be necessarily relegated, mainly, to the Sunday-schools. And to give the children a just understanding of the Scripture literature and a reasonably full acquaintance with its contents in a half-hour weekly lesson for eight months in the year,—how superhuman such a task! How imperfectly it is likely to be done by teachers the vast majority of whom have never had the opportunity of special instruction in the subject, and really know little more of the Scriptures than to be familiar with the words of some small portions of the Psalms and Gospels! I am afraid that the effect of so-called instruction in the Scriptures has been, in very large measure, to make them so hackneyed that intelligent young minds become sick of the subject. I have known some parents who resolutely withheld their children, on this account, from all study of the Scriptures until they were mature. And, in special cases, that plan has worked well. Yet it is certainly an heroic method, in view especially of the fact that our children are constantly in contact with persons who entertain fixed, if erroneous views of the Bible, and are meeting thousand-fold references to and quotations from it, all the time.

God speed all the efforts of those among us who are so faithfully laboring to solve this difficult problem. On the whole, I think there is no one method in Scripture instruction more really useful than the strictly *memoriter* teaching of valu-

able passages. Properly conducted, in concert rather than individually, this may be made entertaining; and the glowing eloquence, the pregnant suggestions, of the selected passages, may reveal themselves to the mind long years after they are taught.

I may add only this. Apprehension of the value of the Scriptures, the effect of all formal religious instruction, must ever be dependent on the anterior and collateral culture which should make youth susceptible to high moral and spiritual ideals. If you would send your children to Sunday-school prepared to profit by the suggestions of faithful teachers, or to church for the elevating influence of public religious services, it must be by your planting early and nurturing faithfully in them the germs of high and noble morality, of reverence for all ideals. Out of homes which no true religious influence is pervading, where unselfishness is not the keynote of all judgment and purpose, where mutual love is not the ruling sentiment, and respect for the ideal the pervading spirit,—from such how can young minds go forth prepared to accept the impressions of pure religion? If the characteristic thought of Jesus is brushed aside in your habitual dealing with moral questions; if his cardinal doctrines of love, of non-resistance to injuries, of forgiveness, of unworldliness,—if these are treated as Utopian visions, not as practical laws of thought and conduct which those who profess his name ought to apply to every private and to all public questions, what can be the effect of teaching the young the words he uttered? It is either *nil* or it is positively injurious. Better youth should never hear his exalted utterances than hear them with the mental reservations, the practical scepticism, which prevail in all Christian countries.

## OUR RELATION TO JESUS.

BY REV. WILLIAM HANSON PULSFORD.

I have been asked to speak of our relation to Jesus. As regards Jesus, what first concerns us is not what we like to think nor what our fathers thought. What are the facts? Who was he? What do we know about him? That is what may be called the critical attitude. You may be afraid of the word "critical," as so many people are, from misunderstanding it. Take the word properly, and it means an attempt to dis sever that which is essential from that which is accidental. It simply tries to look at things in the clearest light which we can gather in our own day.

It is all very well to gaze at the Founder of Christianity through the delicately tinted spectacles of mediæval enthusiasm or in the light of a theology which we have outgrown. But when men demand liberty to see for themselves, and to see clearly, we do the greatest injustice to the person of Jesus of Nazareth unless we fully and frankly recognize that demand. We must get first and foremost at the facts. As the ban which prevented, in days past, all possible inquiry upon this very matter is gradually removed, we are becoming able, through the cultivation of the historic spirit and the development of the historic judgment, to make the necessary division between the facts themselves and those presentations of them which are due merely to the medium through which we see them.

Of course, the making of the division creates difficulties. The majority of people have for so long been unable to distinguish between the realities and the form in which they have come down to us; have been so long brought up to reverence the mediæval picture of the Christ, in a halo and impossible brilliant robes; have so long associated Jesus with the form and color through which they have seen him,—that the endeavor to take away these things appears like laying sacrilegious hands on that which is the real object of their veneration. Yet this has to be done. You may run away, it is true; you may become a Roman Catholic; you may abrogate alike the right and the duty of private judgment, which we children of the Reformation ought to stand for; you may hide yourself in some ecclesiastical cloister,

and try to forget that there is such a thing as criticism: but we of the free church cannot be of that temper. The inevitable spirit of the age which has made for us a new heaven and a new earth, in every department of human thought, has made this earnest critical attitude absolutely essential for thinking men. If you commit intellectual suicide, you may indeed lie undisturbed in the grave where you have buried your judgment, and let the march of human thought go past; but, if you would be alive in a living world of thought, you are bound to stand by the results of critical inquiry, and to separate the early stories and legends about Jesus which mediævalism accepts from the magnificent, heroic figure of the Galilean peasant who comes to us with a glory not of halo and robe, but radiant with the intrinsic splendor and beauty of a great and noble life. It is not difficult to understand the attitude of good and tender souls about this matter. The religious faculties and the critical represent different attitudes of mind. A surgeon cannot cut as a good surgeon till he ceases to be influenced by those bonds of tender sentiment which relate him to his patient, not as surgeon, but as friend. He has to forget that this material on which he is operating with the knife is the living, tingling body of one to whom he is knit with tender ties. Till that time comes, he cannot adequately fulfil the office of surgeon. It is the same with criticism: it must be cold-blooded. You cannot be a Biblical critic in the right sense of the word while you are at the same moment a consciously reverent disciple. You must ask, "What is the truth?" not "Is it what I should like to believe? Is it that which has ministered most to my religious life?" Simply, "What is it?" The critic must not care what his results are. He must insist merely that they correspond to the facts.

The average religious person does not in the least understand that. He is almost incapable of approaching the subject in that spirit and temper. He sees clearly enough, perhaps, that the man with the critical faculty and with his critical machinery, with his analyzing and sifting the Gospels, may by the process get a more or less accurate historical outline of the person and history and teaching of Jesus. But that is to him only a bundle of dry bones. The dry bones are not the Jesus of faith, who lays his cool and quiet hand on the fevered pulses of our life. Men are afraid of criticism simply because they do not understand that, when the critical process stops, the reconstructive process begins. Analysis, anatomy, may help us to understand the living body. It never creates it. It helps us merely to get at the



structure through which some living, throbbing, vital personality has appealed to us.

If your criticism is simply an endeavor to get rid of a belief that men have outgrown, and the result means merely that you cease to believe in miracles, in the Trinity, in the supernatural, in the greater part of the Gospels, it were better for you — vastly better, as far as religion is concerned — to be like the old woman you may see any day kneeling by the roadside in Southern Europe at the foot of some wooden crucifix, which is only a parody of Jesus, and yet finding there that fortitude and help to go on bearing the burden of life, and facing its difficulties with a patient continuance in well-doing which is hard to understand. She knows more about the Jesus we preach than any critical decision can ever give to you. It is just because of the perception of that fact that the fear of the critical process is so wide-spread amongst earnest Christian people. It is because of it that to-day men are so often saying: "Leave these things alone. They are beautiful. They have ministered to Christian souls in countless ages. We want them just as they are, because through them there may come to us, as there did to our fathers, that ministry of the spirit which we need." But let us think for a moment. The fact of your being a skilled surgeon does not necessarily preclude you from being a warm-hearted, compassionate, loyal lover of your fellows. While we insist upon the most thorough-going criticism, because we can have no unreality in our truth if it is to be strong, we must insist also that this very criticism is at the same time the greatest auxiliary we have toward a stronger and firmer faith.

We cannot help finding that the impossible blue robe is incompatible with any endeavor to understand the life of the Galilean peasant, that to remove the gaudy halo from off that sacred figure is the necessary condition of our fuller realization of the meaning and the power of his personality. The glory of the gospel which we of the free church have to declare is not merely the glory of its intellectual clearness and strength. It is that it most of all ministers to the hunger of the human heart to get into closer relationship with an ideal of human life not far off and impossible, but breathing, throbbing, alive, bringing us into living contact with the contagion of the divine life.

To change the figure, we are dealing with one of those magnificent marble incarnations of the sublime idea of classic beauty which some monk found in a Grecian city. It was not gaudy enough for him; and he wrapped it in fantastic garb, and covered the fair, spotless purity of its lines

with things which to him were more gorgeous and more beautiful. He made it glorious with color and gilding, so that those who saw it might reverence its beauty. That was well enough, when high coloring alone satisfied men's minds. But to-day the man who has faith enough in the glorious beauty of the statue says: "Get you rid of the gaudy coloring. Take off that halo. Strip away this artificial unreality which comes between you and the finer beauty which lies beneath, could you only see it."

It was not the theological ideal or the mediæval form that has brought the touch of healing to the weak and the poor and the needy in all ages. It was rather that, in spite of these things, they in some way felt their way back to the man of sorrows who was "tempted in all points like as we are," who "learned obedience from the things which he suffered," who is "touched with the feeling of our infirmities," until the burdened heart felt that the burden was less heavy and the way less lonesome because Jesus of Galilee had travelled by that very road, and bade them not lose heart.

What does it mean when one of the great warriors of the world, in the world's own sense, writes that there is one book that he always carries with him, Thomas à Kempis's "Imitation of Christ"? If there is any circle of intellectual ideals with which I profoundly disagree, it is the circle out of which that came. And yet year after year I, too, read it. Why is it? It is because, in spite of its mediæval dress, we see here a human soul, like our own, getting back into touch with the lover, the leader, the helper, the inspirer of daily living whom he found in Jesus. If that is true of the mediæval Thomas à Kempis, how much more of us, as we come into touch with the Nazarene, after the simpler fashion of Peter and Andrew and the fisher-folk!

There is our message, the old faith in its essence, far truer, finer, than it ever was, because it is emerging in all its fairness into the clear light of God. Upon us lies the responsibility that we be evangelicals of evangelicals. Criticism on the one hand, human need and human reverence and human loyalty on the other, are building for us a fairer faith. It is not only our privilege, it ought to be our glorious duty, to make this our inspiration and our message.

But I can imagine some one asking: But what about all the other great religious teachers? What about those who say that the light of God shone on every nation? What about Jesus in relation to them? Is he unique? Has he a place absolutely by himself? For instance, was he greater than

Buddha? Well, I cannot tell you: I do not think any one can. Where do you place him in relation to Shakespeare, or to Confucius or any of the great India seers? I do not know them. I have seen them only on the outside. But for us Jesus is more than they. He is unique. Your mother is to you what no other human creature can ever be. Her love is a love which for you stands unique and alone. It was from her quiet eyes that you, when you were a little child, first learned what love meant as it sprang up in you responsive to that earliest tenderness, the finest tenderness you have ever known. It is ill with any man who has not deep in his heart the sense of that fundamentally unique relationship which makes his mother *to him* the fairest, the most beautiful, the divinest being that he has known on this earth of God. It is so with Jesus. Buddha is an alien to us. Confucius, Zoroaster, those great, splendid men carrying also the message of God,—we do not come of that stock. We were not born of the travail of their souls. But we *are* of the stock of Jesus. In and through him all our tenderest and finest religious ideals and aims have historically come to us. As Whittier says,—

“Through him the first fond prayers are said  
Our lips of childhood frame;  
The last low whispers of our dead  
Are tender with his name.”

That makes him unique for us. God speaks in all nations and in all times and in all the development of human experience and history, but for you and me the voice of God which for us is most sane and most tender and most true is the voice of the Nazarene. Our traditions are permeated with him. Father, grandfather, great-grandfather, the whole long line through whom our blood has flowed, have been kindled to their highest and best by him, and led to all they knew of the inspiration of God through his personality.

This is a position which not only satisfies the head, but which satisfies the heart. It is not a position which lets us wander off into a vague allegiance to nothing in particular, a general admiring adherence to all the great truths of all the great minds, so far as we imperfectly know them. If you want a working power in your faith, you must focus it. And for us no personal loyalty can so touch heart and spirit and temper as the real Jesus, who may be as near to us as he was to the Galileans long ago, radiant with the light of no gilded halo, but of the grace and truth of his humanity. That is a faith which you and I may well glory in standing for. It is

not one that you must keep carefully sheltered from every storm under the shadow of the rocks of tradition, or which you must cover with tinted glass lest the bright sunshine of God should prove too much for its fragile strength. It is a faith that grows best to-day, as it grew long ago amid the Galilean hills, out in the free, sweet air, and lives best and opens best into fairer and fairer beauty and fragrance in the glorious sunshine of God's truth. Splendid in its strength, a faith like this stands four-square to all the fuller knowledge of humanity. It sits ever beside us on the way in the dark hours when faith is weak and the burden is heavy, one who is indeed able to inspire, and so lead until we, too, find within us the power which grew in him,—the power to make of us men, as it made of him a man, sending us out to declare the gospel of the glory of God shining for us in the face of Jesus Christ.

## HOW OUR DOCTRINE OF IMMORTALITY HELPS TO PROMOTE THE HIGHER LIFE OF MAN.

BY REV. CHARLES E. ST. JOHN.

In his admirable book entitled "Through Nature to God," Mr. John Fiske makes a stimulating religious use of Herbert Spencer's definition of life. Spencer says that "life is the continuous adjustment of inner relations to outer relations"; and Fiske, after showing that such life could have no meaning unless there were reality in the outer relations toward which it displays this ceaseless activity, goes on to study the aspects of life that are developed within humanity by the adjustment of inner relations to those existing in certain realities which, though unseen, are eternal. In the slow but overpowering changes that have resulted in human affairs from the influence of three great assumptions, which, made by the first thinkers, have only gained a deeper hold on the mind as the centuries have brought their lessons,—the assumption of a quasi-human God, that of the human soul's immortality, and that of a moral order holding in the world of the unseen and eternal as well as in this world's affairs,—Mr. Fiske sees scientific witness to the reality of those outer relations toward which these assumptions point. To a reasonable science it is inconceivable that anything else than reality and truth could have upheld the advances which mankind has made under the inspiration of these religious conceptions. The life which they arouse in human souls reveals the genuineness of those outer relations that are connoted under the terms "God, ethics, and immortality."

Returning for a moment to Spencer's conception of life, we find him showing that life advances higher in the scale of being according to the increasing complexity of the outer relations to which it adjusts itself, the adjustment being always an inward act, an unforced seeking; and so, as the spiritual relations pertaining to an unseen, eternal realm of God, those relations which are understood only by abstract thinking and spiritual aspiration, are the most complex of all, we can call the life which grows by adjustment to them

pre-eminently the higher life of man. This higher life is our spiritual growth. It is the soul, the personality of each individual; and, as Maeterlinck says, "It is well that men should be reminded that the very humblest of them has the power to fashion, after a divine model that he chooses not, a great moral personality, composed in equal parts of himself and the ideal." Anything which serves to make clear to men the ideal, the divine models that exist beyond them, is a help to their higher life. Such a help is our doctrine of the immortality of the soul. To the Christian Church these great visions of the world of the spirit which physical science is obliged to call assumptions have deepened into revelations, philosophic perceptions of truth; and in its administrations the Church uses these convictions for the moral quickening of the people. One branch of the Church uses them in one way, another in a different method. Here earnest workers are laying the chief emphasis on one of the several great convictions, and there others are serving under some other of the divine gleams of light. As for our own Church, while it has many ideals that work for the spiritual blessing of mankind, and while it is possibly more free than some churches to change its methods of procedure, and turn now and again from one line of influence to another, it is, it seems to me, possessed of a conception of the life eternal which especially points out our grandest mission among men.

As a body, we have never yet made the forceful use we might of our splendid thought of immortality. And, whatever else we may do toward bringing human nature into touch with the eternal realities, we shall more and more find that the best aid we can give to the higher life of the individual is to show him in what ways the life eternal impinges on his present conditions and moods. Doctrine is not life; but 'tis by our teaching that we make influential the realities that call out life. To this end I hold it to be of tremendous importance that every person should understand that by virtue of his personality he has immortality. This claim I now propose to justify by showing the results in foot-pounds of the higher life that always follow the adequate inculcations of our belief in immortality.

I am well aware that many have lived very nobly without any insistent vision of a life to follow death. This very fact goes to display the grandeur, the deathlessness, of the human soul; but in this connection it is sufficient to call attention to the fact that none on earth are perfect. Every soul can be further developed in the higher life; and we cannot press too strongly the affirmation that our belief in immortality

aids the progress of every soul who receives it. Though strong without it, one will inevitably be stronger with its vital inspiration.

Briefly defined, our doctrine of immortality, as I understand it, is that in every man there is a moral personality which cannot die or be annihilated,—a personality splendidly endowed with power to search out righteousness and truth, and make them a part of itself, a soul which is destined to an everlasting, conscious growth in the higher life which is not comprised in the functions of the body. With this belief we confront the troubled world; and, as one of the preachers of this noble faith, I find myself rejoicing every day of my life for the power of helpfulness it bestows upon me. It gives our Church the power to speak with gracious authority amid all the conditions of human life, especially amid tempestuous conditions, and so to minister to the peace of souls. To the intelligence, to the conscience, and to the will alike, we have wise, brave words to say. Listen now to what people are saying in this “world of men,” and then to the great words with which our Church makes answer.

People say: “On the broad bosom of the creation man plays but a puny part. What is he compared with the power and glory of the ocean? What is he amid the stupendous changes which the centuries bring? From Thibet, Egypt, and Mashonaland to Ohio and Arizona, there are found dim traces of an ancient presence of mankind. Ruins and graves abide through centuries; but what of the men who made them? We know not who they were. We have no other record of their lives. And do not these spectacles of desolation that are scattered throughout the earth compel us to think that man is but a vanishing race, his existence merely ephemeral?” “By no means,” flashes out the Church of faith in answer to this false reading of the facts of archæology. “You have simply called attention to certain yet unfaded ‘footprints on the sands of time,’ that were left behind by souls that were moving onward. All the men and women gathered once at the places where now you see only desolation were busied then, as we are to-day, about the things of the soul. They were winning that which made them independent of the fortunes of the huts they built to stay awhile in, and more enduring than their native land. The human soul is ever building itself ‘more stately mansions’; and, though the surface of the earth be filled with the outgrown shells which man has abandoned, do not for a moment suppose that any study of those relics can fully define the nature of man. Though civilizations decay, souls

do not; and the interest lying in ancient ruins is chiefly due to our instinctive knowledge that even there, so long ago and so far removed from ourselves, men were practising industry, thrift, valor, and faith, and therein were finding earth a school of the higher life. It matters little where a person lives, for he can lay his foundation stones of heaven in any soil. In far-off Judea, where you and I would rather not live, and in an early time which seems to us uncouth and barren, Jesus Christ was able to put such power of the spirit into his breaking of a loaf of bread as to compel the devotion of the world to centre thenceforth around that act. 'Time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthah; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets: who through faith wrought righteousness, out of weakness were made strong.' Time would further fail me if, in addition to those ancient men of power, I were to recount the names of such as Gordon, Livingstone, Nightingale, Tuckerman, and all the single-handed heroes that have founded new countries or lived out grand ideals. Throughout history and space there is no God-forsaken spot, no place wherein any person needed to sink into a last ditch of despair, no condition of things amid which the permanent treasures of the life eternal could not be, have not been, won. Man can be good anywhere, and the virtue is greater than its starting-point. Therefore in all the decaying aspects of humanity's career behold not the transitoriness of man, but always the mere traces of the line of march of the immortals."

Thus we teach men to understand that this beautiful world is but a passing glory in our progressive lives, and that every failure of the material bears subtle witness to the fact that "this world is not our home." With whatever charm or imperfection this world may be endowed, its chief glory is its record as a birthplace of the immortals. As Mt. Vernon derives its grandeur from the man who dwelt there long ago, so the entire surface of our land and sea is enveloped in a blaze of glory from the deeds that men have wrought.

But, not entirely convinced, the people who have thought that, because the pomp and circumstance of civilization are vanity, mankind must needs be the same, go on to say: "But consider our personal afflictions. We suffer so much pain. We fall undeservedly into such piteous years of loss and sorrow. We have to work so hard and incessantly. We are so insistently pressed by these grievous burdens that we cannot keep our hold on the high ideals proclaimed by the Church. Can there be reality back of ideals which real life can thus



obliterate?" "Yes," replies the loyal Church, "it is precisely amid such depths of trial that the doctrine of immortality reaches deepest into the heart. Inasmuch as the eternal keeping measurelessly outweighs the occasional losing, each soul can take unto himself an unfailing power of the self-respect that arises from knowing who and what we are that suffer in the face of things that crush and check. The restrictions and distractions and calamities of life are numerous, God knows; and, in remembering that the Lord God of eternal Love and Justice knows, we lift ourselves out of this smothering tide of engrossment in present trials, and stand up in a freedom that looks beyond the doubt. Afflictions, distractions? What are they but the stuff out of which we are building our temples of God? There are none of them so bitter or so mean but that some soul has used them for the education and blessing of mankind. There is no straighter path of moral growth than that which they follow who confront with inward nobleness these outward conditions of misery. This personal nobleness is immortality. The more we suffer, the more clearly shines the deathless personality, if we have caught the uplift of this far-seeing self-respect. You know the hardships of life, you that suffer; but you do not know them through and through until you deeply understand the inestimable worth of your own souls. This the doctrine of immortality alone reveals to you."

Yet again people cry, in the impatience of baffled brotherly sympathy, "What can be said on behalf of a divine justice in the presence of the innumerable ones that toil without visible reward, and render sacrifices without apparent avail?" Why, nothing, if there be no life after death. The question throws you at the mercy of the man of faith. But persist the questioners: "What of the suppressed souls of earth,—the insane, the weak, the inefficient, and heedless? What of those who seem to have no power to resist temptation? What of those whose work is never appreciated while they live? Corot could find no purchasers for the paintings over which the world now falls into raptures. Was not his life thrown away?" Before these heart-searching facts an unreligious philosophy will beat about the bush in vain; but we rob them of their terrors by our conviction that no soul is ever permanently at the mercy of the body enclosing it on earth. The body is a delicate mechanism by which we are able both to express ourselves and to make examinations into the nature of the outer world. Some persons are equipped with a good one, and some are not. The insane are they whose bodies are

so defective that with them they can neither express truth nor observe outward reality. They live obscured by an impenetrable wall of gross flesh; but within that wall there wait for liberation the germs of eternal life. All they need is opportunity and time, and these our God will give. So, in the case of all for whom the body is in any way a hindrance and a poor reliance, our gospel proclaims "liberty to the captive, freedom to them that are bound, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness." We point souls steadily forward toward the time when by seeking they shall derive strength and wisdom from the eternal outer realities, steadily forward, because

"We know there shall dawn a day.  
Is it here on homely earth?  
Is it yonder, worlds away,  
Where the strange and new have birth,  
That Power comes full in play?"

Now it is not alone the power of God, for whose culminations we wait in patient faith, but also the kindred power of each and every human soul. And when we see Corot and thousands like him serving unwaveringly throughout life their purest ideals, and heeding not the swirls of inconvenience, popular mistrust, and worldly failure caused by so mighty a swimming against the tide, then we know that we are very close to the things that are eternal. O Questioner, inasmuch as Corot did not stoop to swerve from his highest conceptions of art for the sake of selling his works, inasmuch as he went right on revealing in each canvas the full glory of his inmost ideals, he laid down a path through this world which all men can trustingly follow,—a path which shows no break between earth and heaven. As for his reward, it is you alone that doubt it. He does not. Over there he is well content with the record he has made, the path of beauty and inspiration he has left as his earthly footprints. That person is doing the best that can be done amid the conditions of earth who can say with Rowe,—

"O'er my bowed head though waves of sorrow roll,  
I still maintain the empire of my soul."

In life and death, Corot and such as he, the noble army of the faithful, blot out all the terrors and repulsiveness of death. Some think that death is horrible, that man dies only as the brutes die,—each death a ghastly spectacle of weakness, pain, and fear, of everything alien to what might be expected to characterize the passage of an immortal soul

into its larger realms. Oh, I have seen on the very threshold of death, in the extremities of weakness and pain, but with fear absent,—I have seen silent eyes flashing with the magnificent joy of self-possession, and the inexpressible conviction of progress yet to be. In such deaths as that the mere cessation of the physical mechanism is but a trifling circumstance. The steadfast passing of the spirit throws its dignity over all. There will be no fear of death, and nothing ignoble in its actual occurrence in any person who intelligently and completely accepts our doctrine of immortality. There is perhaps no moment when the help of this doctrine is more essential for keeping the higher life at its steady onward pace than it is at that moment when one knows that he is dying.

To one more plea of the people who judge hastily I shall refer. They are asking everywhere: "Does it pay to live? Even though there be what you call the higher life, even though it continue forever, is it worth a soul's while to struggle so hard for that sort of gain?" Akin to this is the universal question, which is not to be considered unwarrantably selfish, "What do I gain by righteous endeavor?" These questions are both answered in the considerate spirit of Jesus by our doctrine of immortality. They are not questions to be passed off as unimportant. Mankind's deep longing for a happy outcome of all true endeavor refuses to be rebuked or cajoled. Each soul, knowing instinctively that all his sins bring back upon himself their full penalty, is openly or secretly insistent that there ought also to appear in his personal life-balance a just and satisfying return for all righteous acts. Few of our race have been able to put wholly out of their thoughts this desire for rewards,—visible, tangible, and speedy rewards,—every martial hero to wear his medal of honor and enjoy his promotion; every honest tradesman to have success in business; every person who under difficulties is true to his moral ideals to be rewarded by fulness of happiness and freedom from sorrow and loss. We rank Jesus supreme as a moral inspirer; yet not even he could hold his nearest followers always apart from this prevalent idea that somehow or other a faithful career ought to bring personal benefits to him who shapes it, and we find Peter asking him what was to be the reward of those that had left all to follow him. There are moments when the answer which Jesus gave to Peter is painful to me as an apparent descent on the part of our Leader from the high plane of the ideal wherein men ought to live to the sordid level on which they actually stand; for, instead of charging

Peter to forget the future in the fine joy of the active present service, Jesus assured him that in due time there would be rewards. But when my thoughts are less dominated by impatience for the slowness of mankind's advance, and are more appreciative of the inherent moral strength by which the race is achieving that advance, then it comes to me that the answer which the narrative rightly or wrongly attributes to Jesus sprang from a wise recognition that the desire for personal gain is natural and right. A feature so prevalent and forcible needs comprehension rather than rebuke. Accepting this as one of the things that make for moral progress, as Jesus seems to have done, we shall only broaden the foundations of the growing righteousness of human life.

In short, it is not a sin for us to ask as we enter upon any commendable work what we shall accomplish by it for ourselves. For the more intelligent comprehension of the work we may give some thought to the question, "Will it pay?" Of course, no earnest soul will cease doing his duty merely because he sees no likelihood of a personal reward, yet out of the heart of the grandest self-sacrifice there still confronts us the question: "Does it pay? Does goodness pay? Does it pay to live? Do the universe and all that is in it pay for the infinite trouble that has been taken with them?" The intensity with which this question is put is one of the chief features of our time. When the stricken mother asks with rebellious heart why her noble soldier-boy should die in battle or in camp, her look comes searching into the very order of creation, and destroying any philosophy of life which cannot convince her that some definite good comes of the death of the young. Then to that mother's side come those that ask: "Is there not lamentable waste in the successive decayings of nation after nation?" "Since thought began, men have been developing differences of opinion about every subject. Does it pay to try to establish truth? The world has been some millions of years in reaching by the slow steps of development its present conditions; and yet how manifest its imperfections to the human judgment! Have, then, the groaning and the travailing of the creative forces paid?" "Mankind has not yet learned to control disease; is not able to hold every child up to the level of its ancestors; is not free from the bondage of the temptations which beset the unwary, centuries ago. Has what we call evolution paid? Man rises, works, eats, and sleeps day in and day out. Does it really pay to run this toilsome race with death?"

To answer these serious, pathetic, and most human ques-

tions conclusively, in a way that ministers to contentment and hope, is to give the higher life of man another decisive inspiration. And such an answer we give with our royal doctrine of the nature and course of eternal life. We begin very naturally by an appeal to personal experience. Did you ever permanently regret the doing of a brotherly or unselfish action? However affectionate hearts may have been wrung, did you ever regret your devotion to an unquestioned duty? Never. Though your purest endeavors may have been balked or misunderstood, so that your wounded self-respect shrinks from a renewed encounter with insult, still will a disciplined and mature self-respect understand how much larger than all such annoyances are the serenity and worth of high motives and generous deeds. In human nature I see an ever-deeping power of this serene joy in right doing. Somehow or other they that persistently obey their conscience are satisfied in doing so. And one reason for this satisfaction is the purely practical one that they have found that their course has paid them in the personal enrichment it has given to their lives.

There is but one answer to all the questions I have been quoting. The deserving do invariably receive their just reward. But human deserving is a matter of the higher life, and its rewards pertain only to the higher life. The average man may hope for some more worldly gain. Sowing wheat, he wishes to reap wheat. Doing kindnesses, he may hope that kindness will be bestowed upon him. He may think that material benefits ought to arise after moral impulses have prevailed in his heart. And then the Church comes to put a better logic into such persons' thinking, and show them that "God is kinder than their prayers." There is no natural connection between the deserts of a pure heart and the material treasures of a prosperous life, and God would be less than just if he gave in answer to an imperishable worth a reward in substance that moths can corrupt and thieves destroy. The divine rewards are sure—and imperishable, inalienable, satisfying.

As in the physical realm, every effect is equal to its cause, appearing instantly with the cause, so, in the realm of the higher life, every thought of my mind, every aspiration, every motive, produces an instant change in me; and that change is my reward or my punishment. There is no question but that the soul is better, stronger, more admirable for every moment of honest thinking and generous devising of nobleness.

And so we come to the sterner question: "Are such gains,

lovely though they be, worth the cost in long endeavor and sacrifice?" "Is 'admiralty' worth having, when its cost is 'blood'?" "Is character so wonderful a treasure that pain, sorrow, and self-sacrifice are not too heavy a price to pay for it?"

Indeed it is! Never again will any one put this doubting question after he has been helped to recognize the actual value of a human soul. If a soul is of measureless value, then its growth is worth whatever price has to be given thereto. Get at the heart of all doubt regarding the worth of living, and you will find it springing from a subtle lack of self-respect. O foolish doubter, look at those paintings for which Corot endured obscurity and poverty. Do you see the glorious beauty of them,—their soft lights, their mysterious distances, their delicate atmospheres, their divine power of making Nature reveal her joys and principles? If you do, you cannot hesitate to say that they are worth the trials that produced them. If you do not, then come with me, and let me teach you how to see with your eyes. And look at that soul of yours, O questioner! You are a moral and intellectual power of which the body is but a defective instrument, a power which no experiments with the tissue of the brain will ever explain. You are a creator of ideals that lie beyond the range of experience. You are a power for making those ideals to become a part of practical life and experience. You are a being "of imagination all compact," capable of originating conceptions of beauty that thrill men's souls, capable of seeing and expressing truths which carry the thoughts beyond all material limits, capable of commanding your body to do noble deeds from which every fibre of it shrinks.

No mere animal ever asks the causes of things, or seeks to know the difference between existence and non-existence, or dreams of there being a perfect orderliness holding together all things that lie in the realms of space. Whereas you know that you have no intellectual life unless you are concerned with such problems. In your methods of thinking, loving, aspiring, and acting, you have a personality all your own. Neither earth nor heaven holds another soul precisely like yours. As an individual, you mould material things to conform to your purposes. As an individual, you speak with God, whose offspring you are, and receive his revelations of that which transcends your senses. Now, if, as you thus study yourself, you come to see what lies before you, you will exultantly conclude that, just as great paintings are worth what it cost to produce them, just as the tough and polished

steel justifies the Titanic fires that give it being, so does this eager multitude of immortal souls measurelessly more than warrant all the toils and sorrows, all the strifes and waitings, of the ages that went into the foundations of human life. Not in vain has the creative God thought through the geologic periods in his vast processes of evolution, not too long is the time thus given, not too many the evils of the process, when we recognize what has thereby been produced,—a race of immortal children of God, of souls that can walk with God.

If, however, you cannot see all this in your soul, then come and gladly suffer them that are wiser than yourself to teach you the ways of the spirit. Thus our appeal to the future is always based on a clear perception of existing beginnings of life. We do not refer to heaven as merely a place of reparations and consolations, as if our life on earth were often a disappointment and defeat. On the contrary, we seek to inspire men to look forward to an assured continuance of the things of the spirit which they begin here. We proclaim the permanence of good work, the sure fulfilment of worthy beginnings, the natural rounding out of life. We wish people to regard their sojourn on earth as a period, not of mere endurance, but of achievement through endurance, not of testing, but of training; and to look forward with a dignified purpose of using forevermore the strength partially developed on earth, and of building grandly on their foundations of disciplined character. We inspire dismayed souls by teaching them that there are absolutely no conditions of life on earth that offer no chance of moral victory. In the depths of grief he that resolves to do so can practise a Spartan endurance. In the face of the subtlest temptations he that will can increase his purity of heart. When life seems to be nothing but monotony, he that so decides can rule his course by the sunniest ambitions. And all will do these things who understand that in such endurance, purity, and ambition, they are laying a hold on the future which cannot be loosened.

Still deeper into practical life sinks the influence of our doctrine by its awakening of patience and courage. The person who is consciously facing an eternal future, with a mind that is duly awed by a knowledge of the portentous slowness with which creative forces have hitherto worked, will learn to be content in his onward march to catch the step from God. For him whose daily work is done in faithfulness, there is no need of haste. When God working from eternity has been so self-restrained as to do in each moment

only so much as the moment would contain, and thereby has created the great conception of progress, we, crown and glory of the creation though we be, can learn to be patient for these few more years that intervene between this day of preparatory things and the larger works to come. This steadfast patience stiffens into noble courage by revealing to us the divine reasonableness of self-sacrifice.

Since creation must needs move slowly, they that bear its burdens must needs endure long. Not otherwise can they serve both God and man. Not until the bridge is down can Horatius leave his perilous duty. Though one more moment may bring death, still must he stand fast; for the destruction of the bridge is the salvation of Rome. In the light of eternal progress we see that sacrifice is not mere suffering. It is *achievement* of the most far-reaching type. It is the work of defence, of transition, and of necessary experiment as mankind plods along. Through it come discovery, improvements, and the sure enlargement of the world's higher life. Where sacrifice abounds, there the veil between the here and the hereafter is thinnest. Knowing, then, from the light that shines through there that unfaltering devotion is not wasted, and that consecrated suffering is like a divine rod and staff to such as wander in weakness, men gain courage for the hardest and slowest service of the ideal. There is no lack of heroes, when it is clear that heroism will tell for something; and so our doctrine of the eternity of life, in making clear the permanence of all spiritual gain, fills all souls with the heroic willingness to help in every hardest way the broadening of the common life.

Thus this conviction gives men a breadth of mind for comprehending that darkness and the light are both alike to God, and a sufficiency of heroic will to impel them to volunteer for the duties that lie in the shadow. Soul after soul, they step forth who have the light of this faith in the future and God's way unto it, to join the noble army of them that desire not to be ministered unto, but to minister. It is a doctrine that impels to all personal strength and unselfishness of character, never once influencing any soul to rate his own happiness above the service of the enduring right. Loneliness, suffering, and death become incidents to be taken in the straight path of duty as serenely as if they were what all men desire. Helped to see the truth about God and the soul, men are inspired to live by it. Taught to honor enduring ideals and think in far-reaching terms, they acquire thereby steadiness and force of character. Inasmuch as by our thinking we do not create truth, but only certain individual



ways of expressing it, we strive always to remember that our doctrine about immortality is not the important thing. Life is what is important; and the doctrine is but a means of bringing the outer life, that wonderful reality, to bear upon the inner life of human souls for their uplifting. As the invisible ether serves to bring down to the growing things of earth the life-giving warmth and light of the sun, so must our doctrine transmit into human souls from realms beyond earthly experience the Life that is eternal. In so far as it fails in this, it is but empty words. In so far as it succeeds, it ministers to the higher life of man.

## DISCUSSION OF THE THREE FOREGOING PAPERS.

BY REV. JAMES EELLS.

It is altogether fitting that the arrangement of these papers should make our relation to Jesus the central point of the general subject, as it must ever be at the heart of Christian faith. I liked what Mr. Pulsford said about the halo that has been placed on the head of Jesus. Perhaps I can gather what I have to say around that suggestion.

In the cathedrals of the Middle Ages you shall find this halo of gaudy gilt surmounting the figure of the mediæval Christ. It was the attempt to visualize the dogma of the theologians. When spiritual appreciation of the real is inadequate, the ideal is apt to be cheapened with extraneous adornment. Therefore, men made the halo tell of a sublimity which they felt, but which they lacked power otherwise to express. But they removed the Christ so far that they were forced to turn to the Virgin and patron saints for the touch of human sympathy and pulsing human life. Upon this conception, criticism began its work. At first it busied itself with putting life and humanness into the bloodless angularity of this Christ. As a result, we have to-day the Christ of a Progressive Orthodoxy, which is, indeed, a human Christ, with great attention paid to the details of the land and home and times in which he lived, with heavy emphasis laid upon the sympathy, the helpfulness, and the love of Jesus; and so strong is this feeling that Dr. Van Dyke could counsel the students of the Yale Divinity School, in his lectures on "The Gospel for an Age of Doubt": "The humanity of the incarnate Christ must stand out as clear, as positive, as indubitable as his Deity: nay, more, it must stand where the New Testament puts it, in the very foreground of faith. For it is only in this humanity that we can truly find the Son of God who loved us and gave himself for us." From this statement it may be seen that all this pity and sympathy and help are thought of not as springing from the human heart of Jesus, but as the transmission merely of God's love and pity,—in fact, that Christ was God. So, while the humanity is insisted upon, it is not a *real* hu-

manity, after all. If the artist were to depict truthfully the Christ of the Progressive Orthodox theologian, he would paint a man, indeed, but still crowned with a glory not his own,—a lay-figure sublimed with an extraneous halo. But criticism continued its work. It entirely rubbed out the halo, and left only the lay-figure, calling it "mere man." And, as it speaks that word "mere," one cannot fail to notice a tone of patronage, as though Christ, being "mere man," was not quite so good as the average man among us. 'Tis the outermost limit of the pendulum-swing.

I plead to-day not for the stripped lay-figure, nor yet for the lay-figure with extraneous adornment. I plead for the Christ with a halo not of gilt, but of the rays of light divine within him, which was there because life so truly was there. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." I plead for a Christ crowned with a halo made possible by a better appreciation of human nature, a halo put upon him because he has set it gleaming upon the brow of every man, a halo of the reverence of eighteen centuries full of men and women who have not dragged him down to their own level, but by him have been lifted nearer to his own. No man's piety can rise higher than its source, nor be greater than its inspiration. I plead for a manhood so filled with the Christ influence that what was said of him may be truly said of all men. That is the higher, the ideal life of men. We can be idealized only by an ideal.

Let me show you what I mean. As you read the New Testament, you are reading not a chronologically arranged biography so much as the history of the impact of a personal influence upon other lives. In the first three Gospels the men and women are strangely affected by this friend of theirs. It was all human, all direct, all simple. Yet the great love for him which was awakened in them idealized him, as all great and pure love idealizes. Peter, James, John, Mary, Zacchæus, were lifted out of their former unworthy selves into a higher life by the influence of a human friend, who walked with them in serenity and goodness. In that companionship they find themselves living a better life, they know not how. Instead of explaining this power, its effect is naturally told; and, behold, they have sketched for us an ideal. All this is more marked in the Fourth Gospel, because of its mystical Alexandrine cast. And who does not know that the Christ of Paul's Epistles is an idealized Christ, yet an influence so potent as to win him from a life of preferment into a life of suffering, so that he counted everything but dross for the excellency of that Christ?

Through the weary decades of persecution, men like Stephen could "fall asleep" when the stones of death fell upon them, because they saw their friend exalted, idealized, unto the right hand of God. From the burning gardens of Nero's Rome, from its arena, from the fagots piled in city streets, from lonely cells and cruel Patmos, they greeted their ideal Christ, and into his hands commended their escaping spirits.

In the hearts of all men to-day to whom the name of Jesus means anything, it means more than the name of any other man. Probably much of this is due to the preaching which proclaims that name as part of a mechanical salvation,—a preaching which breeds a half-formed conviction that destiny is arbitrarily to be administered by him. But, be the cause what it may, the fact remains that this sentiment exists, that a sympathetic listening to the name of Jesus is already widely secured; and, when we appeal to this, the work of the past centuries is to our vast advantage. All of which goes to show that the consciousness of the church and the unchurched cherishes, in one form or another, an idealized conception of the Christ.

There is a popular cry, "Back to Christ!" as if therein lay the ultimate. But to obey that cry would be at the expense of that which the Christian ages have contributed to the sum of his influence. To follow Christ is not to reproduce the conditions of his life in Palestine. Columbus set out across a trackless ocean, and made real what hitherto had been a vague perhaps. Every mariner who turns his prow westward across that same ocean to-day is a follower of Columbus. Nor is it necessary that he should sail in ancient caravel to follow sincerely. Columbus gave to the world a new and solid continent in exchange for a hope and a dream. Jesus showed the world that trustful, glad, complete sonship to God is not a dream nor a guess, nor even a hope, but a blessed and blessing reality. To follow Christ is to move out into the same God consciousness. Thus we gain a reality to which the ages testify instead of a reality in the process of making in the first century.

But the question comes to us ministers: "With the results of critical study to sober our thinking, are we honest in proclaiming as ideal a life which we know to have been a life of humanness?" I think we can be honest, and for this reason: any great truth invariably idealizes the channel through which it comes to us, but does not thereby falsify it. I go down the river yonder to Mt. Vernon. Here is the home of Washington. In that room he read and wrote and

entertained his guests. There are his clothes and swords and books. Here is the garden through which he walked, and the hedge of box which his hands planted. Through this doorway he often passed. In that room he died. And just behind that iron grating, within that marble shroud, all that is left of him is resting. On every hand are the actual scenes of his actual life. But nowhere on earth is Washington greater or more sublime than at Mt. Vernon. The materiality of it presses upon us at every side. But how slow of heart is he to whom these very material details bring no quickening of the pulse, no higher veneration for the ideal Washington! Is that feeling of veneration unworthy and hostile to fact?

Through all the avenues of this national capital, over its beautiful buildings, floats a piece of bunting with alternate stripes of red and white. We know how it is put together; we know the material out of which it is made; we know even the cost of that material per yard. Nevertheless, we give that flag to the winds of heaven on our days of rejoicing; we remove our hats as it passes us in parades; we honor our most honorable by dipping it toward them; we fold it solemnly over the casket of our sleeping heroes. Why treat it thus, when we know what it really is? When we would stimulate patriotism, shall we be untrue to our knowledge of the facts if we idealize the flag, and do not insist upon its price and the method of its making? Although we know that it is but bunting, thank God we have also a higher knowledge,—we know that it stands for the highest ideal of national life.

If in some such way as this we should proclaim the ideal Christ, we should do no violence to the facts of his history. On the contrary, we enhance those facts unto a reality which in former times failed of a just appreciation.

The Bible, Jesus, Immortality! The Bible is the story of those who in olden time strove to be at one with God. The history of Jesus is the story of a life which was at one with God. Immortality is the completion of those who are at one with God. Whosoever hath this hope in him purifieth himself as he is pure,—purifieth, purifieth, until upon him, too, from the more excellent glory there shall come the Voice, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased."

## THE ORTHODOX IDEA OF JESUS.

BY HON. GEORGE F. HOAR.

This great contention between our brethren of the orthodox faith, indeed nearly the whole of the Christian Church, and our own denomination as to the Divinity or humanity of Christ, strikes me as having one very curious feature. I suppose if you put the question to any man on either side, "Do you understand or comprehend Divinity?" the answer would be an unqualified and prompt "No." And, if you put the question to any of these disputants on either side, "Do you understand or comprehend humanity, so that you can define it?" the answer would be a prompt and emphatic "No." Now this whole discussion which has been going on in the Christian Church as to the character of the Saviour is a discussion whether he belongs to one class of being which you cannot understand or comprehend or to another class of being which you cannot define. For one, I strive to devote my thoughts to understanding and comprehending the message of the Saviour, without undertaking to assign him to either of these classes.

I would like to make one other observation for the consideration of our Trinitarian friends. I would like to know what they will answer. They preach to their churches and to us the Divinity and the humanity of Jesus, that mystical and, to my mind, incomprehensible dual nature. They used in the past to reproach us with all the strength of their theological invective for saying that Jesus Christ is a mere man. I do not think that in general has been or now is the belief of Unitarians. But they have been accustomed to attribute it to us.

Now I wish to call your attention and their attention to the fact that, although they reproach us with this heresy as they think it, every quality of greatness which they attribute to their Christ is found in his humanity, and not in his Divinity. It is the human Christ, and not the divine Christ, which they hold up for admiration and worship. The human nature, the human character, the human example of this holy personage of dual nature is infinitely greater as they describe it than the divine nature, character, or example of that being. It is the human Christ, and not the divine Christ, that they

call upon us to preach, to worship, and to imitate. They say that Christ suffered, and for that we are to love and honor him. God cannot suffer. They say that Christ resisted temptation. God cannot be tempted. They say that Christ died bravely. God cannot die. They say that Christ prayed to God. God cannot pray. They say that Christ had a mother and brethren whom he loved in life and in death. God has no mother and no brother. They say that Christ appeals to us because he was of like passions with us. God cannot have like passions with us. They say that Christ failed sometimes. He said in that wonderful outpouring of the heart over Jerusalem, How often would I have gathered you as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! God cannot fail to accomplish his desire. They say that God, who is incapable of suffering or sorrow, gave his only beloved Son to die in agony on the cross for the sins of the world. Which is the greater character, the being who, incapable of suffering and sorrow, gave another being to death and shame and agony, the innocent for the guilty, or the being who, capable of suffering, voluntarily encountered a death of shame and agony, the innocent for the guilty? You strip the Christ of the churches of all the attributes which belong to him in his human character, and all his moral greatness is gone. You have nothing left but mere power, without moral quality or attribute. So, however our Trinitarian brother may reproach you or me, the Christ he preaches, for whom he demands our worship and imitation, is a being of human passion, of human qualities, a being of human imperfection, at least of human limitation.

## RELIGION AND EDUCATION.

BY REV. THEODORE C. WILLIAMS.

I stand here in the place of my distinguished friend Mr. Hooper. It seems to me a singular coincidence. For I began life by teaching school with Mr. Hooper. I had in him an example of what a devoted, accomplished teacher can do for the public good. Again I begin life as a school-master. In that character I speak to you to-day. But I have not left the ministry. I am in Tarrytown as your servant. Only as I have the support of you, and of all my Unitarian friends, has this school, founded by Unitarian liberality, any rightful claim to public favor. There are many good schools. There are not a few in which the religious influence is strong. Unless we can make this school equal to the best, and its religious influence characteristically our own, we have no reason for entering upon the difficult and costly enterprise.

But education and religion can never be put asunder without loss and peril to each.

Where did you get your religion? Did it come to you as to Moses of old, out of some "burning bush" in a solitary place? Did you waken, like Job, from visions of the night, and feel the Spirit of the Lord pass by? I trust such experiences are not beyond your belief or sympathy. Nevertheless, most of us must confess that the best part of religion came to us through education. As for myself, I am sure of it. I first received religion from the instruction of my mother. In later boyhood I attended the Roxbury Latin School, where George Putnam and Edward Everett Hale used often to speak words of power, that sunk deep in youthful hearts. At the same time an orthodox Sunday-school so vigorously disordered my ideas that at the age of seventeen I supposed I had no religion at all. But Harvard College, snatching me as a brand from the burning, made me believe that *Veritas* and *Christo et Ecclesie* are harmonious words. I am sure then, for myself, that I owe my religion to a process of education.

There is not a person in this church but has been led to religion by the same path. You may think you have cast aside the creed of your youth. But you have not, and can-



not. You may have destroyed the form, the 'opinion, but even in its embers is something that doth live. The color of your heresy (if such it be), the scope and direction of your larger vision (if such it be), are determined by your education, especially by the instruction given, in the receptive morning of your youth, when first the sower went forth to sow.

But where and by whom shall religious education be given to each rising generation?

What is the single meaning of the many movements and varied interests that have come before this Conference? Why does Mr. Douthit give his apostolic soul to a "People's University"? What is Mr. Washington's service to his yet unliberated people? What are these guilds of youth, these alliances of women, these strong voices from laymen, concerning national righteousness and social responsibility? It all means one thing: that the minister and meeting-house are not adequate to the propagation of our faith nor to the spiritual hunger of our time. The work of the minister in the meeting-house is precious, is vital, is necessary. But do not adopt the sacerdotal superstition that the Church, alone and unassisted, is sufficient to maintain religion in the world. The Church is the overflow: it is the revealing of many hearts. The Church is the overflow of a faith and life which are in the home, the school, the market-place, and wherever the spirit of Christ is. Such is the conviction, I believe, which inspired the program of this Conference, embracing in its love and prayer so many regions and provinces of the kingdom of God.

Among these regions and provinces what place has the education of youth? Perhaps I can tell you some of the stages by which I have arrived at the conviction that the education of youth is the seed-vessel of the Church,—the vital and vitalizing instrument by which the Church is continued from one generation to another.

Many years ago I travelled in Europe with a pupil, who was a Unitarian. His minister was one of our most revered and sainted teachers. His family were sufficiently loyal to their Church to have chosen a divinity student as the boy's tutor. He was intelligent and observing. We stood one day before a picture of the crucifixion. "Is that Jesus on the cross?" he said. "Yes," I replied. "And who," he asked, "are the men on the other two crosses?" That boy had never had systematic religious instruction. He would have been impossible in England or Germany. We visited together some of the great English schools. We saw the school-boys

attached to Westminster Abbey, to Durham Cathedral. We heard them singing at Magdalen, at Christ Church, at Charterhouse. I began to understand the strength of the Church of England. It is this churchly education which pours upon every English gentleman some unction of the Anglican Establishment. It is not preaching which maintains the English Church: it is the education of English gentlemen under stained glass. It is because of this system that any educated Englishman can, without embarrassment, put on a surplice over check trousers and read the service with dignified devoutness. It is because of this indoctrination of youth that England's Prayer-book follows her flag and her cannon around the globe.

From this beginning, I acquired a habit of observing the methods by which great religious establishments meet the problem of education. I saw the growth in this country of Roman Catholic schools and colleges. I noted how in Italy, France, Austria, Mexico, the first contest of the liberals is to remove the "black robe" from the schools.

Not long ago I happened to wander through a mosque. There is no preaching in a mosque. People go there for blessed silence, for prayer, or for the cool shadows of the marble wall. Yet all over the world Islam is a Gibraltar against the missionary. As I wandered through this mosque, there were groups of boys sitting in circles on the floor. In each circle was a turbaned master, in his two hands a Koran and a rod. Some of the boys showed me texts, which they had written in fair Arabic script, in which "a hair perhaps divides the false and true." I said in my soul, "This is the Gibraltar which defends Islam against the unbelieving dog." I thought how heretic Iwan, when young, did eagerly frequent doctor and saint, and heard great argument.

During the same journey I saw Hungary, where our Unitarian brethren have kept the faith four hundred years, against the persecution of princes and of priests. It is chiefly a population of sturdy farmers. They have no glory of this world, no great literature, no touch with the centres of culture. But from this high-minded, intelligent yeomanry come strong, wise men, who contribute no small share to the higher life of the Hungarian kingdom. It is because they have schools. In the ancient town of Torda, where Francis David first uttered the Unitarian faith, there is to-day, near the halls that witnessed his declaration, a school for boys. Its teachers are all ministers. Its students are from far-away Unitarian villages. I saw many such schools in Hungary, and I ceased to wonder that Francis David's doctrine has endured for so many generations.

But I have said enough to suggest to you how slowly and from how many sources the conviction has grown in my mind that the school is the seed-vessel which carries forward into the future the life of the Church. I sat this morning in yonder square, watching the falling leaves. Above me were the majestic trees. On the ground, already, were little brown seeds in winged pods, or rusty, dusty coverings. Not in the majesty of the vaulted boughs above, not in the golden vesture of autumnal leaves, but in that inconspicuous brown seed is the purpose, the costly purpose, for which the trees were lifted to the sky. In like manner, I conceive the dignity, the charm, the splendor, of religious institutions, are but a sterile glory unless they achieve the religious education of youth.

How shall we do it? Some of you are thinking that the day of ecclesiastical education is passed. In a sense, it is true. But, in a higher sense, new types of education must correspond to the new type of religion which inspires them. We are distrusting ecclesiastical education only because we distrust ecclesiastical religion.

Let me explain. If there be in the world a form of creed which cannot reconcile itself with arithmetic or history or science, the teachers of it must sharply separate the sacred studies from the secular. More and more the so-called profane studies get beyond clerical control. If the school is under clerical management, the creed and catechism may be taught by the same persons who, at other hours, are expounding the secularities and profanities. But between the two classes of study there is no thoroughfare. For the sake of indoctrinating the children in an irrational creed, its priestly defender concedes a parallel course of merely human or rational instruction, because it is expedient so to do. Therefore, the danger of ecclesiastical education is, that it shall produce irreverent, mechanical study, actually take away the spirit of religion from all that it calls "secular," and introduce the student to spheres of "godless" and excommunicated truth.

But suppose we have a religion which interpenetrates every subject of human thought. Should we not have a new pedagogy? Would not the teacher have a new outlook on every subject? Would not his arithmetic and his history become sacred subjects?

Those of you who have studied the recent developments of pedagogic art are aware that a new schoolmaster is abroad. His attitude toward truth, his attitude toward the learner, is wholly changed. He has thrown his rod away. He is

emancipated from his horn book. He has passed from the letter which killeth to the spirit which giveth life.

But this spiritualizing of the teacher's work has been most conspicuous at the beginning and end of our educational system. Froebel is an apostle of religion. The kindergarten approaches her work with an enthusiasm and reverence inspired by a view of education which embraces a complete philosophy of life. At the upper end of the system stands the university, which is always, in some sense, a school of the prophets. All our higher institutions of learning are in touch with religion. Their students hear famous preachers. They study ethics, philosophy, and theology. But between the kindergarten and the university, at the threshold of the latter, lies the secondary school. Dr. Butler has called it the Cinderella of the series. It is neglected, and wears old clothes. It is the stronghold of tradition. It is under the repressive power of tradition. It conforms to no satisfying theory of education. Now it is handed over to ecclesiastics, now to pure secularism, and sometimes is little more than an expensive boarding-house for young athletes.

But for several years the reforming spirit has been busy with this anomalous institution. It is now the most promising field for educational progress. One of the burning problems in secondary education is the religious question. The rivalry of sects has succeeded in secularizing the public school. The Catholic expels the Bible. The Protestant takes down the crucifix. But, since pure secularism does not satisfy the American people, they are building, all over the country, large numbers of private schools, in which religion has a distinct and authoritative position.

The time has come for Unitarians to take part in this general movement. We need such a school more than any other denomination needs it. We need it because our Church has less than any other of that traditional authority which can constrain and compel the rising generation to be preached to and catechized. We need it because our view of religion is one which interpenetrates all life and all truth, and therefore we cannot possibly teach our religion effectively to youth unless we make it interpenetrate the youth's daily life and thought.

But while I stand here as your servant, believing that the education of youth is of supreme and vital importance for your Church and mine, I take no narrow sectarian ground.

I believe that the spirit of religion is necessary to the harmonious development of the human mind. I believe we are not educating at all, unless every subject we study is

approached by teacher and pupil in its relation to the whole life of man, and therefore in relation to what is spiritual and divine.

Is this a schoolmaster's dream? is it a minister's metaphysics? or can it be worked out practically in the daily routine of the class-room? I affirm that it is being worked out by the best teachers, and that it is the educator's central problem.

Let me illustrate by examples. Consider the study of Latin. It may be taught mechanically, as a kind of linguistic algebra, and never convey one breath or pulse of humanity to the victim who struggles in its mortal coil. I recently examined a boy who had read Cæsar and Cicero in several famous schools. He could not vocalize intelligibly the simplest Latin sentence, even after he had translated it. He had never heard of Hannibal. He did not know how Cæsar died. He had not the dimmest notion of the place of Rome in history. He never heard in what cause the Gracchi perished. He knew not the gods to whom the Romans prayed; nor why they fought for their altars and their fires; nor Roman justice; nor the Roman peace. Yet this lad was no dunce, no exception. He is one of thousands. His teachers had let him spend hours over verbal labyrinths to which he had no clew. Why was that boy not made to imagine the Roman world? Why had he not joined with beating heart in the quarrel of Patrician and Plebeian? or trembled before Hannibal at the gates? or seen the imperial eagles fly from Assyria to Britain? Then might his Latin have come to him as a glorious voice, not as a printed puzzle. He would have peered into Latin literature as through a dim window looking over a fascinating country. His teachers should have brought to every recitation something of the soul of Rome. His teachers should have put his mind into communication with a vanished world in which giants lived. His Latin authors should have been made flesh, and have seemed his eloquent guides into a vast scene of exciting action. Every Latin recitation should have enriched his acquaintance with the divine laws by which nations rise and fall. It should have enlarged his conception of the providence of God, strengthened his civic virtue, helped him to comprehend the events of our own epoch. Even the strenuous organism of the Latin sentence should have interpreted to him the quality of the togaed race.

Or consider the study of arithmetic. It has been made to seem a sordid science of profit and loss. Yet in its higher

aspect mathematics are a part of ethics and religion. Number and form are the first ideas by which the human intelligence attains the conception of an eternal and unchanging order. They are the foundation of equity and honor between man and man. Did not Pythagoras make number the secret both of music and of holiness? Did not the Hebrew command the "just balance, the just ephah, and the just hin"? Did not Plato say that "God geometrizes"? Unless the teacher feels this primitive sacredness of number and form, and shows its omnipresence in punctual tides and galaxies, in chemic atom and spiral leaf, he is not teaching mathematics religiously.

I believe we can take, in this spirit, every subject that the school studies, and illuminate it with spiritual significance. In the plastic period of youth it is a fatal error to leave any truth untouched by such illumination. It is a fatal mistake to make religion seem unreal by falsely separating it from all mundane reality.

Surely, it is possible for Unitarians to avoid such mistakes. We claim to be the Broad Church. We say that religion touches everything human. Must we not embody this noble generalization in the work of education?

Ecclesiastical education? No! Religious education? Yes!

Do you want your children to adopt the faith that is your own? Educate them in that faith! If you send them where ecclesiasticism prevails, they will either embrace it or reject it. And, if the latter, it will cost many a doubtful struggle before they can pass beyond negation into any genuine vision of the truth of God. In pleading for religion in education, I am pleading, I believe, for the very life of the Unitarian Church. But also for something more important, for the spiritual health of your children themselves.

## RELIGION AND CITIZENSHIP.

BY ADELBERT MOOT, ESQ.

For thousands of years, rulers took it for granted that it was their function to prescribe the form of religious belief that should be lawful. The thought of an individual liberty that could defy the ruler had not then developed. Religious liberty, in the full sense, developed slowly. Rulers had established State religions everywhere; and rulers and established religions alike, for selfish reasons, resisted all religious change or development. The simple religion of Jesus found such established religions, and had to contend with them. For centuries, Christianity made headway with the people because it was an "undefiled religion" that could be briefly described by a disciple as visiting "the fatherless and the afflicted" and keeping "unspotted from the world." The Master summed up all the Scriptures in the comprehensive injunction to "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, and . . . *thy neighbor as thyself.*"

The early Christians may have failed in some things; but their conduct was such as to show the worth of such a simple religion, when put into action. They made their fellows happy with human sympathy and helpfulness. The good Samaritan was multiplied. The Christian religion was seen to be *a way of living, a manner of life*. Justice was bound to be done where they obeyed the command to "love thy neighbor as thyself." Nay, more; for thereby justice was also tempered with mercy.

The advance toward an ideal society thus produced made Christians numerous, despite repeated persecutions inspired by the jealous established religions of the time. Officials of the government began to be converted to this new religion. To prevent further persecutions or to advance their own interests, they sought to convert the rulers, and in time succeeded. These rulers grafted on some of the illogical doctrines, holidays, rites, and ceremonies of the established pagan religions, to make the new religion more popular with masses who had not yet accepted Christianity. This mongrel Christianity was then made the State religion as a matter of course. As the State religion, pomp, ceremony, and func-

tions continued to be added until the religion of Jesus was corrupted almost beyond recognition. The doctrine of the Trinity was developed; and a famous passage of John was forged and interpolated centuries after the death of Christ and his disciples, to uphold that doctrine else lacking support in the Gospels.

The power of the Church grew until the head of the Church dominated all, and kings and States could not tell where their rights began and those of the pope ended. Individuals had no religious liberty. A citizen then could not govern or help govern, think or help think, unless the citizen did so as the servant and puppet of the Church or State.

But this power of Church and State became too great. A fashionable religion, a State religion, had been so corrupted that even the priests of the Church rebelled. The Reformation began as a protest against the latest and most apparent corruptions. Then began the struggle between the old church and the numerous churches that sprung up over which was the true church. With fire and sword the world was deluged with blood; and men were made paupers by the pretended followers of the Prince of Peace, that the true religion alone might be established. America was discovered just before the Reformation, and this country was partly settled before the wars for religious supremacy were finished. Our colonies at first were little wiser than their times; and they, too, established their State religions, Protestant in various forms or Catholic, as the case might be. Fortunately, there were churches enough so that a man could move to another colony if the religion of his own colony did not suit him. But the danger of losing valuable inhabitants made the sparsely settled colonies more tolerant of religious differences. In the colonies planted to carry out some religious theory and enforce it by law, we find the laws a strange mixture of the Old Testament and worldly wisdom. The religion revealed in their statutes was largely a religion of don'ts. To read their statutes, one would suppose they never read what Christ said about the Sabbath or of what he did on the Sabbath. They appear to have overlooked his example in eating and drinking and consorting with sinners on other days. The Old Testament, not the new one, seems to have been their guide.

What wonder that all this should have produced the inevitable reaction. When the struggle for a larger liberty, or at least to preserve the existing liberty, began as the Revolution, it was bound to make individual liberty more complete, if it succeeded. Liberty was seen to be but half attained, if



complete individual religious liberty was not obtained. Before the Revolution was ended, therefore, the constitutions began to take a form that disestablished the existing State churches, although that task was not completed until long after the Revolution.

And so to-day, in State and nation, our citizens are guaranteed religious freedom; while the Czar of Russia, the Emperor of Germany, the Empress of India and Queen of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and many other rulers of civilized States, rule over a large part of this world wherein the State still determines the legal form of religion. Princes still change their religion legally, as they do their names, that they may rule another State. And all this is done in the name of and for the sake of the religion of Jesus in the year 1899!

Considering these facts, is it any wonder that *our* statesmen and citizens should have a prejudice against religion in affairs of State? Put the question to them, and a majority of our citizens — I had almost said church members — will say, "No! I want no 'religion and citizenship' mixed together for me." So much do they fear a repetition of religious struggles for supremacy, and the attendant evils, from which this country has been happily spared, that sensible men often study the statistics, and then find themselves possessed of the Catholic mania. But they need have no fears; for, even in other countries where established churches still exist, the spirit of the age has long made such results impossible. There will still be legal tiffs over the proper millinery or fashion of the service, such as we have recently seen in England; but there will be no bloodshed by people who are intent upon the mere detail of a ritual.

In this country, too, the leaders among the Catholics are alive to the time. They know the Catholic Church itself will have a future in this country only as it adapts itself to the spirit of the times, the progress of the age. In the free utterances of the present leaders of the Catholic Church in this country, we may discover a patriotism, a progress, a love of freedom, that argue well for the future of our country and the security of all religions. The Catholic leaders here realize that religion obeys the law of evolution. Little by little the unfit and outgrown of each religion is sloughed off and left behind. The religion that cannot grow and develop in accordance with the law of evolution is already doomed. The unfit religions cannot survive. No human effort can keep an unfit religion alive. In the changes going on about us we can already see how fast this truth is asserting itself.

No form of Unitarianism ever became an established religion. So the simple religion of Jesus, as we understand it, escaped corruption by unscrupulous rulers. To-day the preamble to our constitution states our religious belief in the words of Jesus as "*summed up in love to God and love to man.*" *What other Church has so sure and simple a creed?* This our creed is no outgrown, man-made creed. *The truth upon which we stand is a living truth.* This truth is for a working world. It is often said the Unitarians have no religion but righteousness. Our creed is our answer to that charge. But, if the charge were true, how many passages you find in the Bible that take just that view of religion!

In the helpful lives and examples of our own people, from the pulpit to the pews, many of us feel sure we find the legitimate result of such a religion when lived and practised from day to day. Could we have a nation of such citizens, their religion would be sure to dominate its affairs. Such citizens cannot keep their religion out of their lives, their business, or their politics. They cannot do it because their religion is a part of them. Their religion is not a belief about things, but a part of life itself. It was of such citizens, putting their religion into their lives, that it was long since said, "Righteousness exalteth a nation." This pithy statement, based upon observation and experience thousands of years ago, is still a true statement. It sums up the discussion in favor of religion as the basis of citizenship. This, however, does not mean an established religion. We stand for absolute religious liberty, and this means we are opposed to all State churches. Most of us would even tax church property for this reason, among others.

There is a deep-seated prejudice against religion in politics, largely due to ignorance as to what real religion is and what it has done in spite of all corruption and selfish power that has hampered its work. Then, too, politicians who seek selfish ends at the expense of the public do not like to have some minister, like Henry Ward Beecher, selling some beautiful slave in their church, or arguing the right or wrong of some political issue on moral or religious grounds. Such conduct interferes with the "personal comfort" of politicians, who insist that religion has nothing to do with politics. Ministers and church members who insist upon discussing moral questions, when such questions are involved in politics, are disagreeable persons. They may disarrange the whole plan of a politician. But questions of war and peace, or of government, are generally moral questions in the last analysis. They are questions that are really comprehended in

"love thy neighbor as thyself." Then let the minister discuss them, if he understands them. The common trouble is, the minister discusses them first, finds out about them later.

Much of the prejudice against religion in affairs of State is based upon ignorance or a one-sided view of history. With all her faults, we owe a debt to the Catholic Church, which is too seldom acknowledged. That Church slowly raised pagans and heathen to a point where they could see the faults of the Church herself, and where they undertook to correct those faults by founding numerous protesting churches that should be fountains of pure and undefiled religion. To be sure, many of these churches were very narrow and dogmatic; but for the most part they stood for pure and helpful human relations. But the very sanctity of the home for which they stood was first established by the Catholic Church. That Church found our Anglo-Saxon ancestors selling and buying their wives like cattle. The daughter might be and often was legally sold like a young colt. It was no crime to capture a rich maiden and marry her by force or fraud. Having obtained her in this manner, her property became that of her husband, to be squandered at pleasure even upon another woman. The honest but unfortunate debtor was a felon: slavery was his doom. Against such Paganism the Catholic Church struggled for centuries, until slowly it carried point after point. In that struggle, religion, through an imperfect Church, was the reforming principle that changed the law from wrong to right. The sanctity of woman's person was established, her personal liberty was made secure, and the home and family were given a safe, sure, and pure basis upon which to rest. Had religion done nothing more than this, in time the family, the foundation of the State, would have produced the rest of our civilization. So great a service to society, after the Roman overflow of impurity that threatened society with destruction, would have justified an established church despite the evils that came with it. In fact, the established church was but a step in the evolution of our present civilization.

The prejudice against religion in affairs of State and in politics is really a prejudice against theology instead of real religion. All Christian religions profess to stand with us upon the principles of our creed, but they add many things thereto. There are their beliefs about God, about Christ, about the Virgin Mary, about the Holy Ghost, about angels, about heaven, about hell, about eternal punishment, about Satan, about devils, about churches, about saints, about mira-

cles, about the Bible, about creeds, about rituals, about sermons, about Sunday, about the Sabbath, about baptism, about infant damnation, about foreordination, about free will, about conversion, about the elect, and many other things. Then to-day evolution, the new theology, so called, Prof. Briggs, and heretical teachings of geology and science generally, are vital matters of belief, in the opinion of most so-called Christians.

By our stand upon the religion of Jesus *alone*, as he set it forth, with all these latter-day and unnecessary beliefs about it removed from it, we take a stand unobjectionable to any religion. In the Parliament of Religions at Chicago no person, so far as I observed, questioned love to God and love to man as the essence of every religion deserving the name. Love to God we can show here by showing love to man; for this is the essence of the parable of the good Samaritan, the prodigal son, and the other teachings of Christ by precept and act.

Apply our unquestioned religious principles, then, in this country; *for, as all profess these principles*, at least, all can apply them. *This is a co-operative government.* We, its citizens, are the rulers of this country. As rulers, we should aim to exalt our nation. Righteousness will exalt it. By exalting the nation, we exalt our neighbors.

How can righteousness exalt a nation? It cannot exalt while it is mere sentiment, or thought. It can only exalt when it is righteousness in action. Citizens alone can put it in action. We must lift the nation's burdens. In this country we have white men's burdens, black men's burdens, red men's burdens to lift. These burdens are our burdens as citizens. *We* must not only lift, but *we* must carry these burdens. To lift and carry these burdens is religion. In his last annual address, President Wright of the American Unitarian Association put this tersely and well in a few sentences, when he said,—

"We must recognize, preach, and practise the great command of the great Master,— 'Bear ye one another's burdens.' This is the essence of religion."

We must practise burden-carrying, then, if we would know the essence of true religion. Burden-carrying has made England strong, has developed her strength until she has become a mighty nation. The strong are not always just or merciful. Still, England is the most just nation in Europe; is much more broad, just, and merciful than she was before she became so strong. But she is not yet infallible, when her own interests are involved.

This country now needs the help of her citizens in solving live moral, religious, and legal problems of far-reaching importance.

To-day civilization in this country is threatened with social impurity and easy divorces, but the Church again lifts up her voice in eloquent warning. We must profit by the experience of Rome and France, or we are in peril. The rigid rules of the Church go too far; but our laws of divorce are far too lax in most of our States, and it is the duty of the citizen to put religious principles of right into them. If we do not preserve the family, the only sure foundation stone of our country will be removed, and the superstructure will totter and fall.

Nor is it impossible to correct missteps in our form of government. That giant wrong, slavery, crept into our republic, into its Constitution, and became one of our cornerstones, upon which rested nearly one-half our edifice for three-quarters of a century. Beside it all evils of to-day seem insignificant. Apparently, justice to the slave was forever impossible. Our highest court indorsed the doctrine that the slave had no rights that a white man was bound to respect. Impractical abolitionists apparently made his case still worse. But they appealed to the religious sense of the nation. Despite literal quotations from the Bible, and the attitude of the pulpit and press, which was cowardly in the main, the religious sense of the nation was aroused. "Love to man" took the form of demanding justice for the poorest, the lowest, the most degraded and friendless. The appeal to the religious conscience of the nation was not in vain. A literal reading of the Bible gave way to the command of the Master. The spirit of the Bible made alive, and the letter could not kill or enslave. The patient, humble, unknown lawyer of a Western village, wise and practical, arose, and said: This evil is too great to kill at once. But we will stop its spread; and, if it cannot grow, in time it must die. If the law will not permit us to stop it, the law is contrary to the Declaration of Independence and the eternal law of right; and we will right the law and right the wrong of slavery, too. When the slaveholders heard this from this practical man, who could wait and fight as Nature fights, they were afraid. They knew, then, the battle was on between right and wrong (as Lincoln himself said). They feared he was right, and the result would be that which he predicted. Their fear was so great it led them to attempt the destruction of the nation, that slavery might live. Little did they or Lincoln think the end would come so soon or as it did; but, when Lincoln

saw that he must kill slavery to save the nation, slavery was killed.

Now what made Lincoln so truly eloquent in that fight? Was it some form of belief about God or the Church or its rites, doctrines, and ceremonies? Not at all. His source of inspiration was his "love" for his "neighbor." That love was not a sentiment, but a love that caused him to do something. As a citizen, he went into politics with an issue that was a religious issue. It was not so announced at all times, but we can all so see it now. Of course, Lincoln could not have rendered such a service to his country and his race without other citizens who could understand, follow, and help. However imperfect existing religious beliefs may have been, the work done was a true religious work. That work would have been impossible if our people had not been a religious people. The most eloquent speech of modern times, Lincoln's second inaugural address, shows us the religious spirit as his motive power; for that matchless address is the sequence to Lincoln's struggle, and reads like Holy Writ.

The example of Lincoln alone makes clear the duty of every citizen to put his religion into his politics.

*Our nation cannot progress if this is not done continually.* "Thou shalt not steal" applies to the spoils' system and condemns it. No party, no boss, no man, *owns* a single political office. By law every single office belongs to the people. The officials are to be their servants, not their bosses. The offices, then, are to be awarded to the most capable servants. These servants are to be retained while they are most capable. Their political beliefs have nothing to do with their fitness.

When, therefore, a party, an official, or a boss, takes a public office, large or small, to pay a party or a personal debt to some worker or striker or to give as a present to some personal friend, that act is not in substance different from petit or grand larceny. Cleveland was right: public office is a public trust. It is not a private snap. As a public trust, it should be given to those whose integrity and ability entitle them to public trust.

We must maintain this position against all comers. This way alone lies freedom from corruption, from tax-eating, from a corrupt, office-broking set of camp-followers. Here, too, the law of evolution holds. We must accept the fit, reject the unfit. Merit alone is the test of nature, and our government must conform to that law if it would survive. This was the wisdom of the fathers. It is the wisdom of

England that has changed her government from one of the most corrupt to one of the purest. If we would repeat her triumphs in Egypt and elsewhere, we must see to it that in Porto Rico, Cuba, the Philippines, and even at home, merit should be the only test of fitness for public office. When the President of our own party takes a step backward on this point, as he has despite all excuses, we must condemn his action. We must insist that he keep the promises of himself and his party. When we are told he did what he did because Congress was going to attack civil service reform, we must ask, "Is our President then afraid?" We must point to Roosevelt fighting Congress and cabinet officers and politicians openly on the same issue, and winning. We must point to Roosevelt again, giving us almost a model civil service law in New York, despite the politicians of both parties. Did Lincoln draw back when the forces of evil combined and offered battle? Did the knightly Curtis yield ground when his aggressive charge met opposition? And cannot our President hold the ground won by others? We, too, must have courage. We must win that ground back, and more. The civil service reformers hold the balance of power by an immense majority. With right on their side, they are bound to win; for, in Lincoln's words, "Right makes might." It will not do to tell us there was no step backward, when the official cries of triumph in State platforms of his own party condemn the President more than we condemn him.

As a lifelong Republican and a personal supporter, I write these words with regret; but it is the religious duty of the citizen to put the cause of his country before party or person, where the issue is so important, and to condemn acts of such importance where they make against the common weal. Gov. Roosevelt is fond of quoting from a little speech made by Mr. Slicer in Buffalo some years ago, when he said we did not need brilliant qualities in the public service so much as we need "*courage, honesty, and common sense.*" *This statement is true*; and the courage referred to is courage to oppose your party, even your friend, when they are in the wrong,—courage to say they have taken "a step backward" when you have carefully investigated and reached that conclusion.

That, however, is a different thing from attacking motives. I doubt not the motives of the President. There are some excuses for his mistake, but they are insufficient. He and Secretary Gage have been true friends of civil service reform in the past. We do not need to make either an enemy now

by unjustly assailing his motives. We must be just, even to them on this issue. But we must say they erred in judgment, made a grave mistake; for that is the fact. A good record on civil service reform in the past, raising a presumption in favor of good motives, entitles the President to have such mistake treated as a mistake. On the stump, and in the press, too, little attention is paid to this distinction between mistakes and acts due to corrupt motives. An office-holder does not become infallible because he becomes an office-holder; but, if he attends to business and does his best, we can overlook his honest mistakes, if not too numerous.

Many honest men refuse to serve the public because they see so many unjust attacks upon the motives of public men. The unthinking public think the mass of public servants are dishonest. Such is not the fact. The great majority of officials of the national government are incorruptibly honest. Government contracts are generally rigorously enforced. The statistics show astonishing sums of money handled with a percentage of loss so small it is almost infinitesimal. Our yellow journals say nothing of this record. Murders, scandals, defalcations, unjust charges of shortcomings in office, based only upon suspicion in too many cases, are the only picture of our life they give us morning, noon, and night. Boston, New York, and Chicago, and some of the smaller cities and most country villages, have one or more papers that minimize this view; but even those papers fail to paint the millions of honest men and women, and their homes, in their true light. Vice, not virtue, is the picture too much in public view. Choate hit it all when he said the *Sun* made vice so attractive in the morning and the *Evening Post* made virtue so repulsive in the evening it was hard work to remain a Christian in New York. Much as we owe the press as a great educational power that has moved us ahead rapidly the past century, we cannot overlook these grave faults.

The loss to the tax-payer comes, not through dishonesty in the majority of our citizens or officials, but through the spoils system, with needless officials drawing unnecessary salaries, so the citizen must strike the spoils system to get improvement. The principal inducements for putting an unfit or bad man in office or keeping him there will disappear when the spoils system is destroyed.

But we must be just; and that means we must defend, justify, when unjust charges are made. To criticise ever, and never praise or even approve, is to adopt the faulty method



of some newspapers and speakers, who never exercise half the influence they ought with a better method. And we may also discuss and not decide, because we lack information necessary to a decision. A premature decision upon incomplete information is usually unwise. Just such decisions constantly menace republics. Apply these principles to our public questions. There is much calling of names, such as traitor, usurper, tyrant, slave, on each side of the Philippine question. These names question motive, but each side is sincere and honest. Heat alone prevents them from seeing this. Some of our most esteemed public servants have honestly stood against popular sentiment. I do not attempt to decide the Philippine question. I have not the knowledge to do it. Most of us lack the knowledge to decide it. But I do bespeak fair discussion, full discussion, without heat or questioning motives on either side. Full and fair discussion usually leads to a correct solution. It should do so on this question. The Filipinos are not yet schooled in self-government by one hundred and fifty years' experience as we were when we produced the Declaration of Independence. The principles of the Declaration of Independence should be applied to the Filipinos; but they cannot be applied until they are ready for them. "Love thy neighbor" must be applied here as elsewhere to get a right result.

It is in our larger cities that self-government is poorest. In the rural towns and small villages and cities the administration of local governments is generally honest and economical. In some, but not all, of the large cities, we find the corrupt spots that the citizen must attack. New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Cincinnati, seem to be the worst. There able men are so busy making money, so selfish or indifferent, that they often forget their duties as citizens. Even church members do not understand their duties to their neighbors. The result has been multiplied offices, extravagant salaries, jobs and steals that have cost the tax-payers of those cities millions. In Tweed's day the non-partisan committee of seventy showed the way to meet such evils. But they closed the doors after the horse had gone. They did good. For the punishment they gave Tweed is remembered by Tammany with profit to the public to this day. But prevention is better than sickness, even if you do escape death. So our non-partisan committees must do as we do in Buffalo. They must get good nominations out of the old parties if they can. If they get good nominations from each, let them stand neutral. If they get mixed nominations from each, a common case, let them condemn the bad and approve the good. If

they get bad nominations from each, let them condemn both, and run an independent ticket. The independent nomination should be rare, because proper treatment of political parties should produce sufficient nominations on one ticket or the other from which to elect a full staff of local officers. In Buffalo, acting upon this principle year after year has driven the political parties to good nominations in self-defence. After electing men from opposing tickets by large majorities year after year, the lesson has been learned. Bosses, politicians, and parties no longer sneer when you can make or break them. And, when they are on their good behavior, we, too, show all the Christian virtues to perfection. Then the "boss" becomes merely a leader, and the "machine" only the party organization. In this way, we soon come to realize that, if our officials are not what they should be, we are generally at fault.

Many good men take a pessimistic view of our country. They think and say things are going from bad to worse. They are mistaken, for such is not the fact. Over \$250,000,000 a year is spent in training over 15,000,000 young citizens who will be our future rulers. This training now starts with the kindergarten, which does such effective work that even the slums yield few, if any, paupers and criminals from the children who have received this training, as is shown by the remarkable record of San Francisco and other cities.

The number of men and women thoroughly trained in high schools and colleges has increased during the last twenty-five years out of all proportion to our growth in population and wealth. We are beginning to create the only true aristocracy,—an aristocracy of culture and brains, quite independent of mere wealth or political position.

In the second or third generation, millions of immigrants have been fused into the body politic; and among them to-day we find our most patriotic and valuable citizens. Instead of immigrants being a source of danger, our public schools and elective franchise have transformed them into a source of strength and power. While the quality of immigrants arriving to-day is not equal to that of a generation ago, yet the vast majority are still honest men and women seeking a better home and country; and, with larger opportunities, such men and women are bound to make good citizens and to rear good citizens. Even the undesirable minority is free from paupers, criminals, and diseased persons, if the law is enforced. Jacob Riis has shown us that the most undesirable immigrants of to-day may be made worthy citizens, even in the city of New York, if the command

"love thy neighbor" is obeyed, as it is by citizens like Jacob Riis.

We have recently purified the ballot by ballot reform. The State now not only punishes crime, but reforms the offender, if possible, if he be not too old and hardened. It goes further, and prevents disease by compelling cleanliness and isolating infection and contagion. If misfortune comes, if private charity does not relieve by helping victims to help themselves, the State steps into the breach. The individual kindness of past centuries has developed into governmental duty and obligation to the poor and unfortunate. Individuals and the government alike endeavor to relieve his misfortunes and give him another chance. There is now more danger that the lazy, shiftless, and criminal will be fed, clothed, and housed too well than there is that they will suffer from neglect or want.

The good Samaritan of to-day, like Mr. Letchworth, instead of relieving their individual wants, studies the condition of the unfortunate in all countries, and ends a quarter of a century of thought and care for their betterment by causing the State to become responsible for even the unfortunate epileptic. In such cases, we can trace the religion of the citizen through his action and his life into the very life and law of the State. In short, religion through the citizen who rules is easily traced into the laws made by the citizen. It follows, then, if citizens believe in love to their neighbors in a republic, which is merely a co-operative government of all, for all, the belief of the citizens will somehow become the law of the State. In this government, as compared with ancient governments, we see the effect of such beliefs uplifting and transforming government. Our task is well begun, but far from finished. Men like Jacob Riis still find enough to do in letting the light into the slums of New York. There are still men and women enough who find it difficult to get an equal chance for life, liberty, and property, although that is what we undertake to guarantee to each and all.

We are only beginning to learn that schools and hospitals do the best kind of preaching in either home or foreign missions. Our ministers are only beginning to learn that they can do quite as much by what they say and how they live outside the pulpit as they can by repeating creeds or preaching sermons in the pulpit.

Nations are beginning to submit their differences to arbitration, and to provide for an international court of arbitration, that war may be eliminated by nature's process, as a thing unfit to survive, because unfit to be used by a Christian nation.

In the evolution of the law, the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" from controlling individuals is coming to control nations, and the commandment "Love thy neighbor" is becoming the dynamic force which uplifts nations as it has uplifted individuals. All who believe in a God and in his laws, which have lifted man from the condition of a cave bear to his present condition, are compelled to believe in the future advancement of man along the line of evolution. Governments, too, must partake of this evolution; and the last government, and the best government, is self-government. We cannot doubt, therefore, that, despite burdens and difficulties and complications which must be solved, the very solution of those difficulties will strengthen and lift us to higher things. He who reads the matchless address of Lowell upon Democracy cannot doubt the ultimate end of this country if we are true to the eternal law that moves us. When perfect "love" to "thy neighbor" shall become the law of the land, the millennium will be an accomplished fact.

## RELIGION AND SOCIOLOGY.

BY HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT.

If we depend upon lexicographers for a definition of religion, we find that it comprehends a belief in the being and perfection of God, in the revelation of his will to man, in man's obligation to obey his commands, and in man's accountableness to God; and it also includes true godliness, or purity of life, with the practice of all moral duties. If we do not undertake to square religion with dogmatic theological thought and teaching, we shall come to the conclusion that, as distinct from theology, religion is godliness, or real purity, in practice, consisting in the performance of all known duties to God and our fellow-men and ourselves. If we search the heart and the conscience, this will be the outcome. We shall agree with Fichte, that religion is "faith in a moral government of the world," and that without it "morality is superstition, which deceives the unfortunate with a false hope and makes them incapable of improvement." We shall agree, too, with Kant, that religion is "reverence for the moral law as of divine command," and with Doctor Martineau, that religion is the "culminating meridian of morals." Still, we shall go beyond this, and recognize in religion, pure and simple and undefiled, the great moving force which underlies the formation of our characters, determines our action, not only as to self, but as to others, teaches us the rules of right and wrong, and that through character and conduct we show our sense of responsibility and of our accountableness to God and to our fellow-man, in the latter finding the practical work in which we can show the greatest honor to God and the greatest and highest comprehension of our best emotions.

If we consult the lexicographer again, we shall find that sociology is the science of social phenomena,—the science which investigates the laws regulating human society, the science which treats of the general structure of society, the laws of its development, the progress of civilization, and all that relates to society. If we go to our own hearts and experiences, sociology becomes something different from a science: it becomes a habit of social relations, the moral attitude of man to man, the comprehension of the methods

and processes by which men grow out of self and into serviceableness to their fellows. It is, in a religious and an ethical sense, the soul of society, with man as the expression of the soul and the means and the vehicle by which the soul of society works out the redemption of its material elements; and ethics, which is not religion, but which is not ethics unless stimulated by it, means the truest, the highest, the divinest relations of men in society.

Again, we shall conclude that sociology deals with the institutions which enable society to perform its infinitely varied functions, that every feature of society which comprehends the action of a group of individual units represents some institution, and without regard to the theory which may be adopted to account for the origin and development of society; for, whatever that origin may have been, all organizations having the purpose of regulation, government, or defence are institutions created by individuals in their relations to each other. Thus customs, laws, habits, traditions, religions,—everything that represents the action of men in groups,—are institutions in a sociological sense.

With these definitions we can appreciate the facetious answer of a student when asked, What is sociology? He said it was an aspiration; and, while the answer was given to slur the science of sociology as something nebulous and incomprehensible, it has in it great truth. For the aim of society in all its regulations is to reach an ideal state, in which all units, individual and social, shall be happy, and shall in their methods conduce to the happiness of all.

Religion is something more than an aspiration. It is a hope. In it and through it and by it the human race has always looked for the sublimest consummation of life,—that spiritual happiness which comes through the hope of eternal welfare, which comes through the hope of a relation to God that shall make the man of hope something more than human, something divine. Religion and sociology, therefore, with this comprehension, compass the highest elements of correlated forces. They involve an interweaving of interests and a recognition of a common source of existence of action and of ultimate end. Neither religion nor sociology can be studied alone, independently of the other. They must be studied side by side as correlated forces, each acting upon the other, each determining the destination of man and hence of society.

The earlier writers on sociology framed their works upon what is known as the materialistic or biological theory of society,—that society is an organism, developed on the

cellular plan, like the human organism. The latter writers do not consider this theory adequate to account for social organization; and they have advanced the theory that society is the result of psychic forces, of what Dr. Giddings characterizes "the consciousness of mind." If later writers are correct,—and they seem to me to be so,—religion must have played an important part in the evolution of society as a psychic force; for the emotional nature of man is one of the principal elements of religious nature, which is emotional in the highest sense, as it relates to the deeper spiritual and, if you please, even the supernatural tendencies of the human mind.

Dr. Albion W. Small, a philosopher, a sociologist, and a believer in the deepest religious life and in the influence of the teachings of religion, concludes that sociologists are, in the first place, subjecting social facts to such minute analyses that all science will be better understood; second, that they are trying to untangle the complexities of the social process in all times and places, so that we may presently teach men how to find themselves in that portion of the process which is working out in their particular environment; third, that they are explaining the operation of social forces and formulating the laws of their workings, so that we may presently know better what resources are available for human tasks and how they may be most effectively applied; fourth, that they are trying to find standards for judgment about the social products of one time as compared with those of other times, so that we may take more accurate account of our stock of social achievements; and, fifth,—and here is the deepest philosophy of Dr. Small's analysis,—that sociologists are trying to discover in the facts of social conditions and resources material out of which to construct more concrete and specific and coherent ideals of the appropriate aims of human endeavor.\* In this presence I would commend Dr. Small's article on "The Value of Sociology to Working Pastors."

The great question arises, What kind of materials must be used to enable us to construct more concrete, specific, and coherent ideals of the appropriate aims of human endeavor? And the answer must be that an ideal state of society is to be found only when religious elements predominate; for, in studying sociology, we are searching for the philosophy of life, and both the religionist and the sociologist find that, no matter when society began, no matter when social combinations first began to organize their forces, religion played a

\* Cf. the *Outlook*, June 17, 1899.

prominent initiative part. There has been no race in its primeval days, with or without organizations, that has not had its religious ceremonials, with their deep and lasting influence upon the purpose, character, and results of their associations. It does not matter how crude or how repulsive these ceremonials may appear to us now, they were the deepest expressions of the religious elements of man at one time.

We, of this communion, might assert that some forms of theological dogma are simply the result of the superstitious religions found in the crudest races of men. A God or a number of Gods have always had possession of the minds of men. We believe in one immanent God, the source of all intelligence, who is all intelligence. This only raises us in the standard of religious culture and, I believe, in the power of religious force. We apply our religious culture to the shaping of human events, to the formation of human enterprise, to the purpose of human organizations, and hence to the real purpose of society itself. We have grown out of savagery and barbarism and superstition in some degree; but that degree is immense when we compare the present with the far past, and whether we are dealing with society or with religion as a force in society,

The struggles of men assume a different phase as the development of religious belief goes on, the development of social relations accompanying the religious development. We are just beginning to comprehend the living Christ in all the relations of men,—the Christ who lived before the Christian era, and who has had a living personality since then. We believe more and more in the true essence of religion, which is the absolute foundation of the very best society. This is found in the utterance, "Bear ye one another's burdens." But this sentiment is as old as creation, as new as to-day. While all the races, crude and cultured, have had their God or Gods, all races have had their Christs; and the Christ idea in social development has been summed up in the command, "What you do not like when done to yourself, do not do to others," as the inspiration of the Chinese philosopher five hundred years before our own great Master, when from his inspiration came the command, "Do unto others as ye would that others would do unto you." The Christ of the Buddhists gave the world the same inspiration; and so did Seneca, and so did Kant. I have just read in a book entitled "Better World Philosophy" that this is the injunction which has been proclaimed by the sublimest souls that have pondered and agonized over the sins of beings.



The injunction is to put yourself in the place of others. It is consideration of others as ardent as consideration of self. It is the balancing of abilities, the social ideal.\* So, in the great command of the greatest teacher of divine truth the world has ever seen, and of inspired teachers before and since his birth and death,— the command, "Bear ye one another's burdens," — religion and sociology find their deepest expression and their truest harmony.

But sociology deals with practical problems, with the great difficulties constantly besetting governments as the highest representations of social organization. How shall we deal with the poor and those needing the assistance of the well-to-do? Crude charity, as a sociological force, says they must be assisted. Religion, as a divine force, gives charity the first place in human qualities. Religion and sociology, making a scientific study of this very difficulty in human relations, teach us that there is as much danger in benevolence and philanthropy as in the neglect of philanthropic and benevolent impulses. Experience and examination and research show that crude charity is a menace to society. We throw many young men and women into penal institutions by our benevolent acts by bringing them up in reformatory and charitable institutions until old enough to earn their own living, and then sending them out into the world without the knowledge or the technical skill by which they can sustain themselves. More enlightened religion and more scientific sociology will right this wrong, and teach the true method under which men shall be equipped for life-work, and not simply educated to become public wards. Religion has invaded the prison, sociology has furnished the facts, and the religious heart, allied to sociological science, has developed penology into the science of reclamation. Religion has forgotten the wrathful God under which society justified itself in avenging its wrongs upon the wrong-doer, and has taught the world that the only true method is to treat the prisoner as a morally sick man, under the obligation that he shall be returned to society supplied with the knowledge the deficiency in which in a majority of cases brought him to the prison.

Religion is reaching out into sociological lines in other directions. It is putting its hand upon government and upon all the integral elements of government. It is influencing the individual units of society, so that by their development and by their culture the government itself shall be as pure as its source,— a long struggle, to be sure; but religion

\* Cf. "Better World Philosophy," J. Howard Moore, p. 194.

and sociology as allied forces, or, as a better expression, religion as a force in determining sociological work, is bringing about the regeneration.

Sociology has as one of its departments political economy; and, although the economists resent all encroachments of religion or deny the existence of religion as a force in political economy, it is, nevertheless, an assured fact that religion is making a new political economy. The Ruskin school is increasing its student roll, and that increased student roll is developing new elements in the political and economic relations of man. We can join with Henry D. Lloyd in his enthusiasm when he declares that there is a new political economy, which looks first to the care and culture of men; that there is a new self-interest of the individual, who puts his family before himself, his country before his family, mankind before his country, because there is filtering into his conscience the vast fact that his share of what is done for him by mankind is of far more value to him than what he does for himself. This new political economy, which Mr. Lloyd describes as a new self-interest of the community, and which is going into the slums, factories, mines, and workshops, desires to make all safe by making its weakest safe; and Mr. Lloyd closes with the statement that there is a new state,—the organized body of Christ,—which feeds the hungry, heals the sick, and visits those in prison, and gathers up the children,—a new religion, in fact, a religion of progress and of man as a partner in the creation of that progress, creating new ideas, new species of plants and animals, new men, and new society. In this light, can we deny the force of religion in shaping our sociological work? Patriotism is born of religion, and patriotism is a power in the development of society; but in religion is found the very fundamental principle of patriotism,—that is, loyalty to a principle, loyalty to country, and, through loyalty to country, loyalty to God.

A German evangelical, Rudolph Todt, in applying physiological science to society, finds that political economy is the anatomy which makes known the construction of the body social; that socialism is the pathology that describes the maladies of society, and that the church represents the therapeutics that prescribe the proper remedies. And on the title-page of his book he has inscribed the following: "Whoever would understand the social question, and wishes to aid in solving it, must have on his right hand the works on political economy, on his left those on scientific socialism, and before him must keep open the New Testament."

How emphatically true it is that by the adoption of this principle the labor question, with all its ramifications, is lifted to a higher plane than the mere consideration of some of the narrow tenets which have accompanied its discussion! The hours of labor, the question of wages, in this light do not constitute the labor question, but the great struggle of humanity to secure a higher standard of living, to be able to indulge in the spiritual affairs of life, those affairs that are above and beyond the mere contest for subsistence. And in the settlement of labor difficulties, the contests between labor and capital as represented by laborers and capitalists, this principle is the only one that can have any effective or lasting influence. Very many strikes and lockouts are the result of close observance of David Harum's golden rule for the horse-trader,—“Do unto the other fellow as you think the other fellow is going to do unto you, and do it fust.” When this jockey rule in labor matters is displaced by the true golden rule, labor wars will cease or be carried on purely on ethical and economic lines, avoiding those disastrous personal conflicts which not only interfere with business, as represented by the parties involved, but disturb the whole community. The labor question can be treated or solved only by Mr. Dole's “Coming People,”—people who apply religion and knowledge at the same time to a specific question.

We must adopt the therapeutics taught by religion. We must understand the maladies of society through sociological science. Each teaches that the greatest enemy of the human race, as well as the greatest impelling force to human progress and civilization, is selfishness. The egoism of man has carried him into the worst crimes, both individually and collectively, the world has ever witnessed. Egoism has also carried him into the sublimest altruism and into the most aggressive movements for the benefit of the race at large. There is no act of altruism that has not in it the elements of selfishness. Religion would teach us that the selfishness or the egoism shall be of the purest quality, shall be that selfishness which demands of a man such service as shall increase the happiness of those for whom it is intended as much as for his own happiness. Man lives by competitive force. He desires to win in the race. Religion teaches him that his service must be for humanity, and not for himself alone. It teaches that his restlessness, which was born when man came on the earth, must be shaped, guided, and used in the interest of all.

So we can draw living principles from all the reformers,

of whatever name or distinction, the world has ever seen. The socialist teaches that society should be conducted on the basis of demanding from each man according to his ability and giving to each according to his needs,— a doctrine which has in it the essence of Christ's command, but which is dangerous unless intelligently carried out. The facts of sociology teach us the results of reckless adhesion to it; while religion, on the other hand, teaches us the great benefits of its intelligent adoption in the light of the principles of the Christian religion.

Man is full of faults. Sociology undertakes to reveal the faults of man in his social relations, not in a theological sense, but in a practical sense. The application of the true essence of religion is correcting these faults and making the very passions of men forcible in the service of God.

It is not my province at this time to speak to the clergy of the necessity of knowledge in the science of sociology; but it may be intimated that the pulpit is not a lyceum, is not a platform for the especial discussion of sociological questions, but that it is and should be a medium of instruction in those deep, practical, religious principles which, applied to ordinary, every-day human affairs, will lead to a better understanding, to a truer reform than we have seen, and to the enlightenment of men. The attempt to apply religion to sociological conditions, without a knowledge of all that the science of sociology can disclose in any particular direction, comes very near being an intellectual, if not a moral, crime. The pulpit is the place for the deepest religious instruction; but, as the deepest religious instruction means the welfare of the human race in its social relations, the pulpit has a power for good or evil in the direction of this paper which cannot be estimated. Let the teaching of the pulpit be in the light of actual sociological science, and then the broadest and the most satisfactory results will be reached. Whoever undertakes to study science in any department, whether geology or sociology or biology or anthropology, without understanding the religious interpretation of the facts which these sciences disclose, falls short of his duty, falls short in his comprehension of the real, living Christ that pervades all elements of all society and all revelations of science.



## ADDRESSES.



## WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON MEETING.

---

The usual National Conference Meeting under the auspices of the Unitarian Sunday School Society was held in All Souls' Church, Wednesday, October 18, 2 P.M. There was a large gathering. Rev. A. M. Lord of Providence, R.I., vice-president, conducted the exercises. The several speakers received a response to their sentiments, the singing was vigorous, and the cause of moral and religious education received an impetus. The speakers were Prof. Booker T. Washington, Mrs. Isabel Francis Bellows, and Rev. Thomas R. Slicer.

---

## RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AT THE SOUTH.

BY BOOKER T. WASHINGTON, TUSKEGEE.

In discussing religious education at the South, I shall do so in rather a broad sense. The negro at the South, beginning with almost no property thirty-five years ago, has succeeded in building for himself churches, in a degree that I think would surprise people who had not looked into the subject. We are safe in saying that our people own church property that is now valued at more than twenty-five million dollars. This property has been accumulated at the cost of much sacrifice and earnest effort. A very large proportion of it is the result of the nickels, dimes, and dollars which the women have earned over the wash-tub and over the cooking-stove. While he has gone to the North and West for money with which to educate himself and with which to build his school-houses, his church-houses the negro has built for himself.

The most successful effort at organization on the part of the negro is to be seen in connection with his church life. Take, for example, the African Methodist Church, with nine



bishops and with thousands of members, scattered throughout the country. The affairs of this Church are organized and managed with a success that would be creditable to any race, notwithstanding the fact that the negro has had only thirty-five years in which to learn how to conduct successful organizations. In fact, we have built more churches during the last thirty-five years than we have built factories and stores.

The race has not only built nearly all its own church-houses, but in a very large measure it supports its ministers. In many cases the support is very meagre, it is true, often a minister not getting more than \$10 a month in cash for his services.

The church of the negro has not only resulted in improving the moral and spiritual condition of the people, but I think it would surprise you to know to how large an extent the negro church has taken care of the poor and unfortunate among our people. It is very seldom in any part of this country that you find a black hand reached out from the corner of the street asking for charity. This is because the negro church is learning not only to care for the souls, but for the bodies of our people. All through the North and West the white people have thousands of institutions whose object is not only to save the white people, but to keep them saved after they are once on their feet. Everywhere your race has hospitals, day nurseries, rescue homes, free dispensaries, news-boys' homes, Young Men's Christian Associations, lying-in-asylums, institutions for the feeble-minded, societies for the prevention of cruelty to children, orphan asylums, half-orphan asylums, and libraries. The negro is blessed with few of these organizations. If such organizations are necessary for a race that has been on its feet for thousands of years, how much more are they necessary for a race that has never yet got on its feet? Do you wonder that the negro is not always what he should be in morals and religion, when he has so few of these saving and protecting institutions? The church not only preaches the gospel, but in a large degree it answers the purpose of all these institutions to which I have referred.

The faith that meant effort was given to us during slavery. I can remember the first prayer that I ever heard. It was the prayer of my mother. Early one morning, about four o'clock, just as it was getting light, before my mother went into the cotton-field, as I was a-sleeping on a heap of rags on the floor, I was waked by hearing my mother praying for me, that one day I might be free, and that Massa Linkum might

succeed. That prayer gave me faith in God. That prayer served to show me what the religion of my mother and my father meant.

I was in the State of Ohio a few days ago, and I saw there an example of what the negro's religion meant during the days of slavery. I found a man who had bargained with his master a few days before the proclamation of freedom, and who had agreed to pay that master one thousand dollars if he would let him go free. The master said, "You can go if you will give me your word that, at the end of such a time, you will pay me the whole of that thousand dollars." Before he left, the slave put into his master's hands six hundred dollars in cash, and went to Ohio. Then came the emancipation proclamation. When he had earned the other four hundred dollars, that negro walked over the mountains of West Virginia, and found his ex-master and placed the four hundred dollars in his hands, though he was legally discharged from doing so by the proclamation. When I saw him a few days ago, I asked: "Why did you do that? What led you to do it?" "Mr. Washington," he said, "I learned to be a Christian during the days of slavery, and I thought that Christianity ought to be practised as much after I got my freedom as when I was a slave." [Applause.]

During the days of slavery you must remember the negro had practically no family life. The foundation of your Christianity is in a large measure laid in the home. Negro parents during slavery did not have the responsibility and consequently were without the experience of rearing their own children. It has only been within the last thirty-five years that the negro mother and father have had the opportunity of getting experience in creating a family life, in instilling those principles of morality and Christianity into the children which you in your homes have for centuries had the benefit of. At the end of forty or fifty more years, when the negro parents learn by experience how to control and elevate their children, I think you will find a different and higher set of negro youths than those that exist in the present generation.

In many cases it is very interesting to note the difference between the old religious life and the new. Some time ago an old colored man in a Sunday-school was trying to explain why the children of Israel were not drowned when Pharaoh's hosts were. The old man said it was in this way. When the first party came along, it was early in the morning and the ice was hard and thick, and they had no trouble in crossing over. But, when the next party came along, it was

twelve o'clock, and the sun had been shining on that ice a long time, and made it so thin that they went through. There happened to be a representative of the newer generation present; and he got up, and said he did not accept that explanation, for he had been at school and studied about those things in his geography, and he had found out that ice does not freeze down so near the equator. The old colored man replied: "I'se just ben expectin' sumthin' like dat. The time I was talkin' about was before dey had no jographies or 'quators, either."

Under the constant influence of Christian education which you began to help the negro to secure thirty-five years ago, his religion is every year becoming less emotional and more rational and practical; though, for one, I hope that he will always retain in a large measure the emotional element in religion. It is not a difficult effort in any part of the country to get large numbers of our people to join the churches,—in fact, in some communities almost every one is a church member; but the negro is beginning to learn that joining the church is not all, that he must vitalize his religion and make it useful and potent in the little things of every-day life. He is beginning to learn that a religion that does not make one wash dishes well, scrub a floor thoroughly, do an honest day's work in building a house, keep books and teach school conscientiously, amounts to little. He is also beginning to learn that he must be a Christian, not because he fears the devil, but because he loves Christ.

In a very large measure you have helped us in bringing about the change and improvement in our religious and moral life. If you ask me what are the tangible evidences of this improvement and how many Unitarian churches there are among our people, I must answer there is not one. If you ask me how many black men are Unitarians, I believe I can count on the fingers of my hand all that I know. But you have helped us more than it would have helped us if you had made us Baptists or Methodists or Presbyterians or even Unitarians. You have helped us to make strong Christian, generous men and women. You have taught us to crystallize our religion, how to make it practical, how to put it into our daily lives through the educating influences of the strong men and women sent by your generosity into every portion of the South.

A few days ago I was in Montgomery, Ala., and I found an organization composed of the colored ministers of that city; and it was exerting such an influence that it was impossible for a minister who was immoral in his daily life to get

recognition in that city. It was impossible for any of those miserable men to pass as ministers. I found public sentiment in favor of a better ministry. I went to Birmingham, and I found an organization of a similar character. These ministers' unions are not only leading the colored people into more practical and higher religious life, but in many cases they are encouraging the people to go into business and to teach their children trades.

The negro is also beginning to apply his religion to the solution of the race problem which has so long vexed and tried our souls. He is becoming more liberal,—to look at things from a Christian standpoint. He is not only becoming more liberal in church creeds, but he is becoming more liberal toward the Southern white man; and the negro ministers in a large measure are leading off in efforts that are tending more and more to bring the two races together in all matters that pertain to their mutual welfare. The negro minister who once had a hold upon the people by merely abusing the Southern white man is now fast losing ground; and throughout the South an educated, liberal, high-toned set of ministers are fast appearing, who are willing to disregard race, color, and previous condition, in order that they may honestly and bravely do the thing which will bring peace and prosperity to the whole people, regardless of race and color.

We are learning to apply our religion in a way that we have never done before. A few days before I left Tuskegee, I saw a colored man going to camp-meeting; and he had his whole family in a wagon which was drawn by two mules. I said to him, "Going to camp-meeting?" "Yes," he answered, "I belong to that camp-meeting. I knows you think I'se too poor to go, but I'm going. I tell you what, I've bought a house and I've paid for it; and I'm going to camp-meeting. I've got no mortgage on my crop, and I've got a right to go to camp-meeting. I've paid for this wagon that I'm going to camp-meeting in; and these dresses that the women have got on, I've paid for them, and I'm going to camp-meeting, Mr. Washington. You see them two mules: no white man owns them. I done buy them myself. I've got the right to go to camp-meeting, Mr. Washington. Get up, June, get up, Joe, we are going to camp-meeting." That is the way we are learning to apply religion; and, when a man gets to that point, he has a right to go to camp-meeting and enjoy his religion. But it is mighty hard to enjoy it in a wretched house, when it is cold in winter and when it is hot in summer. It is hard to be a Christian under such circumstances.

At Tuskegee, in connection with our other training, we have a Bible training school, where we recognize no sects. We have representatives of at least eleven different denominations, and the question of sect never comes in discussion. We not only teach the Bible, but, what is equally important, we have an understanding that each individual who comes must work, not only with his brain, but with his hands. He must learn to work, so that when he goes out into the rural districts, where they can pay him only from five to ten dollars a month, he can help himself. We teach them that they must buy their land and plant it, and keep out of debt, and lay a foundation for improving the moral condition of the South.

We make a great deal of the gospel of the tooth-brush, as Gen. Armstrong used to call it. We require every student to provide a tooth-brush, and, when we inspect the rooms, we look after these; and, when we get to the point where the student is willing to buy a second and a third brush of his own motion, we feel safe about the salvation of that individual, for we have never seen it fail.

A few weeks ago I was in a district not far from Tuskegee, and I visited one of these colored pastors. He had a church, a Sunday-school, fifty acres of land, and a comfortable house. He was raising corn and potatoes, and quite independent, so far as material circumstances were concerned. I went to the church, and heard him preach what is called in the South "plain doctrine." He had the advantage that he could preach what he believed, for he could support himself if the people did not like his plain doctrine.

In Birmingham I found another, a graduate from this Bible school; and I saw him doing missionary work. I went into a cabin where I saw him take a scrubbing-brush and a bucket of water, and show them how to clean the floor. When a man can put his religion into scrubbing a floor, I think we are getting on pretty well, don't you?

Naturally, during the days of slavery, by reason of circumstances the next world was emphasized. In his religious meetings the negro was prevented from discussing many points of practical religion which pertained to this world. Those who were his spiritual guides in those days found it more convenient to talk about heaven than earth, so that we need not be surprised if to-day, in his meetings, it is the negro's feelings which are worked upon largely, and it is the description of the glories of heaven that occupy most of the time in his religious exercises.

I was in a church where for an hour the burden of the

minister's talk was to get religion and give up the world. I happened to be familiar with the circumstances of most of the people in that church; and I called him aside, and said: "When you told those people to get religion, I agreed with you; but I hardly agreed when you said give up the world. There aren't two of them who own any land, not more than five or six who own their mules. They are all in debt. Most of them mortgage their crops and get on without fit food or clothing. My good friend, it seems to me that your congregation has given up about everything that it could give up, so why do you tell them to give up the world? That is not what our people need to learn. They need to get religion and get the world, and mix religion in with the world; and, in proportion as they do that, their religion will help them in the every-day affairs of life." And, wherever strong, educated ministers have gone into the South, they preach a gospel good not only for the next world, but one good for this world.

We are learning in the South to use our religion in a way that it has never been used there before, and the white man is also beginning to use his religion in working out affairs in the South. A few days ago I attended a most interesting convention; and I saw there white men born in the South, former slaveholders, put themselves on record to the effect that henceforth they would give a larger proportion of their money, time, and strength to the lifting up of the black men at their doors. Of the \$544,000 which had been contributed by the churches to educate men and women in Africa and Japan and China, only \$23,000 was given to educate the black men at their door. They were frank enough to say that they had made a mistake, and to promise that more should be done for the negroes of the South.

It is the negro's faith in religion that has made him patient and God-fearing through all the trials in which we have been compelled to live, especially since we got our freedom. He has faith in God and in the justice of his cause, and this faith will never forsake us. We have never been anarchists. We have always been true to the stars and stripes.

My friends, that is the character of the religious life that enters into the foundation of our people. Others may excel us in acts of loyalty, but we can excel in acts of love. Others may be great, but we have learned to be good. Others may push us down, but we have learned through our religion to help push those up who have pushed us down.

The more I study the problem of the South, the more I am convinced that it is becoming not so much a problem as

to what you will do with the negro as it is a problem what the negro will do with you and your Christian civilization. You must lift the black man up in the South, or he will pull you down. You must change the moral condition of the South, or your own race will weaken in religious and moral fibre. Remember, when I ask you to help the negro, that every time you help a black man to rise you are lifting up a white man at the South. No man of your race can harm the meanest member of mine without the bluest blood of your civilization being degraded.

---

## THE RELATION OF THE CHILD TO THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

BY ISABEL FRANCIS BELLOWES.

In the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy, if it be proper to dignify by that name a discussion into which Shakespearian scholars have shown themselves so reluctant to be drawn, and during which no one of them has ever seen cause to change his opinion, a curious element was that, while every one possessed what might be called a working knowledge of his Shakespeare, no one seemed to know anything about his Bacon, except in the case of those essays on which the weight of the argument was supposed to hang. A great mass of Bacon's writings, bearing the impress of his mind and style quite as forcibly as the essays, are left totally without consideration, whether from ignorance or intention it is not here necessary to surmise.

Now in the child Sunday-school controversy, as I might almost call it,—or, to speak more properly, in considering the relation of the children and the young people to the Sunday-school,—I find myself in something the position of the Baconian theorist. I do not know my Sunday-school or what has been done for it, within the last ten or fifteen years, sufficiently to present my case from that side with the slightest authority. I must speak as the scribes concerning it; and the scribes, as we all know, said very little worth hearing. But with the child—the young person of either sex—I am more familiar, having been thrown constantly with him and her for the last ten years. It is fifteen since I taught

my last Sunday-school class. I must therefore approach the subject this afternoon wholly from the side of the child, and from that standpoint consider what the Sunday-school can best do to meet his religious needs and be a wise and helpful influence in his life. And perhaps it is not an unmitigated misfortune to have the matter considered from this direction; for it seems to me that one of the causes that have contributed to make this institution a problem, and often an unsolved problem, is the fact that it has not been looked at sufficiently from this point of view.

*Punch* had a cartoon, some years ago, representing a lady visitor at one of the country cottages, occupied by tenants for whose souls and bodies she feels more or less responsible. "Don't your children like going to Sunday-school?" she asks of the woman of the house. "Oh, yes'm," is the answer, "they likes goin' well enough: it's the stayin' after they gets there they minds." This is the attitude, somewhat familiar to us all perhaps, that we would like to avoid if possible. We wish not only that they should be willing to go, but that they should not be averse to staying after they get there.

Not that I think that children's likes and dislikes should be made of too much importance in this or any other matter. It is good for them to do what is right and best, whether they like it or not; and the whole tendency of modern life and education is inclined to err in the direction of magnifying the conscious happiness or unhappiness of children, often calling their attention to it unnecessarily, whereas any deliberate introspection is as bad for them as it can possibly be. It either tends to morbid conscientiousness, which is apt to be nothing but inverted self-esteem, or else it damages their necessarily feeble sense of their true relation to the universe, which should be fostered by every means in our power. A great deal of thought should be expended upon the likes and dislikes of children, as an important factor in their education; but almost nothing should be said to them about it.

In the very beginning in the modern schools for young children we hear far too much of this sort of thing. Elizabeth loves to come to school or Gwendolen likes to do things for others, making Gwendolen and Elizabeth instantly conscious of their own emotions; while in the modern homes the importance attached to the likes and dislikes of the young persons in it often form a veritable stumbling-block in the way of their best development. That it destroys the peace and comfort of the elders would be, I suppose, of not much



consequence if the young things themselves benefited by it; but, where nothing but harm results to all concerned, it is perhaps well for us to consider it a little in all matters relating to their moral and religious training.

If I may be permitted to continue for a moment this apparent digression, I would like to say that this system is also rather hard on the children; for the elders who consider their likes and dislikes of such importance, and who continually plan their work and their amusements for them, demand something in response, which the average child is not any too able to give, and for which he should not be asked. We expect the children for whom so much is done to be both grateful and thoughtful in return, and are pained and hurt when we do not find this to be the case, as it usually is not. But we make a mistake both in what we give and what we expect to receive. A high order of thoughtfulness and unselfishness should not be demanded of a child. If he or she is fair-minded and honest, ready to "go shares," to obey promptly, and to run the family errands, that is enough; and that is the straight and natural road to a higher order of service that comes with the later development of their faculties, and these are precisely the things that are not expected of the modern child. I think that the daily duties of life should be done without much comment or talk of praise or blame. Sympathy and affection are much better for children than words of praise; and, if we have to blame, let us be sure that we are blaming them for the right thing. Too often it is the wrong one.

This is a long preamble to what I have to say in relation to the Sunday-school; but, if more were thought about the needs and character of the children whom it is expected to benefit, if these were discussed at the teachers' meetings, and considered in relation to all details of the work, we should do much to insure its success.

In the first place, I am afraid we must admit that the name "Sunday-school," like the word "pious," is a trifle damaged. It has come to stand for something quite different from our ideal of what it should be. Sunday-school literature, Sunday-school hymns, even Sunday-school children, have come to be looked upon, too often, as goody hypocritical and deficient in intelligence and the manly virtues. I have even wondered sometimes if a new name could not be invented to fit the broader and wiser methods of teaching, the better literature in the libraries, the higher ideals of the modern institution as we hope to see it. When I went to Sunday-school in New York, about the second period of its develop-

ment, I had to learn lessons out of a stupid catechism, as ridiculous as it was unnecessary in a Unitarian church; and the few books I took from the library were about obnoxious and unnatural children converting whole families to godliness by their exemplary conduct and advice, taking the feathers out of their bonnets, and keeping them from theatres and wild dancing parties. Books like these I have always held to be an abomination before the Lord; and I should like to see them all hewed in pieces, as Samuel hewed Agag, and after returned to his house in much peace of mind. But that sort of thing has been done away with under a wiser and more systematic oversight than was thought of then. Well-written lesson papers have been substituted for the old catechism, better service books adopted, and the libraries have been thoroughly weeded out; and better literature has taken the place of the old Sunday-school books, which have, in too many instances, I am sorry to say, not been burned or hewed in pieces, but packed in barrels and sent to contaminate the rural districts.

I have been asked of late, more often than I could wish, whether I thought children ought to be made to go to church or not; and the reason of my objection to this question is because I do not know the answer to it. I do not believe there is any one answer that will cover the ground. I have heard of persons who acquired such a habit of church-going in childhood that they continued in it all their lives. On the other hand, I have known of people who were made to go so constantly when they were young that they struck an average when they could do as they liked, and stayed at home altogether. Then, again, I have friends who tell me that they were not compelled to go against their inclination when they were children, and that now they regard it as a privilege of which they regularly avail themselves. Such are the diversities, not only of views, but of experiences, which make it impossible to answer this question of church-going in one word. Some children like to go, which makes a simple and delightful solution of the problem; but others dislike it, and in some cases it makes them exceedingly nervous, and produces a strain, not easy to account for perhaps, but very evident notwithstanding. There are, however, many gradations between going every Sunday and never going at all; and discretion should be used in adapting the frequency of attendance to the individual temperament. That would be the course likely to produce the best results later I should think.

But, whatever may be the decision in regard to church-

going for children, there is no room for two opinions as to the necessity of their religious nature being helped, sustained, and fostered. Reverence is essential, and all the more so because the tendency of the age and of our own nature does not lie in that direction. Only we should be careful that the ideals and thoughts for which we demand reverence are worthy of it, that it is always the spirit before which we bow, and not the letter. Then we shall be safe; and the words of the prophet shall be fulfilled, "He that wonders shall reign; and he that reigns shall rest."

The moral and spiritual instincts of children should be cultivated. Taught to rest on a broad and sound basis of thought, they should have an opportunity to worship according to their light and power, and be led upward and onward by the sympathy and insight of those older ones who possess it. We do not expect their brains or their muscles to develop in the right way unaided. Why are we so afraid to help their souls? Of course, it is in the home that the first and most powerful influences should come in this direction as in every other; but it is in these ways that the Sunday-school should help the home. It is the children's church, where they may gather strength and moral and physical support for the life that is before them.

I need hardly say that the first and most essential element to insure any measure of success in this aim is the personality of the teachers. It is infinitely better to have good lesson papers than poor ones; but the best lesson paper that ever was written has very little influence in the hands of an inefficient and unqualified teacher, and the worst and stupidest set of questions and answers may become a means of grace when used or not used by one who possesses the knowledge and insight requisite for the work. Personality is the great power that moves the world. It is the thing we cannot see or count on our fingers or reckon with openly that does the harm or the good; and I think our Sunday-schools are rather too apt to ignore this great fact in the selection of their teachers, and to accept too easily the offer of any chance person who is willing to take a class, no matter how poorly qualified he or she may be for the responsibility undertaken. I know that this must be a very delicate and difficult matter to deal with. It is not easy to tell well-meaning, enthusiastic young persons, or still less older persons, that they are not qualified for the task to which they bring so much zeal and good feeling. It is also extremely hard to find out whether they are so qualified or not. And yet it is impossible to have a successful Sunday-school where this is not taken into

account, any more than a good secular school would be conceivable with its teachers selected on this principle.

I never could see why Sunday-school teachers — enough of them at any rate to set the tone for the school — should not be paid. I have heard of some ministers objecting to this, because they preferred that such service should be voluntary. Of course, if voluntary service was always of the best quality, that reason would be a very good one; but, unfortunately, facts are against it. The Quaker ministry is not famed for exalted eloquence and zeal, because there are no hirelings in it; and, if ministers are not actuated by any such scruples in drawing their salaries, it is difficult to see why the same principle cannot work in regard to Sunday-school teachers. The laborer is usually worthy of his hire; and my feeling is that, when the hire is sufficient to remove the laborer from anxiety as to the necessities of life, he is a great deal more likely to render that quality of service which is without money and without price.

And this brings me to another objection to this method, which is that no Sunday-school could or should afford to pay teachers for the whole of their time, and the difficulty of adjusting the pay to the services required.

But I think a good many busy women with trained minds and willing hearts would be able to alleviate some other duty by the use of a very moderate sum of money, and thus be ready and glad to give the strength and time so acquired to the needs of a Sunday-school class. A hundred and fifty or two hundred dollars has a good deal of healing in its wings, when judiciously applied; and the subject seems worth considering in this light. A successful Sunday-school means very hard work for somebody; and the superintendent ought to be chosen with that fact in view, and also it seems to me that he or she should be offered some definite equivalent for the definite work he is asked to undertake. Until this is done, I fear that we shall continue to encounter difficulties in securing any superintendents at all,—as I believe is the case at present,—and that, when one is finally persuaded to officiate, he will be too apt to be a busy and tired man, or possibly woman, who will go to the school Sundays, read a service out of the convenient book which has been used for years, distribute lesson papers, talk a little with the librarian and the minister, shake hands with a teacher or two, pat a scholar on the head, look at his watch, wait a little while, and look at it again, ring the bell for the closing exercises, and go off not to think anything more about it until the next Sunday. I am not blaming the man.

He is probably an unusually good man to do this at all, but this is not the way to carry on a successful organization of any sort.

I know that many churches cannot afford to expend appreciable sums of money upon the Sunday-school; and in this case, as in many others, we must do as we may. But, when a church spends three or four thousand dollars upon its music and three or four hundred upon its Sunday-school, the anthems are apt to be more elaborate than religion demands and the Sunday-school to be thinly attended.

As to the lesson papers, I should like to approach them somewhat from the standpoint of the child, and say that I think it is a mistake to give out any Sunday-school lesson whatever to be learned. The papers may be of much service in suggesting to a teacher topics about which to talk with her class; but I do not believe that children should be expected to commit anything in the shape of a lesson for their Sunday observance. I am emboldened to say this by the fact that the superintendent of a very successful Sunday-school in Boston agrees with me, and does not have the pupils prepare anything of the sort before coming. The children have lessons enough; and this one more is a burden to them,—out of all proportion to its real weight, to be sure,—but, I think, an unnecessary and unwise burden. If we elders were required to commit by heart a chapter of the Bible or learn the answers to a set of even the most interesting questions on religious subjects before going to church, I am afraid the attendance there would be diminished in an appalling ratio. And shall we serve the children with less respect than we do minister to our gross selves? Let the opening exercise be long, and let many great passages from the Bible be learned together at that time. Wonders can be done in this way, as I know from experience. Great poems, too, can be acquired so; and great stories and selections too difficult or not suitable to be learned can be read to them. They will like it; and they will learn, and they will listen,—that, also, I know from experience. Give them the best there is,—words of saints and sages and poets and prophets, often, you will think, too hard for them to understand or even to interest them; but you will find it otherwise. Never offer them the miserable twaddle that is supposed to be appropriate for children, nor poor literature of any sort. The best is none too good for them, when it is selected with even a little discretion. We are apt to be very thoughtless about all these things.

I knew an intelligent boy coming home from Sunday-

school and saying: "Why do we have to sing such silly hymns, mamma? 'Oh, how we love our teachers!' this one went. I thought of some I didn't love." Of course, he did: anybody would in his place; and there are a number of such foolish little songs about loving teachers and being glad to go to the Sunday-school and the like that are distinctly bad. They strike the false note of sentimentality, and the children are quick to feel this. Do not let us give them such trivial stuff, when there is so much that is better to draw from; and the same principle applies to the prayers and readings that are used. We do not investigate sufficiently how such things affect children's minds, and are consequently led into committing all sorts of errors in our selections.

It is only on this theory that I can account for the prevalence of a little prayer at one time almost universally taught to children, because it was so simple and easy to learn and sounded so sweet to the listening elders. It is the familiar "Now I lay me down to sleep," etc. This, with its short, effective Saxon words, may be good literature, but it is very bad theology; and, ever since I came to think about it, I have regarded it as a very pernicious little verse. What a sensitive, thoughtful child can think of it is shown by the speech of a little cousin of mine, who proclaimed one night at the hour for his devotions that he thought he wouldn't say "Now I lay me," and then added — with a look half of apprehension and half of defiance — that he hadn't said it for a good many nights, and he had never died in the night yet.

It is such a mistake, as George MacDonald has pointed out, to teach children that they have souls as a possession, as this prayer does. They are souls and possess bodies, and to think of death as a calamity to be prayed against is also most unfortunate. There is not a word about death in the Lord's Prayer; and it is life that we and our children have to do with and need help for, not death. I doubt if we can improve on the prayer of Jesus or produce a better effect on the minds of our children with any little verses of our own making.

These are details, but it is just the careful attention to such small things that makes great enterprises possible and successful. "The smallest objects are as windows," wrote Carlyle, "through which the philosophic mind looks into infinity itself." With infinity in our hearts and patient attention to practical details in our heads, can we not predict for the Sunday-school a future like that holy vision of the prophet, who beheld Jerusalem a city of truth, — "and it was full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof"?

## THE CHILD'S RIGHT TO RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

BY REV. T. R. SLICER.

The child is taken out of the body of its parents to be dropped back into their minds. That is the story of their responsibility. They have assumed the part of creation. They cannot escape the responsibility of instruction. They have no doubt with regard to its other rights. It has the right to be properly clothed, to be properly sheltered, to be properly fed. Its body is precious to them, every particle of it, its very health or its complexion, the light shining in its eye. Everything is dear to their anxious love. That solicitude they cannot escape; and so they shelter the body and clothe it and even befrill it, that it may be an object of beauty. They put it in a downy nest, and they do all these things because the child has a right to be maintained in these conditions provided by parental love.

And, when the time comes for the development of his mind, the child is not asked if he would like to go to school. He is first of all taught. The best instruction is given him. His mind is made to put out the little tendrils by which it can cling to the walls of knowledge. He is not asked how long he will study: he is asked if he has taken his luncheon, if he has on his overshoes. There is in the mind of the parent a sense of responsibility for the health and education of the child. If the right of the child to care and instruction be undisputed, that it may not be sick and stupid when it comes into contact with those associated with it, it has the right that a Christian child born out of Christian parents shall not be a pagan when it comes to the larger contacts of life. It has a right to demand that it shall be taught all that is in the parents' experience, all that the teachers can learn concerning the divine: it has a right to religious instruction.

It is one of the unexplained contradictions that the principles which apply everywhere else are omitted in this particular. It is said that the child shall not "be forced to take on habits of religion." It must be "allowed to grow up until it can choose what form of faith it will have." How can it choose? What gives it the opportunity of choice?

What fits it to make such a choice? What experience has it out of the loins of the past in its little brain, that should make it the arbiter of its highest destiny? You do not take it to the drug store where medicines and poisons are sold, and say: Take your choice. Poison in proper quantities is good: arsenic in proper doses clears the skin; aconite in proper doses is useful. You do not say these things. No, you even say, with trembling, You must not eat too much candy. The child is guarded at every point except as a child of the eternal God; and there, by some kind of superstition, the idea prevails that the child is to come up as it can, until at last it seizes hold on some supports for life, and shall elect what those supports shall be. In that you are defrauding the child of its natural right. You refuse it help at its direst need.

I believe in the naturalness of religion, that it is a function of the human soul. But I believe that it should be taught, just as cooking is taught. Your children, though, are not usually taught cooking, as, happily, the children of the poor are. In our social settlement there are cooking-classes; but there is also a religious service. That is a distinction in our settlement, of which I am glad: we have not only cooking-classes, but there is a religious service on Sunday night. The church is never named, a minister rarely leads them, there is nothing of doctrine inculcated. The leader teaches the life of the soul, just as we teach cooking. One is not more real than the other. As they must eat, they learn to cook. They have got to live, and so they are taught the principles of religion.

Religion is a normal transaction between the soul and the Soul of all that is. I used that word deliberately. I say it is a normal *transaction*. The prayer between the soul that is alert, awakened, and devout and the object of prayer is an actual transaction, as surely an act of commerce and interchange as anything that exists in this world. As the breath from the lungs is related to the atmosphere, as the hand is related to what it has to grasp, as the foot has ceased to be a climber and has come to be the pedestal of the body, as the ribs sustain the trunk, so the soul is related to its source of supply as a natural function of the human creature.

You say the child must be provided with everything in the way of instruction, even to the detail of personal habits; but it shall not be taught religion, because that is something for grown-up folk. All the best psychology of the world is against you. You may be on that side, but the best psychology and the most learned scholarship are on the other side.



The child is born an egotist, and ought to be, because it is in the animal stage of development; but between the age of twelve or fourteen it passes through certain changes of body and of brain that are as real in the brain as in the body. These are changes by which he passes from egotism to altruism, from the love of itself to the love of the other. The sex instincts that are aroused are only the superficial side of the chief aspect of the mind. The love of the other with whom the home shall be built is the love through which may be constituted the relation with God. You say you dare not touch this critical period. Shall we send missionaries to polytheistic nations, that they may learn a knowledge of the true God, and yet not teach the little mythologist in our home the essential presence of the heavenly father in its life?

Some people were talking awhile ago about children's difficulty about prayer. They all agreed that their boys would not pray unless it were insisted they should pray. They said that, when a boy got to be five or six years old, they should not insist on his saying his prayers. I asked, How would it be if instead of sending your boy to say his prayers he should catch you saying yours? If I had a boy six years old who would not say his prayers, I would offer my prayer aloud for him. I would go with him to the heavenly Father. Devotion has in it the element of spiritual contagion. What is the habit of the parent prompts the imitation of the child. It is sure to catch the attention of the child. It is sure to awaken a sense of reality that no imposed task can awaken. That seems to me an experiment worth trying.

But one woman said to me: "What would you do with a child like this? My boy said his prayers till he was about seven. One night he said, 'Mamma, how do you know there is any God?' And I said, 'All the best people in the world have supposed there was a God, and we take their word for it.' And, with perfect logic, he replied, 'Well, I shall not go on praying to a probability.'" The infirmity was not in the child's mind, but in the answer of the mother. There is a better answer than that. That woman said, "I do not know whether that child has ever offered a prayer since then." She ought to have known. She ought to have known whether that boy of seven was in communion with the Source of Life or not. The child committed to our care, whether in home or school, has the right to the best fruits of human experience, told in the simplest terms, which deal with the ultimate realities of life. It has a right to religious instruction.

## PLATFORM MEETING, WEDNESDAY EVENING.

---

### THE APPEAL OF THE UNITARIAN CHURCH TO THE NATIONAL LIFE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

BY HON. GEORGE E. ADAMS.

A layman is not expected to give a very exact definition of Unitarianism. One essential and important part of it, as a layman understands it, is the idea of the dignity of human nature which Channing taught. With the idea of man as a child of the heavenly Father there went naturally a higher idea of the possible development of character in man than prevailed in the religious world before Channing's time. If this is not so clearly recognized to-day as a distinctive feature of Unitarianism, it is because of a change,—not in Unitarianism, but in the community in which Unitarianism has done its work.

The best thing that the Unitarian Church can do for the national life of the twentieth century is to preach to the nation the same hopeful and inspiring doctrine which Channing and Theodore Parker preached to individual men and women.

Views of American life and character are often characterized by optimism so extreme as to make them worthless in estimates of national character.

We have also had enough and to spare of pessimistic views of American character and life. We get it sometimes from Americans. Not long ago I heard of a refined and highly educated woman, living in one of our great Atlantic cities, who declared her belief that the American people is doomed to degeneration because the saving grace of the nation went out of it when the Loyalists of the Revolution emigrated to Nova Scotia and the Bahamas. Criticism of this sort, especially when it came from foreigners, and more especially when it came from Englishmen, used to hurt us forty years ago. To-day it amuses us, but does not affect our judgment or disturb our equanimity.

Thoughtful criticism of American life and character we can listen to and profit by, especially when it is kindly as well as thoughtful. We need all the more to listen to it and

lay it to heart when we realize the position of supreme influence for good or for evil, which the American people is destined to hold among the civilized nations of the twentieth century.

Not long ago I had occasion to make a slight study of the conditions of race and environment which will fix the character of the twentieth-century American. Let me refer to two of them.

First, we shall be a new nation, made up by combining the characteristics of several of the strong races of North-western Europe, substantially the same races which more than a thousand years ago combined to form the English nation.

Out of these races have sprung a large part of the literature and art and a still larger part of the religious and political thought which has come into the world since the fall of the Western Empire. There is no reason to believe that these races will deteriorate on American soil and under American sky, or that their combination in America will be less virile than it was in England.

Consider next the enormous moral and intellectual influence of the language we use. Our American language, which we call English because several dialects of the language are spoken in various parts of England, is likely to have more influence in the twentieth century than Latin had in the tenth or French in the eighteenth. Standing between French and German, stronger and richer than the one, lighter and more flexible than the other, it will be the most convenient vehicle of twentieth-century thought.

Consider the vast number of reading people who will use this language. Sir Walter Besant told us a few years ago of the great influence which a writer of good English is likely to have in the twentieth century, when he can address a reading public of over two hundred millions in their own tongue. That is a condition which has not existed in regard to any language since the world began.

Where will these two hundred millions be found? Some of them, of course, in the British Islands. Far more will be outside of Europe,—in Canada, New Zealand and Australia, and in the farthest East. Midway between Europe and the Orient, bordering on Canada and looking across the Pacific to Australia, more than half of the English-speaking people of the world will be the people of the United States. We cannot easily exaggerate the influence of this nation upon the moral and intellectual life of the twentieth century.

If the influence of American life and character upon other nations is likely to be great, is it likely to be an influence

for good, or an influence for evil? We must hope, and so far as in us lies, we must resolve, that it shall be for good, and not for evil. Our industrial power has given to the world more and better food to eat, more and better clothes to wear, more convenient homes to live in, and larger means of intercourse between men and between nations. Who can doubt that these things have indirectly helped the moral and intellectual life of the world? What can we expect of direct influence of American life and character upon the life and character of other nations? In answering this question, let me refer to two recent criticisms on American life and character.

In the October number of the *North American Review*, Bishop Potter of New York has an article on "Some Social Tendencies in America." In this article he compares the two great republics of modern times, France and the United States. Each, he says, had its origin in a declaration of principles. In America it was the Declaration of Independence. In France it was the revolutionary Declaration of the Rights of Man. Each declaration, he says, was an assertion of extreme individualism. Bishop Potter points out different conditions under which the two republics were founded. "Yet," he says, "as one looks to-day at France and America, unlike as they are in so many of their national characteristics, the tendencies which have in them elements that are mischievous and alarming are substantially the same." He then specifies the lack of a fixed standard of commercial and political honesty and the loosening of the ties of family life. All these evils he attributes to the same cause in France and America. They are a product, he says, of that enormous exaggeration of individualism of which our own century has seen the development, and this exaggerated individualism is itself the outcome of the Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man.

Many suggestions of Bishop Potter are wise and apt. In his main proposition, I think, he has exaggerated the evil and mistaken the cause, and, therefore, the remedy. Paris is not France. Our great American cities are not the United States. Even in our great cities the case is not so dark as he thinks.

Be that as it may, it is remarkable that evils of society in France and America are in America attributed to an exaggerated individualism, when the same evils are in France declared to come from the opposite direction. Edmond Demoulins, whose remarkable book on Anglo-Saxon Superiority is, strange to say, quoted by Bishop Potter, says that

France suffers, not from too much individualism, but from too little. Individualism, he says, characterizes the Anglo-Saxon nations. Therefore, the home life of these nations is secure. Therefore, they are the rising and advancing nations of the world. France is a nation of the communistic type. Hence her industrial decay, the loosening of family ties, and her diminishing population.

If we are suffering from an excess of individualism, our case is hopeless. Individualism cannot be suppressed or controlled, except by institutions. What institutions? Safeguarding national character by the law is out of the question. Can it, then, be safeguarded by the Church? The only church in America that has ever exerted a real authoritative control over morals, since the days of the Puritans, is the Roman Catholic Church. That Church is losing its control of the individual from generation to generation. If the remedy for the evils of American life is the repression of individualism, there is no remedy at all.

To us Unitarians, however, the case is not hopeless. From the Unitarian standpoint there is a remedy. It does not consist in the vain attempt to suppress individualism. Individualism is of the very essence of Unitarianism. It consists in an appeal to the individual on behalf of pure and noble living. It is an appeal to hope rather than to fear. It is the doctrine of hope and trust which shines from the pages of Channing and Emerson and breathes through the stanzas of Whittier and Longfellow.

But now let me remind you of another recent criticism on American life, which, I think, goes nearer to the heart of the matter. The critic is a foreigner, one who loves and admires the American people. I mean Ian Maclaren. In the same number of the *North American Review* to which I have referred, he has a sparkling but not unkindly satire on the restless energy of the American people. In a recent number of the *Outlook* he has a serious article, entitled "The Shadow on American Life." Both articles convey the same general idea. The author means to say that there is too much materialism in American life. He means that a large number of Americans give so much of their time and thought to the pursuit of wealth that they neglect the higher personal life and the life of the family. As for the life of the State, they hand it over to the political boss, because they cannot afford to spare the time from their business to attend to their duties as citizens.

Now it is not worth while to ask whether there is exaggeration in this. We know there is truth enough and to

spare. The question is whether the evil is incurable. Is it an organic malady in American life, or is it only a fever which will run its course and disappear? I believe it is a nineteenth-century fever which will pass while the twentieth century is still young. Consider the history of our people as a whole. Materialism we have had among us always, as all human communities have had; but, judging the American people as a whole, measuring them by and large, the world never saw a fairer example of freedom from materialism, a fairer example of plain living and high thinking, than was given by the people of this country from the first settlement of the Atlantic coast down to the beginning of the nineteenth century. There was no worship of wealth in those days. There was little wealth to worship. The American mind gave itself, not to business, but to theology and politics; and theology and politics were then both intellectual pursuits.

What caused the change?

The French Revolution broke up the old habits of thought here and everywhere. The Napoleonic wars gave us great opportunities in trade. Our patent system stimulated invention. The West opened its vast resources. The steamship came, the locomotive, the telegraph. The power of the American mind turned to industrial development. Each generation did the work of three; and the work was mainly done, up to twenty years ago, by the intense personal energy of men of comparatively small capital. What wonder that the average American gave so much of his heart and soul and strength to industry?

Now we see signs of a change. We have accumulated capital, and capital has learned to combine. The great aggregations of capital which many statesmen view with alarm and platform-makers of both parties are preparing to denounce may have at least this good effect. They may save the mental and spiritual wear and tear of American life. The industrial work of the twentieth century will be largely done by managers of great capital, and not by the intense and often reckless competition of men of small capitals. The pulse of American industry may be just as strong, but it will be steadier and less feverish.

Remember, too, that the engrossing pursuit of wealth that has characterized American life in the nineteenth century is not due to avarice. The average American is eager to make money and free to spend it. He enjoys the pursuit of wealth almost as much as wealth itself. One reason is that during a large part of the century there was little else

to enjoy. We had few amusements, and had almost lost the faculty of being amused. All that has changed. We have the magazine, the theatre, the orchestra. We live more out of doors. We are more generally given to athletic sports than any other nation in the world. Forty years ago it was hardly respectable for a grown man to engage in any out-of-door diversion except driving fast horses. To-day you can often see a judge, a bank president, or a doctor of divinity, walking the public streets in broad daylight with a golf club under his arm.

The larger variety in American life which has steadily grown, and is still growing, is especially helpful as a corrective of the intense and absorbing industrialism in which our friend Ian Maclaren saw a menace to our future. We see the effect of it on our older men of wealth. They found universities, museums, and libraries. They endow professorships and build statues and fountains for the people, in order that those who come after them may have advantages denied to their own generation. We see it, also, in the younger men of inherited wealth. In my own city, which many of you have been taught to regard as intensely materialistic, I am acquainted with a considerable number of rich young men. Hardly one of them lives as if he had the right to live simply to add to his fortune or to spend his income on himself or his family. They are hard-working business men. But, outside of their business work, they are doing something for the religious, charitable, artistic, or intellectual life of the city where their fortunes were made. These things to me are signs of the coming time. To me they are like the light of a new morning. I have no fear of the future of the American people. Our enormous influence upon twentieth-century civilization is to be an influence for good. We shall raise the standard of living throughout the world in a higher sense than that of political economy. The mission of the Unitarian Church to the national life of the twentieth century is to quicken the moral aspiration of the American people. It is to appeal to hope rather than to fear. It is to preach the dignity of human nature, the possible elevation of human life, the same hopeful and inspiring doctrine that came from the lips of Channing. It will be spread by Unitarian preachers and laymen in the next century, as it has been spread in the century now ending; and, when I say Unitarians, I mean not only those who sit in Unitarian pews or preach from Unitarian pulpits: I mean also that large and increasing class of Unitarians who still sit in orthodox pews or even preach from orthodox pulpits.

## THE APPEAL FOR RELIGIOUS RECONSTRUCTION.

BY REV. PAUL R. FROTHINGHAM.

I interpret the general subject of this evening to mean: What need is there going to be of our religious movement in the twentieth century? What ends are we to serve? What good have we to accomplish? What purposes to fulfil? And this question relates to the immediate future, if not to the actual present; for our feet already almost touch the threshold of another century. It's not a remote question, therefore, but a very near one. It's not a visionary and speculative question, but a practical and pressing one.

Now I want to answer this question regarding the immediate future of our movement by saying that the central appeal we have to make—the peculiar and distinctive appeal—is just for this, and nothing else,—for religious reconstruction. There are other appeals, of course; and you will hear of them from other lips. But there's only one great, central, commanding appeal which belongs to us more than to any of the other religious bodies; and that's the appeal I name, for *religious reconstruction*.

Let us not forget on this occasion our many friends and kindly critics who are anxious to save us the trouble of answering for ourselves this question of our future. They tell us we have done our work, that our only appeal has been made already. It belonged to the nineteenth, not to the twentieth century. These people do not deny that we have served a useful purpose in the past. They confess that we have helped the world and helped religion by rooting out false dogmas, tearing down crude superstitions, and, in general, by destroying what really called out for destruction. But this has been done. Hence our work, we are told, is ended, our great appeal is made. In other words, these people bid us fold our tents,—for we have never dwelt in substantial religious houses,—to “fold our tents like the Arabs, and as silently steal away.”

Now there is a certain amount of truth in this, and we may as well confess it; but there also is a little error. It is true that one phase of our work is ended; and if that is all the phase we have, if there is nothing in us but criticism, if



our music is all pitched in the minor key of doubt, if our gospel is a gospel of negations or of vague and indefinite speculations, if its truth can only be formulated against the background of something that is false, why then our tents will be folded for us. But this is not the case. Our appeal to the nineteenth century was essentially for destruction. Our appeal to the twentieth century must be for reconstruction. We who have pulled down must now build up. We who have denied must now affirm. The world is waiting to be told of those things that are permanently true and useful in religion and theology.

One of the greatest sceptics of our age was the Frenchman, Renan. Yet that famous doubter and denier made this searching remark not long before he died: "I fear that the work of the twentieth century will consist in taking out of the waste-basket a multitude of excellent ideas which the nineteenth century has heedlessly cast into it." That appears to me a very significant confession. If anything, it overstates the case of religious reconstruction. And how true it is!—if not true of us, at least true of a superficial phase of science. There has been almost as much dogmatism of denial in recent years in the name of science as there ever was of affirmation in the name of religion. Because part of a thing was seen to be false, the whole substance was looked on as untrue, and was cast aside. But, thank God! a sifting process has begun. We are beginning to gather up and re-establish much that needs to be saved in the name of truth and in the cause of faith. This is the problem and the task of reconstruction. The world is waiting for it to be accomplished. Men begin to feel the need of a vital and substantial faith. We await a new philosophy of religion. Who will write it? We await a new theology. Who is going to construct it? We await a new worship. Who will organize it? We await a new liturgy. Who will frame it? Yes, and we await a new statement of organic religious principles. Who will formulate it along the lines of the largest knowledge of the universe and in the interests of the deepest instincts of the human heart? We have established a new and better point of view, and this must one day contribute to a new set of views. Our heaven has been working long, and it ought at last to produce a loaf of sweet and wholesome faith. We have created an atmosphere, and this atmosphere should now sustain new phases of organic life.

As we look around us at the present time, and throw a discerning glance over the restless ocean of the religious world, we come to realize that this need of reconstruction is

beginning to be widely felt. How significant, especially when we consider the source from which they come, are these words of President Hyde of Bowdoin College! "The current creed of Christendom is a chaos of contradictions. Truths and lies, facts and fancies, intuitions and superstitions, essentials and excrescences, are bound in one bundle of tradition, which the honest believer finds hard to swallow whole, and which the earnest doubter is equally reluctant *in toto* to reject. It is high time to attack this chaos, to resolve it into its elements, and to reorganize our faith into a form which shall at the same time command the assent of honest and the devotion of earnest men." And not less striking and significant are these words from the heart and conscience of Dr. George A. Gordon: "One looks almost in vain for books giving an elaboration into coherent and commanding form of the new ideas by which Christian men are living. We cry out for order. The house of faith must be rebuilt. We have materials in abundance, old and new; but the building is not in sight."

And this cry which comes from those who are believers still, but dissatisfied with the shelter of their Father's Faith,—this cry is taken up and repeated by those who have wandered long without any shelter. The doubters of the world, those who went out from their ancient habitations, not knowing whither they went, and who have dwelt in tents with our modern Isaacs and Jacobs, heirs with them of the same honest doubts and questionings,—these men now look for a city that hath foundations. The winds of doubt grow cold. The wintry air of denial makes them shiver. The old longing for a religious house comes over them,—a new house and substantial, built by human hands, indeed, but built with all the strength of modern knowledge and with the symmetry of the largest truths. If you and I hope to call these wanderers back, we must have something definite to call them to. If we make an offer of hospitality, we must provide a shelter which will meet the needs and satisfy the desires of those to whom we offer it; and this is what we have not yet secured.

Assuming, however, that religious reconstruction is what the twentieth century will require, what appeal have we to make, what contribution can we offer?

Now religion is going to be reconstructed just as soon as we realize this one thing, and realize it all the way through,—that religion is deeply and intensely natural, that it is an instinct of human nature, an inevitable result of human thought and feelings and actions. Instead of speculating about what

constitutes a universal religion, we need to build upon the fact that religion is universal. If our movement has taught the world nothing else, it has at least taught this,—confidence in human nature. And this stone which the early builders rejected must now be made the head-stone of the corner. We are coming to perceive that religion is as natural as life. "Religious institutions and literatures and customs are products of man's spiritual history, just as houses, factories, roads, and ships are the products of his material history." Religion holds the same relation to human nature that society holds to it, that art and music hold to it. Why is it that all our social institutions exist? Why is it that we live in towns and cities, and bind ourselves into numberless social organizations? It is because the social instinct, as we call it, controls our actions. Why is it that we line our streets with beautiful buildings, and adorn our houses with pictures and bronzes and works of art? It is because we have an instinct which makes us love the beautiful. And for a similar reason, because we love harmony, we take delight in music. And it is just the same with religion. The one constant in religion is human nature, with its hopes and fears, its aspirations and desires,—an ascending constant, we have learned, but still a constant. We talk to-day the same deep language of the heart and conscience that Isaiah, Homer, Socrates, and Epictetus spoke.

"The springs of action and affection," says our prophetic Dr. Martineau, "are immortal and unchangeable: the love and hate and terror, the pity, the sorrow and crime that are woven into the epic and drama of a remote antiquity, have their fibres still thrilling in the heart of to-day; the same deeds kindle us to scorn or admiration; the same incidents startle our laughter or our tears." And we need no seer to remind us that aspiration is the same quivering and ascending instinct to-day as when John had visions of a heavenly city. Pity scalds the eyes with tears as hot as dimmed the sight of Jesus weeping over Jerusalem. Remorse still flings the soul into that dark abyss where Peter found himself after his cowardly denial, and faith lifts it to the distant heights that beckoned to the great apostle. These things do not vary; and these are the instincts, rich and deep and permanent, that ever tend to make religion a fresh and personal creation.

When the black patriot, Toussaint L'Ouverture, was taken prisoner and carried off in chains to France, his cruel captors believed that he had left vast treasures behind him, hidden somewhere in his native island; and they tried to extort his

secret from him. "Yes," he answered calmly to their questions,—“yes, it is true I have great treasures. They are hidden here in my heart, and you cannot take them away.”

There has been much talk in connection with religious reconstruction, much of it wise, and some of it very eloquent, about the new universe in which we live. Science, we are reminded, has opened new heavens and revealed a new earth. The world has changed its front. A new and vastly longer and wholly different pedigree has been discovered for the human race. And this is all of it important. It is all intensely significant. But in spite of heavens and earths and new worlds and longer pedigrees the heart of man remains the same. And out of this heart are the issues of the religious life. We must keep it, then, with diligence. You remember well, of course, that old legend of Elijah. But did you ever think of its deep significance? Elijah was desolate and despondent: it seemed to him that God had ceased to care for him and protect him. So he went a day's journey into the wilderness; and, standing with the depths of a gloomy mountain cavern at his back, he prayed his God to show him that he was not left alone. And the thunder burst and the earth trembled and the rocky peaks gave back the awful echoes, but God was not in the thunder or the earthquake; and then the lightning flashed, but God was not in the fire. And after these outward signs there came a still, small voice that seemed to speak within the prophet's inmost soul; and Elijah bent his head, and listened to his God's commands.

These still, small voices, which are speaking yet, must be our inspirations for religious reconstruction. For religion, as old Dr. Walker said, is “not a science, but a want.” It only remains for us to trust the deeper instincts of our souls, and to build upon them faithfully in the morning glow of modern knowledge, and the work will grow beneath our hands.

On the western coast of France there rises a lovely island, which once was nothing but a naked peak of narrow rock. Nearly a thousand years ago, however, a pious monk, in obedience to a heavenly vision, built a chapel in honor of St. Michael on the lonely summit. Treacherous sands and swiftly sweeping tides surrounded it on every side. But one by one religious devotees took refuge there. And the tiny chapel grew into a church, and the church was girdled with sombre, shadowy cloisters. A little village soon grew up around the steep and jagged edges of the mount. Walls were added for defence. And at last the men of the world, the practical fighting men, perceived that those men of God had

silently secured one of the strongest fortresses in France. And after that Mont St. Michel became a stronghold of France against her enemies ; while to-day it is sought by multitudes of tourists, who wonder at the grandeur of the site and the beauty of its buildings.

So shall it be with religion in the future. It shall establish itself on the impregnable rock of human nature, a thing at once of beauty and defence.

## THE APPEAL TO CHRISTIAN SENTIMENT.

BY REV. ADELBERT L. HUDSON.

The purpose of our meeting to-night seems to be in the nature of range-finding, and my part has been made comparatively easy by the spirit of the morning session; for no one who heard the utterances of the different speakers, and felt the quick and warm response of that representative audience, could fail to realize that, after nearly one hundred years of climbing the rugged and sometimes lonely heights of rational religion, the Unitarian Church has now reached a point where it has become deeply and seriously conscious of itself as a Christian body.

It is useless to belittle the practical value of sentiment. It is the power which underlies all progress. It profoundly sways our civilization. We may affect a sort of anthracite culture,—heat without flame; but give us an occasion worthy to kindle our enthusiasm, and we show ourselves at once as inflammable as dry driftwood.

The sentiment which has inspired and directed our progress during the past century is reverence for liberty of thought. This has found easy and untrammelled expression in our national and individual life, while, to a large extent, it has been excluded from the field of religion; and the especial contribution of Unitarianism to the progress of the century is that its contention has not only established the right of liberty of thought in religion, but has even enthroned it in the very seat of authority, so that to-day one may think and express his thought as freely in religion as in science or economics.

This in itself is no slight achievement. It has done more than stimulate general progress. It has affected individual life as well. It has meant salvation from despair to thousands whose hearts have longed to hold fast the religious ideals of their youth, while their minds have revolted from the creeds and dogmas with which these ideals have seemed hopelessly involved. On the other hand and equally it has meant salvation from indifference to other thousands who, in outgrowing old beliefs, have come dangerously near to losing faith in the eternal verities.

It is not without cause that Unitarians look with satisfac-

tion upon the consequences of their brave and lonely struggle for religious freedom; but after all its chief value is merely preparatory. Rational thinking is essential to true progress, but its worth is small compared with the dynamic power of lofty ideals. It attains its greatest usefulness when it furnishes the soil in which these high ideals may find most perfect growth.

It is this larger opportunity for usefulness which invites the earnest effort of Unitarianism in the second century of its organized activity. What our civilization most needs to-day is a vivid realization of the Christ spirit in all the complex relations of our social, industrial, and civic life. But this cannot be brought about through the claims of ecclesiastical authority or traditional statements of belief. These have been discarded and outgrown. In order to win the allegiance and control the destiny of the thinking masses, the influence of the Christ life must come to them hand in hand with rational thought; and it is just in such companionship that it finds freest and most natural expression.

The Christian religion has influenced the lives of men, more or less, in all ages of the Christian era, but not by means of theological dogmas or elaborate forms and ceremonies. The real source of the power it has manifested does not lie in the outward effort of mistaken champions to identify the personality of Jesus with the eternal God. It inheres rather in the subconscious ideal of a human Christ inspiring the heart and vitalizing the will. The tremendous revelation, still but faintly grasped, of the essential unity of God and man; the possibility of human nature, present in all stages of our incompleteness, to attain perfection through the unfolding of a divine life resident within ourselves; and the promise of such attainment held out by the example of one human life which was grandly "true to what is in you and me,"—this has always been the real substance of the Christian faith.

The elaborate and irrational worship of Jesus as God has hindered hitherto the best development of Christian sentiment. As Mr. Pulsford showed this morning, the halo and the shining robe of mediæval worship blinded men's eyes to the real motive of the life of Jesus. It is only as these hindrances to clear vision have been swept away that full opportunity is given to make the ideal of the Christ life a controlling influence in the lives of men. This opportunity comes to the Unitarian Church as an affirmative duty and a sacred trust. From its hard-won vantage-ground of honest, free, and rational thought it is able to make the spirit of the

Christ life a vital influence in the lives of those who no longer feel the force of the old motives in religion. Because it does not seek the aid of supernatural sanctions, it has power to bring the reality of the Christ ideal into personal contact with what is real in human life and human need. The speaker referred, by way of illustration, to the celebrated painting of the head of Christ by Leonardo da Vinci, to be seen in the Suermondt gallery in Milan, which, without any of the conventional marks used to denote the subject, so impresses the beholder with the artist's conception of the power of God in man that it lifts the soul into harmony with lofty idealism and stimulates the will to noble striving. And he told how the artist gained final inspiration for his work, not from the representations of the Christ in cathedral worship, the writings of the holy Fathers, or in lonely meditation, but by going among the people, mingling with their life, and learning how the Christ thought led men toward the best and highest. This, he said, is the noblest function of our liberal church in its practical appeal to the twentieth century: so to present the simple lesson of the humanity of Jesus, with its eternal revelation of the divinity that lies slumbering in man, that it shall help to solve the practical problems of the time, and give the world a mighty impulse Godward.

But, in presenting this lesson to the world, we must not overlook the important truth urged by Mr. Eells this morning, that our best inspiration does not come from the retrospective cry, "Backward to Jesus!" but in the truer and braver appeal, "Onward and upward and forward to Jesus!" From its very nature the revelation of the unity of human and divine could not remain a fixed conception at any period of time. It must continually find new and larger and finer interpretations as man advances in the scale of being, just as the great truth, "God is love," which the child reads on her motto in the Sunday-school, takes on new and deeper meaning with those experiences in life which reveal the length and breadth and height and depth of the power and sacredness of human love. If humanity has grown in any worthy way during these nineteen hundred years, then our conception of the Christhood should be grander and more complete to-day than it has ever been before. This element of growth power is essential to continued human helpfulness. This is the very essence of our message to the future, that it is a progressive ideal which we cherish. It contains a germ of the divine life capable of infinite expansion. Creeds cannot circumscribe it nor definitions limit its unfolding power. Amid the



harsh discords and the threatening conflicts of the present time it beckons us to see the larger vision and live the nobler life. It lights up the uncertain outlines of the coming century with the fuller promise of God's wisdom, tenderness, and love; and we turn with reverent affection from the Christ that was and the Christ that is to the "Christ that is to be."

## THE APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE.

BY REV. W. W. FENN.

In reading the literature which the three hundredth anniversary of the birth of Cromwell has brought afresh to our notice, one is impressed by the frequently occurring phrase "liberty of conscience," which seems to sum up nearly all that those brave men were stoutly contending for against the arbitrary authority of church and monarchy. Who could have suspected then that in so short a time after the victory had been won and the rights of conscience securely established it would be necessary to plead for the obligation of conscience? Are we like children playing in the marketplace, willing to fight to the death for a king in captivity only to celebrate our victory and his freedom by renouncing obligation and compelling abdication? Will the twentieth century acknowledge conscience? It is touching to recall the confidence once reposed in reason and conscience as the final arbiters of thought and conduct, especially in these days when the authority of both is denied by some, regarded indifferently by many. If we may adopt Dogberry's phrase, it has been proved already and it will go near to be thought shortly that reason and conscience are not of supernatural origin, but have grown up in a purely natural way as contrivances by which the individual may be flexibly adjusted to his environment. When this assertion has been made, men are prone to declare that therefore reason and conscience have no authority whatsoever. A prophet is not without honor save in his own country and among his own people; for they have watched his bringing up, and are acquainted with the influences which fashioned him. Hence like the old lady living near a theological seminary, who said she never had any respect for ministers after she saw how they were made, those who look upon reason and conscience as purely natural in origin and development are apt to lose respect for them. When, however, we perceive that God is nature, the vital principle of growth, the fact of natural rise and progress gives favorable instead of adverse evidence. Again, the authority of conscience is weakened when we recognize, as we must, that conscience has led different men in different ways. "You must obey your conscience," says

Ruskin, only make sure that yours is not the conscience of an ass. Yet the jackass must obey what conscience he has, or remain an unimproved jackass to the end of the chapter.

It is certain that we have no infallible revelation of God to man. But, acknowledging a progressive revelation in institutions, we must recognize it also in the reason and conscience of man out of which institutions proceed. They are guides, not infallible, yet sufficient directors of the individual way, if not visions of the universal good.

Besides these direct attacks upon the authority of conscience, it has been undermined by the growth of the idea of solidarity; for, whatever else one may say about conscience, so much is certain, that it is individualistic. It is the man's own perception of that which is right, and whatever tends to weaken the individual tends to weaken the authority of conscience. In the September number of the *Atlantic*, Charles Kendall Adams has declared that the characteristic of the closing century is its irresistible individualism, by which its great results have been achieved. Every careful observer knows, however, that the pendulum is on the backward swing, and that the idea of solidarity is coming to the front in human thinking.

In one of the William Belden Noble lectures at Harvard, Prof. Peabody said that Phillips Brooks stood at the end of one period in religion. He was the Homer of the age of personal religion, which is to be succeeded by that of religion as pre-eminently a social force. These two great ideas of individualism and solidarity are coming into conflict in all the relations of life. Upon which side in the conflict will the Church be found? It is one of the distinguishing characteristics of Jesus that he reconciled in experience, in life, ideas which so far we have been unable to reconcile in thought. In him, social and individualistic ideas blend harmoniously. And yet, as the product of the Jewish development, he represents chiefly the individualistic element in religion. To him religion was a personal relation between God and man and between man and his brothers.

But the individualistic idea died out of Christendom, and the idea of the institution took its place. If we are true to the essential spirit of Jesus, our emphasis will be placed still upon the individual, and not upon the institution. But the institution is exalted in Christendom, and the Church as a whole will probably be on the side of solidarity. What of our Unitarian churches? Recognizing fully that both elements are absolutely necessary, we whose modern history begins with the church that was in the house of William

Brewster, composed of men who believed in mystical individualism, whose independent career begins with Channing, whose central thought was the dignity of the individual human soul, and culminates in Ralph Waldo Emerson, in whom the mystic individualism of Scrooby found its perfect expression, we are obliged by our inheritance, by our tradition, by our creative principle, to emphasize the idea of individuality in religion. The rapid progress of the Unitarian churches at the beginning of this century was owing to the harmony of their thought with the spirit of the time. To-day the movement is against individualism, and it may be ours to champion the rights of the individual reason and conscience against the growing power of the institution and the urgent ideal of social unity. It may be the supreme appeal to the conscience of the twentieth century will come from our Unitarian Congregational churches.

Shall we consider two forms which may be taken by such an appeal? First in business. Business men deserve deep and sincere sympathy in these trying days. There are high-minded business men who are tortured by the fact that they are part of a great business system whose ideals, whose methods, are far beneath their personal ideals. There is the conflict between the individual and the institution in the ethics of business. The Church, which believes in the supremacy of conscience, will not dictate; but it will ally itself with all its power to the conscience of the business man. It will say to the young man, "Live by your highest ideals of truth; and if, as a result, you must walk in poverty, loneliness, and obscurity, then in God's name have manliness enough to pay the price." It will say to him, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" The idea of saving one's soul often seems to us ignoble; yet if by the soul you mean the highest, noblest qualities of man, his purity, his delicacy, his sensitiveness, his personal integrity, then it is still the supreme duty of every man to save his own soul, to keep it alive, and nothing is worth the price of a debased and dishonored soul.

Is it a hard saying? Our fathers in Gainsborough adopted a covenant which perhaps was the original covenant of the Plymouth Church, in which they pledged themselves to walk in God's ways made known or to be made known to them, whatsoever it should cost, God being their helper. Whatsoever it should cost them! As one reads these words now, he sees Barrow, Greenwood, and Perry on the scaffolds, the arrest in Boston, the painful separation at the banks of the Humber, the poverty of Amsterdam and Leyden, the hard-

ships of Plymouth ; yet, whatsoever it should cost them, these men would be true to conscience. That was the spirit that made New England great ; and woe worth the day it shall be drained out of us ! They were ready to die for a theological idea, for a church polity. Are we not willing to sacrifice dollars for a moral principle, that we may have a conscience void of offence toward God and man ? This is the appeal that the Church will make to the conscience of the young man of the twentieth century,—that, whatever he may lose, he must keep his honor, he must obey his loftiest ideals, whatever it shall cost him, God being his helper.

Is the Church to make that appeal ? Judgment must first begin at the house of God, for we are confronted in Christendom to-day with the same conflict between the individual and the institution. It is a well-known fact that there are thousands of clergymen in the creed-based churches whose beliefs, sometimes openly expressed, often revealed only in private conversation, do not square with the creeds of the Church. I gladly acquit most of these brethren of intentional dishonesty. They believe in the immense value of the Church to society. They see that it is a progressive institution moving toward truer thought. Therefore, they remain in it, that it may be kept intact during the critical period of growth, and that they may help it forward to a position of truer, nobler service. No one who comprehends the spirit of such men can sympathize with the denunciations often hurled against them. The welfare of the institution stands higher in their estimation than absolute integrity of the individual.

A young man on the point of leaving his birthright church to join the Unitarian fellowship was counselled not to make so foolish a move. "Stay where you are," said his friend. "You will be recognized as one of the liberal men, you will attract large congregations, you will have the power to help in the transformation of the church, whereas, if you go to the Unitarian fellowship, your influence will cease. You will preach to small congregations all your life. Your usefulness will be comparatively insignificant." What a temptation to come to a young man ! "Then the devil taketh Jesus up into a high place, and showed him all the kingdoms of the earth, and said unto him, All these will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me."

Did Jesus care for power or high place ? It was the most subtle temptation that ever comes to a human soul,—the temptation to usefulness. How much might he accomplish if in a position of authority ! "Thou shalt worship the Lord

thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." We have no right to sacrifice personal integrity for the sake of social utility. Let the young man stand alone, if need be; and he shall find himself not alone, but in the Father's presence.

People used to speak of Jesus as judge. In a very real and true sense, that is true: Jesus is the judge of man. Would you dare, looking into the clear, honest eyes of Jesus of Nazareth, to make the shuffling excuses and apologies that you are now making to yourself and others for your life? How can a man stand face to face with that noble spirit, and plead the cause of the institution against the individual conscience? Say what you will, and let us speak in all kindness, with the deepest sympathy and love, about the worth of the Church,—after all is said, the spirit of Jesus Christ moves a change of venue from utility to conscience. That is the appeal to the conscience of the Church of the twentieth century. There are men who will hear it, and who will rise up obedient to the summons, saying, in the words of Martin Luther, "Here stand I: I can do no other, God help me." And into the victorious conscience enters the peace of the living God.

"Perish policy and cunning, perish all that fears the light,  
Cease from man and look above thee, trust in God and do the right."

The meeting on Thursday afternoon was devoted to the interests of the American Unitarian Association. The following addresses were delivered:—

## THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

BY HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT.

The purpose of the meeting, as I understand it, is first, to promote a better understanding of the aims, the policy, and the work of the American Unitarian Association.

Second, to remove any doubts — if doubts exist — as to the necessity of its work.

Third, to remove any misapprehensions which may exist in regard to the aims and work of the Association.

Fourth, to so explain and present its policy that it shall command the approval and support of the representatives of all our churches.

The American Unitarian Association probably has its faults; but, so far as I understand them, they are faults of conditions. I believe the Association has the confidence and support of the Unitarian denomination throughout the country. Its seventy-five years of work ought to have brought that result. Nevertheless, there are misapprehensions about that work which sometimes indicate a lack of confidence here and there. I have heard this among other things, that last year the Association expended ten thousand dollars less than it received, that it is an organization that should expend all that it receives, and there should be no surplus. On account of that a wealthy and very good business man withdrew his contribution, for he said that if an organization does not expend its whole income, there is mismanagement somewhere. The answer to this is that the Association must make its appropriations on what it expects to receive. It must make the appropriations for 1900 in 1899, and on what it expects to receive, not on what it has in the bank. Making the estimates on that basis, through the generosity of the denomination, it received last year ten thousand dollars more than it expended. You may rest assured they will make that up in appropriations for the coming year. Then perhaps business may be dull, and the receipts not be equal to the appropriations. What is to be done? The Association must borrow that some way. It must tide over the difficulty; for its pledges to the societies it is aiding are sacred pledges, and they must be carried out.

That is one of the misapprehensions which it is well, perhaps, to explain.

Another misapprehension or misunderstanding lies in the fact of the claim that the Unitarian body is, as Dr. Bellows used to call it, an unsectarian sect. That can be claimed as the condition of the Unitarian body to-day. It is an unsectarian sect; but it has certain aims and purposes which must be carried out, and which have been laid before you. Every organization has some purpose, and the purpose of the Association is to increase the non-sectarian sentiment of the world by broadening its religious views; but, in order to do this, there must be organization of some kind for the very purpose of extending its views. Yet there are men and women, thoroughly in sympathy with us at heart, who object to this, because they think it stands for sectarian work. Yet it has no ecclesiastical power. It has simply an executive board, elected for the sole purpose of carrying out the will of the whole body. If the body of the Unitarian denomination in this country desires to abandon organized work, then it should not support the American Unitarian Association. That whole idea, which existed more broadly thirty or forty years ago than now, of non-sectarian methods, has had a retarding influence on the work that we are set to perform.

There is a misunderstanding about the work of allied bodies. There is this Association, and there is the National Conference. There is the Women's Alliance and the local conferences, all working to one end, each in its own way. All work for the great purpose of extending our belief. And yet about this very multiplicity of organization we hear criticism which injures one or the other. The American Unitarian Association works at one end of the line, and the Women's Alliance at the other. The American Unitarian Association has been working for seventy-five years. Its aims have been before the people all these years. The Women's Alliance comes as a great help to stimulate and foster local enterprise. It collects its funds and dispenses them in its own way; and yet individuals, when asked to contribute to the treasury of the Association, have objected because the Women's Alliance raises nearly as much—about \$50,000 the past year—as the Association itself raises, which last year was nearly \$57,500, the point being that there is no necessity existing to make contributions to the Association. There need be no comparison of the work of the two bodies. Certainly there can be no comparison the results of which would not be thoroughly creditable to each association. The Women's Alliance is organized for one purpose.



It carries out that purpose in a very grand way. It raises money for local purposes, and its contributions are used in aiding societies locally. The purpose of the Alliance is to promote local organizations of women for missionary and denominational work. It in no way contributes to the funds of the American Unitarian Association, which has charge of the missionary work of the whole body. And, as will appear later, there is no conflict of duties. Hence there should be no comparison of the amounts collected; but, if such comparison is to be made, it should be just to the Association, which, if it counted its funds on the same basis as the total collection of the Alliance is made up, would have a total reaching into the millions.

The Association always facilitates the work of the Women's Alliance, which is bringing vital interest in a noble way into this work. The American Unitarian Association always welcomes its work as that of a sister who is helping a brother in the laborious work he is trying to do.

During the first half of its existence the American Unitarian Association performed its service almost entirely in the New England States. When the great West and North-west were settled, Unitarianism was carried there. In the South there was no Unitarianism. It has sprung up there now; and you may find some struggling group of Unitarians trying to perfect an organization there, so that they can carry to their neighbors the gospel of our communion. It was natural that the idea should have sprung up that the American Unitarian Association is a local organization, devoted to the interests of Unitarianism in New England, and, perhaps, in some of the Middle States,—a feeling that the Association does not reach far enough, that it is not in reality a national body. A few figures will satisfy any man that that is a mistake.

According to the report of the treasurer for the fiscal year closing April 30, 1898, it is seen that, of the total contributions of the churches, New England contributes a little less than 75 per cent., the Middle States about 24 per cent., and the rest of the country a little over  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.; while, of the contributions disbursed for the mission work of the Association, New England receives a little over 30 per cent., the Middle States a little over 19 per cent., and the rest of the country over 50 per cent., the Western States alone taking 31 per cent. of the whole expenditure, and the Southern and Pacific States 19 per cent. Nothing could more forcibly show that the American Unitarian Association is a national body than these figures.

There may be other misconceptions, but they are not important. Coming to the details of what the Association, as the executive body of the denomination, actually does, the duties of the secretary, as the chief executive officer, may be referred to as the best illustration.

It is his duty to keep a record of the meetings of the corporation and of the board of directors; to conduct the correspondence of the Association and keep a file of the same; to speak or make public addresses in behalf of the Association wherever and whenever its interests require him to do so; and from time to time to visit different parts of the country, in order to become acquainted with the opportunities for liberal Christian effort, and to give sympathy and help to the scattered bodies of Unitarians.

The secretary is thus primarily a constitutional executive. It is his first duty to carry out the votes of the board of directors. He is bound by the decisions of that deliberative and administrative body, which is in turn responsible to the constituents of the Association.

The secretary is a member without vote of all the committees of the board of directors, and it is his duty to prepare the business for the committee meetings. The preparation of the committee business involves a large amount of correspondence.

The secretary must be in constant communication with the ministers and officers of the seventy-five or eighty parishes aided by the Association, giving counsel as to the conduct of these different enterprises, and holding the ministers to the full discharge of their duties.

The secretary has general supervision of the Publication Department, and must see to it that the free tract list is kept supplied with new material, and that the needs of the Post-office Missions are met. He must be on the watch to secure good books and tracts.

In addition to the advice given to aided parishes, the secretary must be in a position to give good counsel to independent societies which ask his aid in the selection of ministers, and particularly to introduce to the notice of churches ministers who have not had time or opportunity to prove their merit in their profession. This delicate task requires insight alike into the special needs of the parishes and into the character and gifts of ministers. The secretary must respect the independence of Congregational churches, and yet he must endeavor by all legitimate means to prevent injudicious appointments, and to direct the attention of the parishes seeking ministers to the men who can best meet their special requirements.

Beyond these distinctly official duties the secretary must be alert to increase the income and endowment to the Association, to recruit the ministry with promising youth, to welcome ministers of other fellowships, to promote the prosperity of the churches and institutions of learning and philanthropy which are associated with the Unitarian movement, to watch and, if possible, anticipate the changes in the social and religious habits of the country, and, as far as possible, to adapt the work of the Unitarian Church to these progressive alterations. He can thus profit by a wide intercourse with all sorts of men and by every real discussion on theology, sociology, or religious organization.

It is impossible to sum up in statistics a work of this character. A record, however, was kept at this office of the secretary's work during the calendar year 1898, which shows that in that period he conducted Sunday services and preached sixty times, made public addresses at ten conferences, seventeen Unitarian clubs and Ministers' Associations and seven Branch Alliances, and took part in sixteen installation services, together with thirty-four other public addresses, usually in Unitarian churches. The secretary's letter book for the same period shows a record of 2,688 letters, not including the circulars sent out to more than one person, which would add about eight hundred to the list. His journeys for the year included three trips to the Central West and eight to the Middle States, besides visits to almost every part of New England.

The American Unitarian Association will succeed in its efforts to promote the Unitarian cause throughout the country just in the proportion that it succeeds in winning the confidence and affection of the people in our churches. I do not hesitate to assert that it is deserving of your full confidence, your full support, and your entire co-operation.

## THE MESSAGE OF OUR CHURCH TO OUR OWN PEOPLE.

BY REV. SAMUEL A. ELIOT.

It is credibly reported that a distinguished divine of our communion, leading the worship of the congregation in the Harvard College Chapel, once offered prayer after this fashion: "Make," he prayed, "the incorrigible correctable, the intemperate temperate, and the industrious dustrious." If I may use the word of another Cambridge clergyman, not of our communion, I should say that the primary problem set before our Unitarian people to-day is how to make the indifferent different.

The most formidable obstacle in the way of our organic advance is not misunderstanding or prejudice or the petty criticism that sometimes annoys us, or hostility or bigotry, but just our own indifference. The directors of your Association do not want and do not ask any uncritical acceptance of their decisions. On the contrary, they believe that a reasonable collision of opinions is wholesome; and it is obviously to the advantage of the Association when diversities of view are represented in the governing board itself. We expect of Unitarians independence of thought and candor of speech, but we believe that these traits are not incompatible with mutual respect and confidence. Those of us who are in earnest in this cause are not disheartened because some people oppose our work, but because our friends do not care for that work. It is not the cantankerous Unitarian who discourages us, but, rather, the indolent and vacant Unitarian, who sits in the seat of the scornful, and disdains to know anything about denominational affairs, who never reads the report of the Association, and who never takes up the *Register* except to glance at the "Pleasantries." A well-bred and good-natured self-content seems to be a characteristic Unitarian trait. It is not that we do things that we ought not to do: it is that we leave undone the things that demand our intelligence and energy. For every good Unitarian soldier fighting at the front there seem to be five hundred looking on. We do not waste our talents; but do we not too often hide them? If we do not add to them, if

we do not increase them by exercise, if we do not make them fruitful, do we not deserve the doom of the unprofitable servant?

Let us not confuse religious opinions with religious experiences. Let us not mistake information for obedience. A thoughtless familiarity with truth soon destroys respect for truth itself. I have no confidence in a faith that is all enjoyment without exercise. It is easy to make a truth an interesting but bed-ridden invalid. If health is to be sustained, it must have out-of-door work to do. A virtue unpractised is soon a virtue lost. "Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, that man is blessed in his deed."

I know how hard it is to champion an unpopular truth, how easy it is to make plausible excuses for our denominational ignorance or apathy. I do not urge upon you any aggressive defiance, but I do long for a fresh outburst of moral courage. This work is hard service only to those who serve it grudgingly. Take hold of it hesitatingly, and like a nettle it seems all pricks and stings. Take hold of it resolutely and earnestly, and we shall find obligation turned into inclination.

We do not understand our heritage when we merely admire it. Beautiful, indeed, upon the mountains may be the feet of them that preach good tidings; but how is it when we are called to follow them when they come down from the heights and walk in the stern ways of common life? Here in our Conference we may well be filled with ardent desire to attain to our best ideals; but how will it be to-morrow, when we face the dust of vulgar selfishness? Will our bright enthusiasms vanish, like the bright clouds that make the morning landscape beautiful, or will they lead us right forward against all hidden iniquities and cherished prejudices? I pray that ours may be the ardor of spirit which is not merely a fine fancy or a sentimental approval of truth and virtue or a slothful sympathy with goodness. I want ours to be an ideal not easily attained, but to be won through hardness and unbroken fight. I want ours to be an enthusiasm which is able, unstained, unchilled, to go down into common life, and glorify it. I pray that our ardor may not be transient, but habitual; not involuntary, but intentional and personal; not general, but particular.

Will not such a passion of service increase the liberality and energy of the members of your Association? I would not seem to be censorious or complaining. I have elsewhere

taken occasion to acknowledge the generous and self-forgetting helpfulness of many friends. The gains made in the efficiency of your work during the last two years have been due to the resolute helpfulness of such of our ministers and people who appreciate and accept their responsibilities in our democratic and co-operative organization. I do not fail in gratitude for that helpfulness; and I rejoice to believe that more and more our people are becoming roused to a sense of their opportunity, more and more are they willing to take up the cross of the present apostolate, and offer themselves to spend and be spent in the service of truth, freedom, and unity.

One of the largest gifts which any individual can make is that of personal service, and the Association enjoys a great deal of gratuitous service from its friends and members. I cannot pause for individual thanks to the many ministers and laymen and laywomen who put heart and industry into the often difficult task of raising the missionary money; but may I not congratulate you upon the quality and amount of the unpaid service rendered by your president, your treasurer, and your directors? That service requires sound judgment, knowledge of men and knowledge of affairs. I do not hesitate to say that your present board of directors is second to none that your Association has ever called into its service. The board is faithful in duty, and is without a trace of provinciality. It diligently endeavors to make every dollar do the work of ten dollars. It faces all the hardest facts, yet is rationally optimistic and thoroughly sane and business-like. The constitutional articles by which your board is chosen are well devised, providing for the adequate representation of different sections of the country, for a fitting proportion of ministers, lay men and women, and by the three years' term for a sufficient mobility. It is important that the membership of the board should be sufficiently continuous to have a steady aim and a purpose transmissible from year to year, and equally important that it should be constantly refreshed by the election of representative men and women who are fertile in new suggestions.

Beyond the gift of service is the gift of money. That has been so constantly discussed here during the days of our Conference that I shall not detain you on this matter longer than to call your attention to the fact that this is the seventy-fifth year of your Association's life, and to suggest that you cannot better celebrate the seventy-fifth birthday than by raising your contributions to the appropriate sum of \$75,000. It can be done, and done at once, if you will agree to adopt

an intelligent subscription method and push the work promptly and thoroughly. I ought not to need to repeat that the contributions received before Thanksgiving are the most welcome. Do not, I pray you, leave the matter to the last minute. The canvass can be made in November just as well as in April. Unitarians have given liberally to everything excepting the furtherance of their own ideas. We are magnificent givers, but let me appeal to you to give to your own missionary work in some grander fashion than in the past. People call to us from every State in the Union to help them to build and to maintain Unitarian churches. And perpetually we have to say to them: "No! We believe indeed that there is both great need and good promise for a useful church in your community. But you must wait. Do not try to be born this year. Postpone it till next year or the next, until we get a little more money to purchase swaddling-clothes and a cradle for you."

"I have," says Dr. Savage, from whom I have just quoted, "a Unitarian friend who said, not a great while ago, that she did not propose to give money to anything except Unitarian causes until she could find some generous orthodox who would contribute to build a Unitarian church. We have counted it a part of our liberalism to help everybody else and everything else. I believe in this, provided it can be reciprocal. But so long as our cause is suffering, languishing, waiting for help; so long as, though Moses and all his followers speak to the children of Israel and bid them go forward, they cannot go forward rapidly enough to meet their great opportunity for lack of means,—so long as this is true, I appeal to you more generously, more heartily, to sustain and support our own institutions, our own purposes, our own causes, our own works, in every part of our land."

But beyond this matter of lifting the annual contributions is another matter. There are many branches of the work of your Association which ought to be promptly and liberally endowed. The experience of a hundred generations has abundantly proved that churches are the most enduring of all artificial institutions, and that religious endowments, if made sufficiently elastic and not too closely conditioned, are the most lasting means of doing good to human kind. The religious institutions of Europe have survived the destruction and reconstruction of every other institution, legal, commercial, or governmental, on the continent. They have, if I paraphrase the word of a Unitarian whom I especially honor,—they have seen society remodelled from its founda-

tions, and have played no unimportant part in that reconstruction. However wedded to false doctrines, however corrupt in practice, they have been the steadfast guides of higher civilization. We perceive the tenacity of life in American churches. The first churches of Plymouth, Salem, and Boston, are older than any other Massachusetts corporation, court, or government. They have seen a colony transformed into a province, and a province into a State; and they have seen the State undergo the profoundest modifications in its industries, population, social habits, and religious hopes and customs. Those who seek to do some perpetual good in the world cannot hope to find a more durable and secure custodian for a trust for the benefit of mankind than a corporation which, like your Association, seeks to uphold imperishable ideals. Those who wisely give endowments to such an institution, pledged to the diffusion of pure and undefiled religion, plant a seed which will fructify for centuries.

Again, a stronger sense of responsibility and a deeper religious vitality in our churches will furnish us with an increasing supply of wise, earnest, and devout men for our pulpits. It is a too obvious fact that in this generation an entirely inadequate number of men of force and ability are attracted to the profession of the ministry; and it is equally obvious that our work will go just as fast and as far as our churches are able to command the services of brave, reverent, high-minded men to be their guides and exemplars. Only through believers can unbelievers be reached; only by public spirit can men be made public-spirited; only through faithfulness can men be won to faith. A living message finds expression only in living spirits. From one man, through many men, to all men, that is the historical and still the inevitable method and progress of the Christian gospel.

It is a just reproach that Unitarian churches do not sufficiently recruit their own ministry. It is our privilege to welcome many ministers of large capacity of service, who have been bred and trained in other communions; and we rejoice in their allegiance. Often they make the best, the most ardent, the most self-forgetting of our ministerial force; but we can have no deep confidence in our stability and fruitfulness until the religious atmosphere of our own Unitarian churches and households is such as to make it natural and inevitable that manly youth shall, without any sense of hostile environment, any unsympathetic comment, choose the ministry as the largest, highest opportunity for the exercise of their gifts. Never, I do believe, was there such an



opportunity as religious conditions present to-day for the energy of men of force, tact, and insight, and never,—though some of you may mock at the thought,— never probably such a reward.

Your Association asks, then, these things of you,— your confidence, your co-operative zeal, your money aid, your manly and generous young men. Are not these opportunities of service our sacred obligations?

## OUR MESSAGE TO OTHER CHURCHES.

BY REV. HOWARD N. BROWN.

The attempt to deliver a message sometimes calls in question the amount of confidence to be placed in the messenger ; and I suppose we cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that, up to this time, the majority of our fellow-Christians are not disposed to listen with much respect to any advice or criticism we have to offer. It is sometimes urged that we are disqualified for this purpose because of our failure to build churches on any large scale or to extend ourselves as a denomination in any very rapid manner. But we beseech all fair-minded people to consider the great difficulties under which our work as a denomination has been done, having been obliged to contend with an almost universal prejudice against us. Surely, they who have been trying to tear down our work almost as fast as we could build ought not to be foremost to accuse us of being ignorant of spiritual carpentry. I declare that, in the face of such difficulties as no other religious people of modern times has been forced to meet, we have made progress, and that the character of our work does entitle us to be heard. Furthermore, a considerable number of people, the masters and leaders of their time in literature, in statesmanship, in reform, have borne our name. It is worth while, for those who do not know what these representative minds have thought on the deepest questions, to be at some pains to learn what light comes from this source. At all events, whether or not these names which are very sacred in our traditions will suffice to carry our message to others, we ourselves shall be inspired by them to make known the truth given into our keeping, till even the most deaf ears must hear. We are a small people. We have not been an insignificant people. And the Presidents, governors, and high ministers of State, the poets and historians of the first rank who have been of our faith, to say nothing of our preachers who have won national fame, — these may be our witnesses that we have a message which no indifference will kill.

At no point is it more difficult to correct a common misunderstanding than in explaining that we are not the implacable and deadly foes of a set of beliefs that make up what is

known as evangelical Christianity. There has been a long succession of claimants to the right to teach a final understanding of spiritual mysteries, and it has been supposed that that was our ambition. One after another these movements have risen, each one proclaiming the beliefs of its predecessors to be false or incomplete; and it has been assumed that we have brought forward our peculiar doctrinal views which we wish to impose on all mankind. But that emphatically is not our message. There is but one doctrine which we have any commission to attempt to destroy in other minds, and that is the doctrine which enthrones doctrine above conduct and life. There is but one absolute denial which we wish to make. We deny that any soul can be lost or cast away because of its opinions. It may be said that no one believes this now, to which we answer that not so long ago the whole Christian world believed it. And although many individuals, and in increasing number each year, find new light, yet the great organizations still exclude from their membership those whose beliefs are not of the orthodox stamp. For this there can be only one explanation or excuse, which is the unchanged assertion of these great organizations that the heretic in matters of belief is not of the household of God.

Take, for example, the venerable doctrine of the Trinity. We have no conscious desire to destroy that in any mind which finds help and satisfaction in it; but we do ask, Is it true enough or important enough, so that the Church must excommunicate those who do not find in that doctrine light and help? We acknowledge much that is beautiful in what the modern champions of this doctrine say; but when they tell us that it is really a grand old shibboleth, and ask why we will not use it with them, we reply, It is because you have made of it a shibboleth, and we know that the true follower of Christ is to be quite otherwise discovered. We think that we appreciate doctrine at its true worth and know the importance of those forms of thought which are expressions of man's sense of a divine reason in the life of the world; but we say that the church of Christ ought to be, first of all, a communion of saints, not a communion of theologians, and that the Church must suffer when the orthodox believer is kept in and the saintly life is kept out, if the two are not conjoined. It is pleaded that we must have some kind of sieve by which to separate the chaff from the wheat; but we say that the sieve which has been so constructed as to gather a great deal of chaff into the bins, and to allow a great deal of wheat to be scattered in waste places, is poorly devised for that purpose. It is perfectly plain that a man of no con-

science will subscribe most cheerfully to any creed which you place before him; but thousands of people are to-day kept out of the Church by their intellectual honesty, which will not allow them to subscribe to the creeds. But they say, Surely, we should have liberty to prescribe what conditions we please for our own membership: if you do not like the church as we conduct it, go apart and build one for yourselves. But no, we say again: your church is not your private club. The church is a public institution, a public trust, and you are bound to administer it for the good of all men, not to suit your own private peculiarities. Every person has a right to advise you of your duties, and you are bound to listen to intelligent arguments.

We make bold to say that the Church suffers because a certain philosophy of human origin has been proclaimed as if it were a divine revelation. A poor philosophy of religion may not be a very desirable possession; but it is infinitely worse to have any philosophy, good, bad, or indifferent, so enthroned in the minds of men that one must make himself a martyr if he venture to question its conclusions. We do not aim to destroy the philosophy of other Christian people. It is not even our first care to amend it, but only to get it rated at its true worth, to take it from the place it has usurped as master and make it a servant of the religious consciousness. We have our own views of the religious life to advocate, which we commend to every man's conscience in the sight of God; but, if to-day we could get the creeds of Christendom rewritten to accord with our own ideas, the larger part of our work would still remain to do, so long as any but reasonable means were employed to coerce any soul into acceptance of God's truth.

It is curious how difficult it is to make ourselves understood on this point. Having weeded out of our garden certain things that seemed to us of less value, in order that the ground may be reserved for more precious and fruitful growths, now comes the charge that we have fallen into "doctrinal sterility." We think it is in no wise necessary to still further enrich the world's theological botany by producing a new variety of the flowers of thought about as different from what has gone before as might be a new variety of pansies. We say that there has been too much of this culture. We hold that the vital truths of religion are few and simple, that God is, that right must prevail, that the wages of sin is death, that all seeking and finding must be at the last divinely evened. These truths, and truths like these, are the life-blood of religion; and on all affirmations of less conse-

quence men must be allowed to differ on pain of forfeiting more and more the respect of reasonable men.

Perhaps that is not the worst of the results that may follow the doctrinal basis upon which the Church has come too much to rely; for that basis calls into existence an immense ecclesiastical machine, whose strength is largely wasted in the mere politics of ecclesiastical management. It is matter of common knowledge that in every great religious convocation there is almost as much wire-pulling as in a political convention, simply because no action can be taken which does not touch the permanence of the creed. That creed requires to be guarded and watched with as much care as a set of crown jewels; and if it could simply be left to itself, like the creed of astronomy or chemistry, if it were nobody's business to secure its permanence, the result would be infinite gain to the Church and to mankind.

All this criticism is, of course, only the negative side of our message; and we say these things not out of self-righteousness or a desire to be disagreeable, but because we judge that some one must say them, and say them over and over, with wearisome iteration, to produce the necessary effect.

The positive form of our message is that the purely ethical and spiritual contents of the gospel are vastly greater than they have ever been known or estimated to be in the common thought of man. They are great enough to sustain that gospel on its career of conquest and enlightenment, though criticism should sweep away every vestige of the mythical and miraculous elements which have been mingled with the life of Christ. The almost universal belief in miracles once made it seem necessary to men that the teachings of Christ should have entered the world in miraculous fashion. But that demand is passing away; and the teachings of the gospel are more and more appealing to men, as they have always appealed, by virtue of their inherent reasonableness and authority. The Church is built upon the personal leadership of Jesus of Nazareth, called Christ. It is his influence which has called together and welded together into organic union the elements out of which that mighty organization is composed. The Church has risen because he has lived. The Church will continue because his leadership survives. And this, we say, is enough,—enough as the basis of organization, as a bond of union, as a motive for missionary enterprise and endeavor. Christianity is rightly the name to include all those who wish to be followers and disciples of Christ, as Platonism was once the name of those who were followers of the great Greek philos-

opher. That is all that should be demanded. So much may be asked, because no honest man wishes to call himself a Christian except as he finds something in the example and the precept of Christ which appeals to the loyalty of his heart. More than this ought not to be required of any soul, because the moment other conditions are made, then the inferior things begin to usurp superior place. The Church has never had wiser counsellors than the Pilgrims and Puritans, who for a time refused to write their beliefs into a creed to bind the consciences of their fellow-men. The First Church of Boston, to-day a Unitarian church, still lives under the covenant which was written when the colony was first planted and which was first signed by Gov. Winthrop. It is a covenant which might serve in its beautiful simplicity as a basis for Christian unity throughout the world, and it indicates the only path in which the Church can safely walk.

We hold our message to be so simple that a child can understand it. It seems to us so true that it need only to be stated to carry conviction to all who hear it; and yet experience teaches us that there is only one way in which this message can be effectively preached,—that is, when it is embodied in a living church of such stability and spiritual fruitfulness as to challenge the attention of all beholders. Our task is not ended when we have proclaimed our message. It is then only just begun; for there rests upon us the very solemn obligation to demonstrate our theories by making as many churches as we can, before whose example the charges commonly made against freedom in religion shall fall to the ground.

We see with great gladness of heart the growth of a broader spirit in other religious organizations. But, if any man thinks that therefore our work is nearly done, let him reflect that not one of those great organizations as yet holds any chartered right to admit to its membership one who simply wishes to be a follower of the founder of the Christian faith. What we are contending for is something like manhood suffrage in religion, the right of the soul which wants to obey the precepts of Christ to be recognized without any other qualifications as a citizen of that kingdom which he came to establish. We have before us an arduous task. We have many a hard fight to make before we shall win. There are difficulties and discouragements without end to be met; but, if we will stand together and use the means at our command to strengthen each other's hearts and hands, then, with God's help, we shall not ultimately fail.

## REPENTANCE FROM DEAD WORKS.

SERMON BY REV. SAMUEL M. CROTHERS, D.D.

Cleanse your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God.  
HEB. ix. 14.

When we speak of repentance from sin, every one knows what we mean. A man has done something of which he is ashamed. He renounces his past, and enters upon a new life. The consciousness of transgression, the sudden revulsion of feeling, the new determination of the will, constitute repentance.

But there is another kind of repentance. It is what is termed in the New Testament "repentance from dead works." Tennyson, in the noble prayer with which "In Memoriam" begins, joins together the two repentances:—

"Forgive what seemed my sin in me,  
What seemed my worth since I began."

He turns with profound dissatisfaction not only from his old failures, but from what at the time seemed success. The turning away from one's good deeds that are dead and that interfere with further progress is as necessary as repentance from actual sin.

The ambitious youth, as he looks forward to his chosen career, has many disquietudes. They arise not from doubts as to his ability, but only as to his opportunity. He is conscious of power, but he does not feel sure as to the field for its exercise. This is a crowded world, which has not been prepared for his coming. His ships are on the sea, his

"Argosies with portly sails,  
Like signiors and rich burghers of the flood,

Do overpeer the petty traffickers."

But what about the harbor? Is there a sufficient channel for such deeply laden vessels? He says to himself: "I cannot be sure of that! I fear that ample provision has not been made for the approach of my argosies."

"I should not see the sandy hour-glass run,  
But I should think of shallows and of flats  
And see my wealthy Andrew docked in sand,  
Vailing her high-top lower than her ribs  
To kiss her burial."

And, if his ships should find a sufficient channel, still he is disquieted lest there should be no market for the precious wares they bring.

Years go by, and the man finds that many of his fears were groundless. The world is much richer than he had supposed. There is appreciation for the best that any man can do; there is ample scope for all his powers. He is conscious of limitations, but he has discovered that these limitations are not so arbitrary as he had imagined. They do not lie primarily in the circumstances that surround him. He is self-limited. He suffers not so much from lack of opportunity as from lack of vision to see the opportunity, lack of ability to quickly and firmly grasp it. A thousand opportunities have come and gone, finding him unprepared. It does not really explain anything to say that there were obstacles in the path. Of course there were obstacles. But obstacles are meant to be overcome, and can be overcome by sufficient power. Failure is but another name for weakness. If one were strong enough and wise enough, he could not be imprisoned by what seems adamant necessity,

"For it is in Zodiacs writ,  
Adamant is soft to wit."

The mature man learns that it is useless for him to lay the blame for his shortcomings on the outward world with its circumstances and its accidents,—the world that confronts him, challenges him, threatens him, and which yet is ever ready to reward him if he proves to be strong. For this world is always waiting for its master, and yields to the energy of the soul. The man ceases to be a critic of the world, and becomes a critic of himself. He says: "If I were wiser, quicker of wit, more steadfast in purpose, the obstacles which now seem insuperable would not hinder me. I am limited by my own weakness and ignorance. I am like a creature in a trap, that goes round and round, while all the time there is a way out, only it does not see it."

Shakespeare, thinking of the distance between himself and his heart's desire, writes:—

"If the dull substance of my flesh were thought,  
Injurious distance should not stop my way;  
For then despite of space I would be brought,  
From limits far remote where thou dost stay.

But, ah, thought kills me that I am not thought."

He did not say, "Ah, woe is me that such injurious distance keeps me from the thing I most desire!" He saw that



the distance was nothing, the obstacles were nothing in themselves. He recognized the limitations of his own nature.

Now that is the way for us to think of our failures. There are, indeed, some limitations that we must frankly recognize, as those of outward circumstance. It is not possible for every one to gain the world's applause, its glittering rewards of wealth and station. Time and chance may happen to us all. But, when we come to ask the more important question, Is any man foreordained by circumstances to be the victim of the world? is he foreordained to be a failure? is it determined by outward circumstances that he shall not stand erect, that he shall not have joy, have some measure of contentment, some vision of the Eternal? then we have to answer that our limitations must be sought in ourselves, and not in the conditions of our life. What we complain of as lack of opportunity is in reality the lack of sufficient power.

We talk of the unknowable, the impossible, the impracticable. These are only relative terms. We have no right to say that any reality is in its nature unknowable. It would be intelligible to a sufficiently large and clear intelligence. It is folly to say that we must never attempt the impossible. We cannot tell what is impossible till we try.

Just here we find the great danger of mature life. Teachers of religion have usually spoken of youth as the most critical period in the spiritual life. I think that there is a period in middle age that is equally perilous. It is the time when a man is tempted to give up making experiments and taking chances. It is as if his own past stupefied him. He begins to live in habits and by formulas rather than through direct contact with living realities. His very virtue insensibly takes a somewhat reminiscent tone. The call to duty does not come as the sound of a trumpet, awakening an instant response. It seems but an echo of sounds he has heard many times, and which have led to nothing. It seems as if the very channels of his intelligence were clogged by the accumulations of past experience. The man does not see the thing that is immediately before him, but sees some old thing that looks like it. He gives his judgment, not from direct insight, but from habit.

The other day I read in a newspaper an article in which the writer, in urging the need of a new appointment to a post of great responsibility, was made to say, "What is needed is a man of great inexperience." It may have been only a printer's error, but it contained a real suggestion. When any forward movement is to be made, better inexperience than the experience which only makes a man timid, which

disheartens him so that, remembering an old failure, he fails to put forth his full strength in a new endeavor.

It is when we almost reach this point that we need to be recalled by some strong voice which bids us cleanse our intellects and our consciences of their dead works. No matter how good these works may have been, how necessary in their time, away with them! The question is what is good and necessary at this time? There are circumstances under which a good habit is more dangerous than a bad habit, because the real demand is that we shall fit our action to the immediate circumstance. We fail to see our duty because our minds are occupied with irrelevant moralizing.

When you look back and think of the days that were lost, that were failures, how often you find that the reason of our failure was a certain preoccupation of mind! There was a day given to you for recreation, for refreshment, for the joy of life. But on your holiday you carried with you the cares of yesterday, its strenuous will, its petty anxieties; and your day passed away, and left you unrefreshed. The opportunity had come: you passed it by unheeding, busied and perplexed by your own dead works.

And in your friendships, in your work for others, in your place in the community, how often you have had that same experience! Yesterday you did a generous deed, which came out of a full heart. You relieved a friend's need, and you gained the reward that came from it. To-day, remembering that satisfaction, you are ready to repeat it; but no friend comes to-day in distress, there is no one whose worthy poverty appeals to you. Instead of that there comes another kind of man, harsh, ill-kempt, a man of insistent speech, not a friendly person at all. He comes, not with a plea, but with a demand. He asks, not mercy, but justice. He asks it of you, of the society of which you are a part. You are not prepared for that man. Your good deeds do not go in that direction. You want to do what is merciful, what is generous; and this man comes to you, and insists that you shall do what is just. You turn away, seeking for some object for your kindness to act upon, some one to soothe, to sympathize with. Afterward you look back, and you see that there was an opportunity that came to you, different on this day from the day that went before. From this you turned aside. Because you loved mercy, you refused to do justice.

We are to cleanse our conscience from our old good works because we are here not to preserve our consistency, not to preserve our self-satisfaction, not to preserve even an exist-

ing order: we are here to serve the living God. And it is just because He is the living God, and not a dead God, that each day brings its new task and its new demand. It may seem to the dull mind that there is a monotony of virtue demanded of us. To do justly, to love mercy, to walk humbly before God, to find joy and peace in the Holy Spirit,—are not these the same day after day? No: they involve each day a fresh adjustment of ourselves to our environment. It is easy for the dull mind and the dull conscience to repeat themselves. But when a man is repeating himself, when he is cherishing and preserving his old good works, he has lost sight of the living God and of that heaven that is

“Built of furtherance and pursuing,  
Not of spent deeds, but of doing.”

To do justly to-day means, first of all, that you see clearly the facts of to-day, the circumstances of to-day, and, seeing clearly, adjust instantly your will to those facts, and not to an order that no longer exists.

We have come together as representatives of free churches. We have considered plans for the enlargement of the work which we have at heart. We have listened to words of wisdom and of inspiration. But, as we separate, let us remember that no plan which the wisdom of man can devise can be successful if adopted blindly and carried out with unintelligent literalness. Its success depends on those modifications and adaptations to particular circumstances which can only be made by persons whose minds are alive and alert. The power of moral and spiritual truth depends on its timeliness. No formula, however excellent, can sum up the amazing variety of truth. No work that ever man did is to be slavishly repeated.

We discuss the proper work of the church, its emphasis and its method. This is helpful so long as we remember that, at the best, we can only make suggestions, which are applicable to special circumstances. We cannot bind our actions by hard-and-fast rules of procedure. Should our preaching be controversial or constructive? Should its tone be radical or conservative? Should we lay stress on the emotional or on the intellectual aspects of religion?

The fact is that there are no formal and final answers to such questions. It is like asking whether a healthy man should rest or work, eat or sleep. He should do each in turn. The Hebrew prophet felt that he was commissioned “to root out, and to pull down and to destroy, and to throw down, to build and to plant.”

Much has been said in our meetings about the need of more constructive and positive preaching and work. This is wise and wholesome advice. But living men, facing the living world, will not bind themselves always to preserve one attitude and to follow one method. Our work is as manifold as that of the prophet. If we see some public evil that should be pulled down, let us pull it down. If we see some superstition that should be destroyed, let us try to destroy it. That is our business. Let us not be afraid to be called iconoclasts. Because we are, on occasion, called to do the work of iconoclasts, we are not the less true worshippers. The very essence of liberal religion is in the discriminations that it makes. It is not enough that we should cultivate a reverential spirit. We should reverence only that which deserves our reverence. But we cannot face the real world without realizing the demands for constructive work. If we see something that ought to be built up, then, as servants of the living God, let us arise and build. Each day brings its own opportunity and its peculiar demand.

We sometimes hear it said that the period for criticism is passed, and we must give ourselves exclusively to the work of nurturing a more fervent faith. But how can faith be kept pure and reasonable except through perpetual criticism? Superstition comes in the moment the vigilance of the intellect is relaxed. We read that, when a young man came to Jesus, "He looked upon him, and loved him, and said, Yet one thing thou lackest." There was love and criticism in the same mind. Jesus saw something to love, and the same quick glance discerned what was lacking. It is just such perception that we need to keep religion from falling into a weak and credulous pietism.

And, above all things, we must remember that the needs of those to whom we minister, and not the beautiful consistency of our own theories, must be the first consideration. I have sometimes heard ministers discuss gloomily the question, "Why we do not reach the Masses." Usually, the trouble with such a question is that it does not seem altogether disinterested. The impression is made that those who take part in the discussion are more interested in the welfare of the church than of the people. It is as if a company of physicians, instead of considering the proper treatment of disease, should debate the question, "Why do we not have more Patients?"

Our real purpose is not to induce people to support the church. It is to use the church for the benefit of the people. The minister of religion conceives of his work as being akin

to that of the physician. It is an answer to human need. Here are people sick at heart, discouraged, perplexed. How may they be strengthened, uplifted, directed into the right way? And just as various as are the needs must be the remedies.

To one especial need must our liberal church minister. It must seek and save those who have lost the joy of life and the strength of confidence, through intellectual doubt. To minister to such minds, one must be free from prejudice, open to the perception of new phases of truth. Matthew Arnold describes those who are "wandering between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born."

What message have we to give to such minds? It is not that we have a new system as complete as the old one which they have thrown aside. It is not that they must turn from one formula to another. We are here to make them realize that that which they called the world and which they lament as dead was never a real world. It was a picture men made of the world. Its formal completeness, which once satisfied them, was but an evidence of its real imperfection. It was not a true likeness.

The picture fades; but we are here. What shall we do? Wait disconsolately till another picture comes answering to all our preconceptions? Shall we wait for a new world to be born worthy of our powers? Rather let us say: Away with our preconceptions! We will open our eyes to reality. The real world is already here. We may not understand it as thoroughly as we thought we understood the old picture. It is vast, strange, perplexing; but it is God's world, and we are in it to serve him. To serve him truly, we must forget ourselves, and follow on.

"Silent rushes the swift Lord  
Through ruined systems still restored."

We must cleanse our minds from everything which obscures the light of the present day. Thus only may we see truth. We must cleanse our consciences from all that keeps us from instant recognition of this day's duty. Thus only may we learn the meaning of righteousness.

## THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE.

The National Alliance held its biennial meeting in the Unitarian church, Washington, D.C., on the afternoon of Oct. 17, 1899. The audience was a large and interested one, including one hundred and thirty-two delegates. The chief addresses were given by Kate Gannett Wells, on "What Unitarian Women of the Nineteenth Century bequeath to the Women of the Twentieth Century," and Isabel M. Chapman, on "The Power of Organization." The corresponding secretary also made a stirring and forcible address, giving in detail the work of the Branches since the last biennial meeting. There are at present 242 Branches, with 10,182 members. The following table shows the growth of the Alliance:—

### SUMMARY SINCE ORGANIZATION, OCT. 20, 1890.

<i>Year.</i>	<i>Number of Branches.</i>	<i>Number of Members.</i>	<i>Money raised by Branches.</i>	<i>Expenses of Executive Board.</i>
1891 . . . . .	90	3,877	\$15,551.02	\$664.81
1892 . . . . .	105	5,232	28,287.65	1,309.71
1893 . . . . .	132	5,982	32,456.48	1,699.75
1894 . . . . .	138	6,612	34,632.87	1,762.48
1895 . . . . .	164	7,727	40,401.11	1,798.71
1896 . . . . .	185	8,455	45,608.64	2,096.98
1897 . . . . .	218	9,145	46,920.27	2,083.76
1898 . . . . .	231	10,159	52,789.77	2,024.53
1899 . . . . .	242	10,212	53,391.04	2,450.03
			<u>\$350,037.85</u>	<u>\$15,890.76</u>

The "Number of Branches" and "Expenses of Executive Board" are correct, the "Number of Members" and "Money Raised" somewhat underestimated.

A most interesting feature of the meeting was the presence of Rev. J. G. Dukes, of Burgaw, N.C., one of the two Southern missionaries employed by the Alliance. Mr. Dukes made a strong impression, not only upon his audience, but also on the people with whom he came in contact in Washington. His simple but enthusiastic statement of the work he is trying to do, the long journeys he takes, the people he reaches, and the great hope he feels in the

success of his efforts, made his story a most telling one; and those who heard it will not soon forget it.

On October 19 the officers of the Alliance held an informal reception, in the parlors of the Arlington Hotel, from four till seven o'clock. This reception has become a regular part of the National Conference, and in a place like Washington, where the delegates are widely scattered except at the meetings, affords the only opportunity for coming together socially or for the meeting of friends.

The following are the newly elected officers:—

Mrs. B. Ward Dix, president, 608 Carlton Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Miss Flora L. Close, treasurer, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Emily A. Fifield, recording secretary, 4 Ashland Street, Dorchester, Mass.; Mrs. Robert H. Davis, corresponding secretary, 5 East Forty-first Street, New York.

Vice-presidents: New England, Kate Gannett Wells, 45 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass.; Middle States, Mary Louise Catlin, 48 First Place, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Southern States, Antoinette Danforth Smith, 509 W. Ormsby Avenue, Louisville, Ky.; Central States, Fanny Field, Avondale, Cincinnati, Ohio; Middle West, Mary W. McKittrick, 2913 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.; Rocky Mountains, Rebecca P. Utter, 1600 Lincoln Avenue, Denver, Col.; Pacific Coast, Lucy M. Stebbins, 1609 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Cal.

Directors: Maine, Sarah Fairfield Hamilton, Saco, Me. New Hampshire, Mary A. Downing, 74 South Main Street, Concord, N.H.; Massachusetts, Elizabeth P. Channing, Milton, Mass.; Sarah E. Hooper, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.; Sarah C. F. Wellington, 871 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Mass.; Abby A. Peterson, 305 Chestnut Avenue, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Lillian M. Cressey, Northampton, Mass.; Phœbe M. Waldo, 98 Washington Square, Salem, Mass.; Caroline I. Chaney, Leominster, Mass.; Abbie L. Stone, 185 Vernon Street, Worcester, Mass.; Ella P. Judkins, 128 Third Street, Lowell, Mass.; Elizabeth B. Lombard, Plymouth, Mass.; Sarah B. Williams, 43 Ingell Street, Taunton, Mass.; Rhode Island, Mary E. Cleveland, 48 Benefit Street, Providence, R.I.; New York, Minnie H. Bishoprick, 431 Washington Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Mary Seward Merrill, 504 Onondaga Street, Syracuse, N.Y.; Canada, S. Margaret Loud, 84 Crescent Street, Montreal; New Jersey, Elizabeth N. Bell, Rutherford, N.J.; Pennsylvania, Elizabeth J. May, 2033 Sanson Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Ohio, Kate Lindsay, 418 Dunham Avenue, Cleveland.

Ohio; Illinois, Ellen F. Marshall, 1882 West 22d Street, Chicago, Ill.; Missouri, Belle M. Page, 928 Holmes Street, Kansas City, Mo.; Michigan, Ida A. Marks, 57 Sibley Street, Detroit, Mich.; Wisconsin, Mary G. Upham, 146 Martin Street, Milwaukee, Wis.; California, Elizabeth B. Easton, 903 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Cal.; Carolyn Wattles, 2235 Dana Street, Berkeley, Cal.

## BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTORS.

BY EMILY A. FIFIELD.

Impossible as it seems, the time has once more arrived when with satisfaction and pleasure the Executive Board makes its biennial report to the National Alliance. During the stirring events of the last two years its work has been uninterrupted and progressive, with no startling changes and, it is believed, with no backward steps.

The growth of the Alliance has increased the Executive Board to 39 members, Wisconsin and Canada having become entitled to representation. It has been necessary to create a new section, called the Central States section, under the care of an additional vice-president, making seven in all.

By the death of Mrs. Anne B. Richardson in January, 1899, Massachusetts lost one of its ablest directors, the first member of the Executive Board to die in office. Mrs. Richardson was one of the earliest promoters of the Alliance, and only a long period of waning health reconciled her friends to a loss which has not yet been made good in the organization.

The meetings of the board have been held regularly on the second Friday in each month at 25 Beacon Street, Boston. The attendance averages fourteen or fifteen. Five of the vice-presidents and nineteen of the directors have been able to attend some one meeting, and some members of the standing committees are always present.

The matters for consideration have been many and important, and the need of careful discussion and decision has become so great that the monthly meeting has frequently been an all-day meeting with two sessions.

It has been said that a national organization would find great difficulty in inviting members so far distant from each other as the limits of our country, and still greater difficulty



in having responsible officers scattered far and wide; but having united the women of a church, and then the women of a Conference and State, there should be little difficulty in bringing into fellowship the Unitarian women of the whole country. Surely, no society ever had a more loyal and harmonious board of officers than ours.

The ideal placed before us in the early days has not yet been reached, and there is not yet a branch in each individual church; but the Alliance is making its spirit and purpose felt among liberal thinkers everywhere, and proving its power to strengthen the Church and to bring all workers together for the common good.

To inspire and guide this spirit and purpose is the business of the Executive Board. It has no authority and no power of control over the Branches, and can only advise and suggest, aiming to bring about unity of thought and action. Each Branch develops according to its own ideas, has its own by-laws and its own internal regulations.

It is held to the national organization by the slender thread of an annual fee, and by the stronger cord of sympathy and fellowship which leads each to work for interests common to all.

The Alliance preserves by its admirable methods the privileges of local self-government, and the general supervision and guidance which alone can insure a consistent policy on matters of importance.

To carry out these methods, it is necessary that full information of all affairs considered by the Executive Board should be given to the Branches, and equally necessary that each Branch should keep in close communication with its director and, through her, with the whole board.

The request for a monthly report or statement from each Branch has seemed vital to the success of this system, as directors should keep closely informed of the circumstances, the purposes, the needs, the wishes, of the Branches, and be able to give information, to unify plans, to guide missionary work, and to direct all efforts into the best channels.

As a great help in this direction, during the last year the Alliance has issued each month a printed bulletin for the use of the Branches. This bulletin appears in the publication called *Word and Work*, which is printed under the joint care of the American Unitarian Association, the National Alliance, and the Young People's Religious Union, the secretary of each organization being responsible for the material supplied. *Word and Work* should be not only a great convenience, but tend to make the work of each

organization much better known, and has been productive of most harmonious relations. It should be a link between the societies, bringing all workers in the denomination into connection with one another for the common good. For the Alliance it is the direct medium of communication between the executive and the Branches, and through it every Branch may know just what is being done by every other one all over the land. This monthly publication contains such full details and is so widely distributed that a change in the Manual has been experimentally made, converting it from a volume of reports into a convenient directory of available information.

The Alliance has now established headquarters in the Unitarian Building, Boston, Room No. 6 having been assigned to its use by the Association. A clerk in attendance every morning is prepared to answer questions, give information, distribute the literature of the Alliance, and look after the "Paper Exchange," another undertaking of this year. Many able and valuable essays are read before the Branches from time to time by individual members, and the Alliance has arranged to keep at headquarters type-written copies of such of these as the writers are willing to lend or exchange with others. This has early proved useful, especially to small and newly formed Branches and when speakers have disappointed a meeting. As this becomes more fully known, its value will be increasingly appreciated.

Through its Study Class Committee the Alliance has this year issued its fifth Study Class Leaflet. This contains four programmes for Alliance classes, and has been most carefully prepared. The subjects vary sufficiently to suit all minds, and a list of suggested readings gives much additional scope to the use of the leaflet. The five leaflets now available are most valuable aids to the study desirable in every Alliance Branch.

The Post-office Mission and the Cheerful Letter Exchange continue to be active agencies of the Alliance. Each committee reports to the board, and is under its general guidance and direction. There is no limit to the work that may be done in either of these ways, and each Branch should undertake one or both. The beautiful little *Cheerful Letter* should be well known to every Alliance member.

In its missionary work the Alliance has continued the policy outlined in the last report. A special committee receives all appeals from churches and societies, and, after careful investigation, with discriminating judgment makes recommendations to the board. The board again considers

the recommendations, and presents such as are approved to the Branches. Eighteen such appeals have been sent out during the last two years. You will hear from the corresponding secretary that many other appeals have been made and the generosity of the Branches has been shared by a multitude of other objects; for in money-giving, as in other matters, the "independence of the Branches" is strictly maintained. It is, however, still the wish of the board that, in the distribution of Alliance money, denominational needs should have precedence over any educational or philanthropic undertaking whatever.

The special missionary efforts of the Alliance continue to be directed to the support of Mr. Gibson in Florida and Mr. Dukes in North Carolina. The work done by them is still pioneer circuit preaching, each visiting certain places regularly, meeting groups of people in halls, school-houses, and even in groves. The assurance has seemed positive and reliable that much good is being done; and the board, believing in such broadcast sowing of the seed, and knowing the great need in small and remote places, would gladly urge the Branches to do more along these lines.

The little society at Green Harbor, Mass., with its chapel and parsonage, has fallen entirely into the hands of the Alliance. Aside from what the people themselves can give, the support of a minister there must be supplied by the Alliance Branches. The Alliance considers this missionary post a sacred trust, and will not without effort see it abandoned.

The expenses of our student at Meadville Theological School have been paid as formerly. The present recipient is an Iclander; and he will, when graduated, work among his people at Winnipeg.

Besides attending the monthly meetings, the vice-presidents and directors visit the Branches assigned to them from time to time; and wherever it is practicable the directors hold meetings, at which the Branch officers or delegates from the Branches can bring forward the questions that seem most pressing and most vital, and can consult together as to the best way of answering them.

Under the care of the vice-presidents the Associate Alliance Branches also hold periodical meetings, of great value in bringing together members in the different sections, and giving opportunity for listening to addresses and for social intercourse not otherwise to be gained.

Each year, as usual, a public meeting has been held in Boston during the time-honored Anniversary Week, this,

too, affording opportunity for many who do not visit Boston at any other time to learn of the Alliance and take this in connection with other denominational meetings.

In the last report the corresponding secretary gave an account of various missionary tours she had made and Branches visited by direction of the Executive Board. So effective and valuable were these trips considered, and so frequent were the requests from unvisited places, that in the winter of 1897-98 she was again sent out to continue the good work. Her own report gives the details and the results.

The president, too, has made a seven weeks' journey, attending the sessions of the Southern Conference, the Michigan State Conference, and visiting many places on the way. Nearer home many Branch meetings have been gladdened by her presence, the strenuous cheerfulness and courage of our first officer always adding very much to the honor and pleasure of receiving the president.

These dry details will show that the special duty of the Executive Board is to strengthen and conserve the whole body by maintaining close relations with the individual Branches composing it, by extending far and wide a knowledge of Alliance principles and methods, and by forming new Branches as fast as possible, by helping everywhere those who are trying to make known and keep alive our faith, and through every means in its power carrying that faith to individuals and letting it do its own work.

The Executive Board is forced to recognize that there are many problems before it which cannot be easily solved. It was a long step in advance when the Alliance convinced so many women in the churches that it was wise and helpful to add the *religious* work to that done by the old sewing circle, and that the church would be stronger and better if the spiritual as well as the material needs were cared for. So far from working an injury, the growing fellowship of a national organization has broadened the social life of every Ladies' Aid that has joined it; and in the charitable work the inevitable result has been a clearer understanding of needs, a simplification of methods, and a closer sympathy in action.

How shall we take a longer step and bring *all* women of the denomination into this closer fellowship, into this knowledge which will "quicken the religious life of our churches," help them to adapt their methods to modern conditions and better meet the needs of the communities in which they stand?

How shall our visions be translated into realities?

A report must necessarily be a backward look, but our face should be set forward toward an ever nobler, grander future. With a deep sense of responsibility and with the consciousness that we must leave unsolved some of the problems which seem most vital, we still foresee a wider field for usefulness. With renewed patience and a deeper faith, we start on another two years' work.

The future growth of the Alliance depends upon faithfulness to its ideal. All that has been achieved means opportunity for finer, better work, for more patient effort and more skilful adaptation of means to ends. Every member must be ready for more work, for new undertakings and larger responsibilities. More than this, each must believe, in her own heart, in the spirit of service and self-sacrifice which alone can make the Alliance work effectual.

It is true that many of the details are tiresome, that sometimes it requires an effort to attend the meetings, that it is hard to write reports and read papers; but no one has ever questioned the good already done or that it was well worth while to do it. The sacrifice of time and money required of each member is small; but each "lending hand" must have something more than time and money in it. It must have a firm grasp on the principles of our liberal faith and belief in the Alliance as an instrumentality for their dissemination. A body of women in each church, filled with the right spirit, could give Unitarianism the power it is said to be losing. Because religion has to do with life, the Alliance can take hold of all the great problems of the day,—the social problems, the educational problems, and the moral problems, as well as the religious problems,—and, considering them in the light of the faith it professes, may so fill its members with high purpose and sympathetic earnestness as to prove untrue the statement that "stagnation has come in the Unitarian body."

With such prospects in view, it is safe to congratulate the Alliance on its past history, on its splendid equipment, and on its glorious opportunity.

## UNITARIAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

---

The meeting under the auspices of the Unitarian Temperance Society was held on Tuesday afternoon in the First Congregational Church. Rev. Charles F. Dole, president of the society, presided, and in opening the meeting spoke as follows :—

Why should we have a meeting of the Temperance Society in this crowded week? I think it would be rather unfortunate if we Unitarians were to gather for a conference of three or four days once in two years, and should not say anything about this tremendous subject that has brought us here to-day. People would naturally ask, Don't you care, or haven't you any convictions about it? It would be rather a pity if no answer were made to that question. All over the country multitudes of earnest people are asking, whenever they hear of the Unitarian faith, To what does it lead? It has certain deep religious principles; but how do those principles work out in conduct? How do they work with respect to just such questions as this of temperance? We here believe that our Unitarian religious convictions work out in a very definite way. They work in an earnest desire and attempt to do something to abate the enormous evils of the drink traffic. Whatever method we may take toward that abatement, however we may differ as to means, we are prepared to show that our convictions require us to do all that we can to abate the evils of intemperance.

Our society has been organized that we may be able to say to those who ask what we think of the drink question, Here are pamphlets and tracts embodying the views and convictions of Unitarians regarding this problem. And, that we may farther compare our views, we come together here.

## THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT ABROAD.

ABSTRACT OF ADDRESS BY DR. CHARLES H. SHEPARD.

The results of alcoholism are so deadly and so universal as to make the fact patent to every one that inebriety is one of the great curses of the world. A fruitful source of the trouble is excessive alimentation, and what are generally called stimulants are sought to quiet the irritation that follows as a natural consequence; but the great mass of intemperance arises from the unfortunates who are thrown out of employment, those who are going down hill financially, and have no secure future in the mad rush of competition. An eminent English authority, after over thirty years of investigation of individual cases, found that 86 per cent. of drunkenness was directly traceable to financial depression caused by the present methods of competition. It seems as though mankind were bound to have some nepenthe for their sufferings, and in narcotics they find an expensive surcease for the time being.

Nothing will so speedily subdue nervous excitement as the ever convenient and alluring alcohol. It is sought to give insensibility to nerve agony, and secures for a time rest and repose; but the wear and tear of this oft-repeated nerve strain are frequently shown in paralysis and insanity. Perhaps the most serious effect of alcohol is its direct tendency to interfere with nutrition, and, by promoting growth of cellular tissue, to compromise the integrity of the brain tissue. The irresistible impulse of our modern civilization, from infancy to old age, is push; and the mental and physical powers alike suffer in the long run. Instead thereof the people should be taught to give more time to rest and recuperation, and less to stimulation.

Pathology tells us that the brain and nervous system of persons who have used spirits is changed, shrunk, and disorganized. Also other organs, such as the liver, kidneys, and heart, are so seriously damaged in structure as to very imperfectly perform their work. In many cases these injuries are so marked that there can be no doubt of the drinking history of the person, although no other facts are known.

It is a fact of unusual interest that alcohol affects the brain cells and nerve tissue first of all, and more especially than

any other part of the body. In a number of instances, where persons intoxicated have been killed and the brain examined soon after, there was revealed an intense congestion of the membranes and serum infiltration.

Recently a number of observers have been engaged in the study of the effects of alcohol on the senses and general brain activities. The results have given a clearer understanding of the whole problem. It is found that in each instance the power of the senses diminishes. The range of vision quickly decreases, and the ability to distinguish colors is obscured. A noted astronomer gave up all use of wine, simply because it blurred his senses, and after using wine or spirits his work contained errors. Painters and photographers find from experience that all forms of spirits, even in moderation, disturb their color sense.

The hearing is likewise lessened. Sounds of a certain pitch cannot be distinguished, and below a certain key they are confused.

The sense of touch is equally obscured. The sensations of surfaces are often diminished at least one-third from normal. The loss of power to distinguish heat and cold is pronounced in the experience of men exposed in a cold climate, where spirits taken give a sense of warmth at first, followed after a time by extreme coldness.

The same is noted in the abnormalities of spirit drinkers in matters of taste and smell. At no time in these examinations did the senses become more acute, but always diminished from the first use of spirits. Thus in all the five senses a marked paralysis or slowing up and diminished acuteness followed the use of small doses of alcohol.

Farther experiments of the power of the muscles were made, showing that no feat can be performed on the supposed strength of spirits. Muscular power and endurance are always seriously diminished by the use of alcohol, while the delusion is always present of greater ability than ever. In cases of poisoning from spirits the lessened temperature of the body is often a marked symptom.

These experiments and measurements have been extended to the operations and functions of the brain, and are going on in several laboratories in this country and Europe.

Another series of experiments show that alcohol also impairs rapidity of thought and promptness of mental reaction, or responses to impressions, and also show, without exception, that the action of alcohol is that of a depressant anæsthetic, or paralyzant.

The normal man who, after taking two ounces of spirits,



shows diminished sensorial activities and lowered brain power, with appreciable lessened force, is at the beginning of the line, at the other end of which are stupor and profound intoxication.

Says Dr. T. D. Crothers, of Hartford, Conn.: "The effect of spirits in all cases is that of depression and narcotism. The supposed stimulation is irritation, not increased strength and vigor. The relief from pain, discomfort, and fatigue which follows its use is narcotism. The sensory centres are lowered in activity and partly paralyzed, and do not register the danger-pain and fatigue-symptoms."

The brain, when healthy, is so soft as not to retain its shape but for the membranes and skull, and for its dissection and study the student places it in alcohol for a time to harden. But with the drunkard's brain this process has largely taken place in life, and his brain can be detected in the dissecting-room. It is pickled in alcohol, so to speak. Such a brain cannot perform its functions properly, as we are all too well aware.

Owing to the greater delicacy of the organization of women, they are affected more seriously by alcohol than men. In Normandy, France, the women drink more than the men; and the mortality among the children is excessive in consequence. The drink habit may be transmitted; and the child of the steady drinker, whether boy or girl, who has never tasted alcohol, may be a dipsomaniac, for heredity is a vital factor with every individual. It is a fortunate thing for the world that women, as a class, are temperate, else would the race degenerate.

Nature's great law of the survival of the fittest is forever operative; and, other things being equal, the best man wins. The man with a tobacco heart or cigarette brain and alcohol-weakened intellect and will is not on an equal footing with the man who has none of those infirmities. Good physiology means good health, good morals, good mind, and leads to success. Bad physiology means disease, sin, suffering, leading to failure.

While public opinion in Europe is much behind America along the line of the temperance movement, a large number of earnest workers, as well as a number of eminent scientists, have given extensive and exhaustive research to certain phases of the question; and at the same time most commendable measures have been taken to enlighten the public by gatherings and discussions. It was the speaker's privilege to attend, as one of the delegates of the American Medical Temperance Association, the Seventh International Con-

gress on the Abuse of Alcohol, which was held in Paris during last Easter week.

This congress was the largest and most successful of the European gatherings held on this subject, and indicates that the people are waking up to a more serious study of alcoholism. The total registration was between eleven and twelve hundred, representing twenty-one countries and colonies.

The first general session was presided over by the minister of public instruction from Belgium. The president of the congress, Dr. Legrain of Paris, was ably assisted by many of the prominent men of France and other countries. The title of the congress was significant. It was against "the Abuse of Alcohol," and yet it was remarkable that such a large number of prominent Europeans should gather in the interest of this cause. A notable incident was when the official representative of the government of Roumania, in a ringing speech, moved that the name be changed to "'against' the Use of Alcoholics." This was promptly carried, when put to vote.

The opinion is very prevalent in our country that the drinking of wine and beer in France and on the Continent is commendable, and that intoxication is rare. This is shown to be a great mistake from the fact that France is the most drunken country in the world. Already some of her wisest men have sounded the note of alarm, and the attention of the government has been called to the subject.

During the sessions of this congress a remarkable article was published in the *Figaro*, the concluding sentence of which was as follows: "It would be well for every Frenchman to rise every morning with the thought that he belongs to the race that consumes the most alcohol." The following startling lines were prominently displayed:—

"Alcohol is death to the race. Alcohol will kill the European as it killed the Indians of the Western Continent. Alcohol means disease, means tuberculosis, means decay, sterility, impotence. Alcohol is another word for wickedness, cruelty, vice, and insanity. Alcohol means misery, downfall of nations; and the best way to prove patriotism, and to be useful to one's country, is to fight against alcoholism."

France heads the list with a yearly consumption of 14.19 litres for each person; while Canada is placed at the bottom of the list, with 2.50 litres to each person. Statistics show that in France and Belgium the consumption of alcohol increases, while in other countries it diminishes.

Germany, as well as other grape-growing countries, is

becoming seriously affected by the excessive use of spirits. This was demonstrated by the large gathering of government officials and representatives of many sections for the amelioration of the condition of the people, as well as a large number of medical men and clergymen, to protest against the use of alcohol as a beverage. One hundred and fifty papers and addresses were offered during the four days' session; and a free discussion of the many phases of the alcohol question was permitted, particular attention being given to the danger of alcohol as a beverage, as well as to the danger of moderate drinking. Catholic and Protestant clergymen vied with each other in calling attention to this danger, and emphasized it with much vehemence. A few eminent physicians followed with reasons and statistical facts sustaining the clergymen, and some lawyers and jurists were not behind in giving their evidence. These were received with great enthusiasm by the audience, composed as it was of reformers and representatives of different orders of temperance societies.

Among the delegates to the congress were a large number of women, who carried off the palm for earnestness and eloquence. Mme. Selmar, the delegate from Denmark, electrified the audience by the most eloquent and finished address of the congress, on the work of women and the church in temperance reform.

No special policy or line of work was adopted by the congress, but among the points insisted upon by the papers was that of teaching the truth to children, the improvement of homes, and the increase of personal vigor, health, and longevity, the diminution of sickness, crime, and pauperism, and the self-evident proposition that total abstinence is not dangerous, nor the withdrawal of spirits in any way hurtful. It was, indeed, a revelation to Continental Europe to see a thousand men and women of all grades of society gravely discussing a question which was supposed to be confined to a few radical reformers.

ABSTRACT OF ADDRESS BY REV. WILLIAM  
G. ELIOT, JR.

There is urgent need of better information concerning this problem, and a deeper insight into its exigencies. One night, as I was passing along a street in Seattle, I overtook a man who was evidently drunk. He asked me where a certain street was. I tried to direct him, and asked where he was going. He said that he was going home. I then said to him, "When you fellows are drinking, why don't you quit before you get into such a fix?" His reply was, "Oh, hell! you fellows don't know anything about it." That struck home, and intensified my conviction that a mere knowledge of general facts and statistics is entirely one-sided without some insight into the personal and individual phases of the problem.

In recent years we have been passing through a transition. What man interested in this problem has not found himself called upon to modify his opinions and change his convictions in the light of new information and new experience? I have known prohibitionists who, in the light of experience, have ceased to be prohibitionists; while I have known others who were opposed to that method who have become prohibitionists from the results of experience. The same is true of those who have been total abstainers. This is to me conclusive proof that differing views should be treated with fairness, sobriety, and sympathy.

We must not only study the best methods and the personal phases of the question and acquire convictions of our own, but we must have the courage of those convictions, and study how to persuade men of our conclusions. There is no view of the temperance question, held by reasonable men, which cannot be offered to people without offence and without loss of respect for you on the part of other reasonable men. I have seen the extremest views presented and received with respect, because of the fairness, the simplicity, the sympathy, and the courage with which they were put forth.

If our society could every year issue a bulletin summarizing the best and fairest information on this subject, it would be a good thing.

## TEMPERANCE WORK IN ILLINOIS.

BY REV. JASPER L. DOUTHIT.

I have been very kindly invited to come here from my far-away home and give some brief account of my practical experience of the drink evil in the section where I have lived and labored most of my life. Of course, this must be a personal experience and personal testimony that is more or less embarrassing to give. And yet I realize that it is largely by relating to each other our personal experience in trying to help needy humanity that we are quickened to co-operate in needed reform.

How difficult — next to impossible — for one to put himself in another's place! And yet it is the only way to know how to obey the Golden Rule of Christ, that must bring the Golden Age of man. It is the way to bring us into vital, personal sympathy with the most needy and tempted; and without such sympathy no reform ever was or ever will be accomplished.

A young lady of New York, who wrote for the *Philadelphia Ledger*, over forty years ago, pleading for radical measures against the drink evil, was accused by some friends of being a maniac on the subject. Whereupon she wrote:—

"Go feel what I have felt,  
Go bear what I have borne,  
Shrink 'neath the blows a loved one dealt,  
And feel the cold world's scorn;  
A sufferer from year to year,  
The sole relief a scalding tear.

"Go weep as I have wept  
O'er a loved father's fall,  
See every promised blessing swept,  
Youth's sweetness turned to gall;  
Life's fading flowers strewn all the way  
That brought me up to woman's day.

"Go hear and feel and see and know  
All that my soul hath felt and known.  
Then . . . . .

"Tell me I hate the bowl,—  
Hate's but a feeble word.  
I loathe, abhor, my very soul  
With strong disgust is stirred,  
Whene'er I see or hear or tell  
Of that dark beverage of hell."

Those verses were pasted on the first page of one of my first scrap-books, forty years ago. You would know why I pasted them there if I might tell you my early experience with the liquor demon. My friends, if you knew the inside of a true story that I might tell, but which I have never told publicly; if you knew the thorny path that I, as a bare-foot boy, trod; if you knew the agony of soul which I suffered, the flood of grief through which I must wade for most of my life,—I am sure you would not blame me for being radical—fanatical, if you please—against the drink habit and liquor traffic in all its forms.

I do not know how to account for the indifference and apathy, if not contempt, that some good people show toward the temperance reform, unless it be they have never had the serpent's sting come home to them.

Was not Gladstone right, when he declared the drink evil to be a greater curse to mankind than was pestilence and famine combined? I am sure all my life experience confirms that testimony. "What fools these mortals be," who kill themselves with liquor! Ah, yes! but they were not considered fools by any means at first,—not men of soft brains and feeble wills. They were men of strongest will, and, in many cases, bright genius, swayed by their power great multitudes of their fellows. They were men who seemed to know almost everything but their own downward course to ruin. They were not bad men, as a rule. They were among the best citizens but for drink,—noble, chivalrous, generous-hearted. Some of the most popular and most capable public servants but for drink. What a story the old court-house here where I was born and have lived and labored for a lifetime might tell! Nearly every one of the most popular officials for fifty years has gone down with drink. The State capital might tell the same story. The saddest story of all that I know is that of one of the noblest patriotic governors of that great State, a man beloved by his fellow-citizens, standing at last in shabby dress on the streets of the State capital and begging for money to buy him a drink in the licensed saloon! Many that I knew as a boy among the first families, the most wealthy and respected of my district, were swallowed up in this maelstrom, their great fortunes swept away. A terribly large proportion of those who sleep in graveyards near my home were victims, either directly or indirectly, of this ravenous monster. And I think this story of the woful harvest of drink may as truly apply to thousands of localities in this nation.

And yet they would have condemned drunkenness. It

was considered disgraceful to be a drunkard; but, to be a free man, you must drink or let it alone as you pleased, only you might be sociable and drive away care by getting hilarious on occasion. You can see, then, how young people would be lured into the drunkard's hell. When I saw good people and even ministers habitually indulge and only be more sociable and hilarious, I was inclined to do likewise; but when at last I saw some of those same persons beastly and riotously drunk, beating their wives and children, then I grew alarmed and my whole soul revolted. It is the example of respectable people and the charm of gilded saloons that decoy and catch the young unawares. At seventeen years of age my eyes were opened. Satan was unmasked to me, hoofs and horns. Then the necessity was laid upon me to cry aloud and spare not. I believed in the gospel with all my heart as God's power unto salvation. But, somehow, it was largely the victims of drink who were first drawn to join the little church organized in the old court-house. It was said of the congregation, "It can't live long: it has too much Bourbon whiskey aboard."

Several of the members went down, but with colors flying; for our church motto was, "Every time you fall, rise and try again." I had never taken the pledge up to the time the reform began in Shelbyville. Then I said, "Let us all, even habitual total abstainers, take the pledge for others' sake." So did every member of my congregation, old and young.

Then began what is known as the Blue Ribbon Crusade in that region. It started at the old court-house, with a dozen persons at the meeting. It spread like prairie fire in dry grass. For forty-two nights in succession we held meetings in the largest audience-room in the city, crowded to overflow, until nearly every man and woman in all that region wore a blue ribbon badge. But the battle was not won. The colors were all right, but the laws of the State were not up to them. Then began the law-protected war against snares and stumbling-blocks. I saw that many who had joined my church and donned the blue ribbon found the open saloons too much of a temptation for them. I discovered that, while I was spending days and nights in pulling men out of the stream of intemperance, others up stream — and some of them very respectable — were setting snares in their way, so that they were caught, and thrown again into the horrible flood. These words of Cardinal Manning came to me like a special message from Heaven: —

"It is mere mockery to ask us to put down drunkenness by moral and religious means, when the legislature facilitates

the multiplication of incitements to intemperance on every side. You might as well call upon me as the captain of a sinking ship, and say, 'Why don't you pump the water out?' when you are scuttling the ship in every direction."

Then I began my political warfare against the evil. I began striking at what I conceived to be the root of the deadly upas tree,—the legalized saloon. I took up the work through the little parish paper which I had started, and which I scattered by tens of thousands from a little hand-press at first. We welcomed people of all sects and parties, and made personal vital religion the one indispensable thing. There can be no reform without this. Finally, the old "Whiskey Jug Charter," as it was called,—the city constitution that had protected the sale of liquor by the gallon since the Indians left, despite the protest of a majority of the citizens,—that whiskey charter was abolished, the dram-shops were voted out, and my little paper, *Our Best Words*, which had become a weekly, with the largest circulation of any paper in the county, was published in the room on the public square in which one of the largest saloons had been kept.

It was heavenly for a few years. Then came sad reverses. Several of the most generous helpers of the paper and temperance reform had passed away. I was in a cross-fire, on the one side because of aggressive warfare against the liquor traffic, and on the other side because of my religious name. My living was cut down, and I was obliged to give up *Our Best Words* weekly, and also the monthly for a time. By trick of liquor politicians, combined with the apathy of respectable citizens who disliked to mix in dirty politics, open saloons came again for a while. Then a few friends rallied to help resurrect *Our Best Words* in a small way; and the battle began again, and was waged, till last spring a remarkable event occurred,—an event that never occurred before in Illinois to my knowledge. It was this: when by trick of liquor men the mayor-elect (who was a church member and against license) was about to be forced to grant license, it was suggested as a way out that the question should be submitted to an informal vote of "the people." Then an alderman moved that, as women were "people," all of them who were residents and of lawful age be permitted to vote. The motion carried. "The women won't be fools enough to vote," they said; but the women swarmed to the polls on election day, to the great surprise and disgust of saloon men, and voted out saloons by an overwhelming majority.



That election was the sensation of the day in the newspapers; and Shelbyville, by that women's ballot against saloons, became as a white city set upon a hill.

But the serpent was scotched, but not killed. It had been the custom to celebrate the Fourth of July with liquor drinking at near saloons. About ten years ago I came into the possession of some mineral springs in the wild, unfenced woods five miles from Shelbyville, and close to my birthplace. The drink demon had haunted that vicinity since I could remember, and occasionally held high carnival at those springs. But the spot had most tender associations for me, and I vowed by God's help that the ground should be made too pure to ever again tolerate in any form the demon which had caused so much distress and wrecked so many homes. In the first place, our country's birthday should be celebrated there, free from King Alcohol. It was done. At that first anti-saloon Fourth of July celebration there were about seven thousand people, and Gov. John P. St. John of Kansas gave the address. When we tried to hold religious services on Sunday there, a sort of Parson Brownlow orthodox preacher said to me: "Brother Douthit, let us have a union basket meeting at the springs. I'll go and help you out." There was a great crowd that day; and Satan came, too. He started a refreshment stand, with beer and whiskey, on a piece of land that I did not own and so could not control, within a hundred yards of the big log that was our pulpit that day.

But we kept pegging away with meetings till the devil was driven away. Then we began summer assemblies, a sort of camp-meeting Chautauquas. At first there were about a dozen tents and a few hundred people, the next year twice as many, and the next year still more, and so on till last summer there were over one hundred tents and about one thousand people encamped there for nearly twenty days, with an average daily attendance of about two thousand people, representing all parties, sects, classes, and conditions of men; and I did not see or smell the sign of intoxicants on any one during that whole assembly.

Now I think I may truly say I used to see more of the evils of drink in that county on any public day than I see now for a whole year.

However, you may know, we yet have about twelve thousand open dram-shops in Illinois, and thousands and thousands tending both sides of the bar, though it is no longer regarded as an honorable business, as was once the case.

Abraham Lincoln in his early days was for a time a bar-keeper. I remember that in his contest with Judge Douglass,

in 1858, for a senatorship, he was twitted with the fact before a popular audience. In his reply he said: "Judge Douglass has accused me of having been a bar-tender. It is true. I cannot deny it. But the only difference between Judge Douglass and me is this: I tended the bar on the inside, he tended it on the outside, I soon quit tending bar. Judge Douglass hasn't quit yet."

I am sorry and ashamed to say we have not all followed honest Abe's example, and quit tending bar. But we are going to quit some day. It is coming in the rise of temperance summer schools, or Chautauquas, all over the State. It is coming in the spirit of Frances Willard and her books and in scientific temperance instruction in our common schools.

The secretary, Rev. Richard W. Boynton, closed by giving a few figures relative to the amount of literature distributed by the society. That department has tripled in the last three years. Mr. Boynton read a letter from Father Conaty, rector of the Catholic University of Washington, expressing regret at his inability to attend the meeting and his interest in the work.

## LIST OF DELEGATES.

---

Reported as elected to attend the Eighteenth Meeting of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches, to be held in Washington, D.C., Oct. 16-19, 1899.

---

NOTE.—The asterisk appears only before the names of those persons who did *not* hand in their delegate tickets at Washington.

---

### CALIFORNIA.

POMONA—First Unitarian Society: \* Rev. Oscar Clute, LL.D., \* Mrs. J. T. Brady,  
\* Mrs. A. W. Burt.

### CANADA.

OTTAWA—Church of Our Father: \* Rev. Albert Walkley, \* G. C. Holland, \* Andrew Halkett.  
ST. JOHN, N.B.—Church of the Messiah: Rev. and Mrs. Stanley M. Hunter, George S. Fischer.  
TORONTO—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Oscar B. Hawes, Mr. and Mrs. M. A. Thomas.

### COLORADO.

COLORADO SPRINGS—All Souls' Unitarian Church: \* Rev. William H. Fish, Jr., \* Mrs. L. M. Towyalin, \* Mrs. Elizabeth Risley.

### CONNECTICUT.

HARTFORD—First Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. Joseph Waite, \* Charles Henry Field, \* John R. Root.

### DELAWARE.

WILMINGTON—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Alexander T. Bowser, Mrs. Francis S. Garrett, \* Mrs. Alfred D. Warner, Mrs. Samuel Bancroft, Jr.

### ILLINOIS.

ALTON—First Unitarian Church: Rev. George R. Gebauer.  
CHICAGO—Church of the Messiah: Rev. W. W. Fenn.  
SHEFFIELD—Unitarian Church: Rev. Seward Baker.  
SHELBYVILLE—First Congregational Unitarian Church: Rev. Jasper L. Douthit.

### KENTUCKY.

LOUISVILLE—Church of the Messiah: \* Rev. Arthur W. Littlefield.

### MAINE.

AUGUSTA—Christ Church: Rev. E. E. Newbert, \* Gen. and \* Mrs. Selden Connor.  
BANGOR—Independent Congregational Society: Rev. Seth C. Beach, Mrs. Harriet S. Griswold, \* Hon. Joseph F. Snow.

EASTPORT—First Congregational Society: Rev. T. E. St. John, Miss Annie A. Noyes, Mary Wadsworth.  
 FARMINGTON—First Unitarian Society: Rev. William H. Ramsay, \*Mrs. Grace A. White, \*Henry P. White.  
 KENNEBUNK—First Parish Church: Rev. J. D. O. Powers, \*Mrs. Mary G. Moody, \*Geo. R. Robinson.  
 PORTLAND—First Parish: \*Rev. John C. Perkins, F. H. Jordan, Miss Annette O'B. Walker.  
 PRESQUE ISLE—Independent Society: Rev. Edward H. Brennan.  
 SACS—The Second Parish: Rev. W. F. Skerye, Sarah Fairfield Hamilton, Mrs. Stockman.

## MARYLAND.

BALTIMORE—First Independent Church: Judge Thomas J. Morris, Charles H. Torsch, Mrs. M. A. Perry.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

ANDOVER (North)—North Parish Church and Society: Rev. Chas. Noyes, Miss Kate Johnson, Mrs. Mary L. Noyes.  
 ARLINGTON—First Congregational Parish: \*Rev. Frederick Gill, Mr. and Mrs. E. C. Turner.  
 ASHBY—First Parish: \*Rev. George S. Shaw, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. Joel W. Sheldon. Alternates: \*Mr. and \*Mrs. J. K. Gates.  
 ATHOL—Second Unitarian Society: \*Rev. Carl G. Horst, \*Hon. and \*Mrs. Charles Field.  
 BARNSTABLE—Congregational Church and Society in East Precinct: \*Rev. John A. Bevington, \*Capt. F. M. Hinckley, \*Miss H. L. Day.  
 BARRE—First Parish: Mrs. Henry Hapgood, Mrs. Moses Ames.  
 BEDFORD—First Parish: Rev. Loren B. Macdonald.  
 BELMONT—Congregational Society: Rev. Hilary Bygrave, E. Cate, Miss M. Livermore. Alternates: \*Charles W. Winn and \*Mrs. J. E. Elliott.  
 BERLIN—First Unitarian Society: \*Rev. A. E. Wilson, \*Miss Mary A. Bassett, Miss Eva Hastings.  
 BEVERLY—First Parish: Rev. Benjamin R. Bulkeley, Mrs. C. W. Boyden.  
 BILLERICA—First Congregational Society: Rev. and Mrs. Minot Osgood Simons, \*Mrs. Albert R. Richardson.  
 BOLTON—First Congregational Church: \*Rev. E. C. Headle, Mr. and Mrs. A. L. Nourse.  
 BOSTON—Church of the Disciples: Rev. Charles Gordon Ames, Mr. Leonard Stone, Mrs. Charlotte E. Cooper.  
 Arlington Street Church: Mrs. Mary G. Pickering, Henry Pickering, Mrs. Henry Sturgis Green.  
 Bulfinch Place Church: \*Rev. Christopher R. Eliot.  
 First Church: Rev. and Mrs. James Eells, Miss Caroline P. Corder.  
 King's Chapel: Rev. Howard N. Brown.  
 Second Church: Rev. Thomas Van Ness, Dr. Francis H. Brown, Miss Edith Brown, \*Freeman J. Doe. Alternates: \*Mrs. Freeman J. Doe, \*Mrs. Dwight L. Ensign.  
 South Congregational Church: Rev. Edward E. Hale, William Howell Reed, and Mrs. Sarah T. Hooper.  
 (Charlestown)—Harvard Church: Rev. C. C. Carpenter, Miss Elizabeth Hurd, Miss Sarah M. Draper.  
 (Dorchester)—First Parish: Rev. Eugene R. Shippen, Henry F. Howe, Miss Mary L. Hall.  
 (Dorchester)—Christ Church: \*Rev. Benjamin A. Goodridge, \*Mrs. C. H. Streeter, \*Mrs. F. T. Fuller.  
 (Dorchester)—Third Religious Society: \*Rev. and \*Mrs. Frederick B. Mott, Mrs. M. Talbot Fay.  
 (Jamaica Plain)—First Congregational Society: Rev. Charles F. Dole, Mrs. Ellis Peterson, Miss Mary F. Gill.  
 (Neponset)—Church of the Unity: \*Rev. George E. Littlefield, \*Mrs. Margaret Hayward, Mrs. Abbie Cadman Woude.  
 (Roslindale)—Unitarian Church of Roslindale: Rev. Richard W. Boynton, \*Miss Mary E. Hastings, Mrs. G. B. Harrington.  
 (Roxbury)—All Souls' Unitarian Church: Rev. Henry T. Secrist, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Newhall.  
 (South Boston)—Hawes Unitarian Congregational Church: Rev. James Huxtable, \*Benjamin James, Jr., William Shankland.  
 (West Roxbury)—First Parish: Rev. John H. Applebee, Mrs. Bertha M. Sparhawk, Mrs. M. E. W. Sparhawk.  
 BREWSTER—First Parish: \*Rev. Thomas Dawes, \*Mrs. Olive C. Winslow, \*Miss Lucy F. Frigham.  
 BRIDGEWATER—First Congregational (Unitarian) Society: \*Rev. Charles A. Allen, \*Mr. and Mrs. R. Alden.  
 BRIDGEWATER, EAST—First Parish: \*Rev. John W. Quinby, \*Charles F. Mann, \*Mary A. Rust.  
 BRIDGEWATER, WEST—First Congregational Society: \*Rev. E. B. Maglathlin, \*Benjamin B. Howard, Esq., \*Mrs. E. Bradford Wilber.  
 BRIGHTON—First Parish (Unitarian): \*Rev. F. S. C. Wicks, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. Daniel Goodnow.

- BROOKFIELD—First Church (Unitarian): Rev. William L. Walsh, A. E. Rice. Alternate: Elisha Webb.
- BROOKLINE—First Parish: Rev. Wm. H. Lyon, D.D., Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Stearns.
- Second Unitarian Society: Rev. Edward D. Towle, \*Charles A. Brown, Sarah Gavett Jones.
- CAMBRIDGE—First Parish Church: Rev. S. M. Crothers, Mr. and Mrs. Robert S. Morison.
- Third Congregational Society: Rev. Augustus P. Reccord, \*Mrs. Charles L. Jones, Rufus H. Manson.
- CANTON—First Congregational Parish: \*Rev. Henry F. Jenks, Charles H. French, \*William O. Chapman. Alternates: \*Mr. George Frederick Sumner and \*Thomas B. Draper.
- CHELMSFORD—First Congregational Society: Rev. Granville Pierce, Mrs. B. M. Fiske.
- CHELSEA—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Margaret B. Barnard, George M. Stearns, Gorham H. Tilton.
- CHICOPEE—First Unitarian Parish: Rev. William W. Peck, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. Robert E. Bemis.
- CLINTON—First Unitarian Society: \*Rev. James C. Duncan, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. Jonathan Smith.
- COHASSET—First Parish: Rev. Wm. R. Cole, Amos A. Lawrence, Elliot Stoddard.
- CONCORD—First Parish: Rev. L. B. Macdonald, Henry J. Hosmer, Miss Lucy H. Fosdick.
- DORHAM—First Parish: Rev. J. Worsley Austin, Mrs. Isabel French, Mrs. Eleanor T. Field.
- DIGHTON—Piedobaptist Congregational Society: Rev. and Mrs. A. J. Rich, \*Mrs. N. Baxter.
- EASTON, NORTH—Unity Church: \*Rev. William L. Chaffin, Rev. G. G. Withington, Miss Mary L. Lamprey.
- FAIRHAVEN—Washington Street Christian Church: Rev. Wm. Brunton.
- FITCHBURG—First Parish: Rev. W. F. Greenman, \*Mrs. Harris C. Hartwell, \*Mrs. George A. Lawrence.
- FLORENCE (Northampton)—Free Congregational Society: \*Rev. and Mrs. Alfred Free, \*Mr. and Mrs. Fred Atkins (alternate).
- FRAMINGHAM—First Parish (Unitarian) Church: Rev. E. C. Smith, Mrs. A. S. Lewis, Joseph C. Cloyes.
- GARDNER—First Unitarian Society: \*Rev. Charles A. Place, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. William Bixby.
- GLOUCESTER—First Parish: \*Rev. L. Walter Mason, \*Mrs. F. A. Docherty, \*Miss Lucy Babson.
- GRAFTON—Congregational Society: \*S. A. Forbush, \*Miss Sarah Brigham, and \*F. M. McGary.
- GREENFIELD—Third Congregational Society: Rev. John D. Reed, \*Mrs. Mary P. Wells Smith, S. B. Slate.
- GROTON—First Parish: Rev. Joshua Young, D.D., Mrs. Daniel Needham, Miss Lucy F. Young.
- HAVERHILL—First Parish: Rev. and Mrs. F. A. Gilmore, Dr. Frances Lamb.
- HINGHAM—First Parish: \*Rev. John W. Day, Gen. and Mrs. Wilmon W. Blackmar.
- HOPEDALE—The Hopedale Parish: \*Rev. Lewis G. Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Eben D. Bancroft.
- HUDSON—First Unitarian Society: Rev. John Baltzly, Mrs. M. E. Dawes, Mrs. Blanche Hathaway.
- LAWRENCE—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Geo. H. Young, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. W. T. McAlpine. Alternates: M. P. Perley, \*Miss Mary A. Mitchell.
- LEOMINSTER—First Congregational Society: Rev. Frederick J. Gauld, Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton Mayo.
- LITTLETON—First Congregational Society: Rev. Wm. Channing Brown, Mr. Asahel W. Sawyer, Mrs. Anna Brown.
- LOWELL—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Charles T. Billings, \*Mrs. William P. Brazer, Mrs. Ella P. Judkins.
- LYNN—Second Congregational Society: \*Rev. Samuel S. Stewart, Charles H. Newhall, Charles B. Tebbetts.
- MALDEN—First Unitarian Congregational Society: \*Rev. LeRoy F. Snapp, George S. Mansfield, Sarah E. Mansfield, Catherine M. Lincoln.
- MANCHESTER—First Unitarian Church: Mrs. Henry S. Greu, Mr. and Mrs. George Peirce.
- MARLBORO—Second Parish: \*Rev. Edward F. Hayward, \*Mrs. William J. Swift, \*Miss Caroline B. Boyd.
- MEDFORD—First Parish: Rev. Henry C. De Long.
- MENDON—First Parish: Rev. J. F. Meyer, Miss Julia Darling, Miss Florence Darling.
- MIDDLEBORO—First Unitarian Society: Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzo Wood.
- MILTON—First Congregational Parish: Rev. Roderick Stebbins, John C. Cobbe, \*G. Arthur Hilton.
- NATICK, SOUTH—First Unitarian Parish: \*Rev. L. R. Daniels, \*Mrs. Harriet J. Daniels.
- NEW BEDFORD—First Congregational Society: Rev. Paul Frothingham, Mrs. Wm. J. Rotch, \*Mrs. Edward C. Jones.
- NEWBURYPORT—First Religious Society: Mrs. Mary Morrison, \*William P. Jones, \*Elisha P. Dodge.
- NEWTON CENTRE—Newton Centre Unitarian Society: \*Mr. and \*Mrs. D. Frank Young, \*Mrs. Carrie M. Twombly.

- NEWTON—Chestnut Hill Society: \* Rev. Edward Hale, \* Mrs. Alanson Bigelow, \* Mrs. A. S. Foster.  
(West Newton) First Unitarian Society: Rev. J. C. Jaynes, George Hutchinson, George H. Ellis.
- NEWTON HIGHLANDS—All Souls' Unitarian Church: Rev. William Safford Jones, Mrs. Daniel O. Jones, Mrs. Charles Ellis.
- NORTHAMPTON—Second Congregational Church: \* Rev. George C. Cressey, \* Frank Lyman, \* Mrs. Robert E. Edwards. Alternates: \* Thomas M. Shepherd, \* Mrs. Gertrude A. Clapp.
- NORTHBORO—First Congregational Society: \* Rev. Josiah C. Kent, Miss Ellen Williams, Mrs. Annie D. Fairbanks.
- NORTHFIELD—First Congregational Church: Rev. and Mrs. Geo. F. Piper, \* Dr. N. P. Wood.
- NORTON—Congregational Parish: Rev. N. S. Hoagland.
- NORWELL—\* Mrs. Sarah C. Nash, \* Mrs. Nelly H. Torrey. Alternates: \* Mrs. Lizzie W. Otis, \* Joseph C. Otis.
- PEABODY—First Unitarian Church: \* Rev. J. W. Hudson and \* H. F. Walker.
- PEMBROKE—First Church: Rev. Charles W. Casson, Mrs. E. P. Litchfield, Miss Florence M. Collamore.
- PETERSHAM—First Congregational Unitarian Society: Rev. Robert Collyer Douthit, Mr. and Mrs. Francis W. Lee.
- PLYMOUTH—First Parish: \* Rev. Charles P. Lombard, Elmer E. Douglas, \* Miss Annie B. Stephens.
- QUINCY—First Congregational Society: \* Rev. and \* Mrs. E. C. Butler.
- RANDOLPH—Church of the Unity: Henry A. Belcher, Hannah B. Belcher, \* Julia C. Alden.
- READING—Christian Union Church: Walter P. Eaton.
- REVERE (Beachmont)—Church of the Unity: Rev. E. R. Butler, Mr. and Mrs. Fred H. Fittow.
- SALEM—First Church: Rev. E. J. Prescott, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Newcomb.  
North Society: Rev. George D. Latimer, Mrs. Z. A. Gallup, Miss Anne King.  
Second Church: Rev. Alfred Manchester, Daniel A. Varney, Mrs. Harriet M. Horton.
- SANDWICH—First Parish Church: Rev. Edward G. Spencer, Mr. and Mrs. Wm. L. Nye.
- SCITUATE—First Parish: \* George O. Allen, Mrs. Charles Webb, Mrs. E. L. Bonney.
- SHARON—First Congregational Parish: \* Rev. John C. Kimball, \* Mr. and \* Mrs. Horace S. Shepard.
- SOMERVILLE—First Congregational Society: Rev. W. H. Pierson.
- STERLING—First Congregational Society: \* Rev. John N. Woodman, \* Mr. and \* Mrs. L. Warren Rugg.
- TAUNTON—First Congregational Society: \* Rev. and \* Mrs. A. R. Hussey, Miss S. B. Williams.
- TEMPLETON—First Parish: \* Rev. John M. W. Pratt, Mr. and Mrs. F. P. Stone.
- UPTON—First Unitarian Society: \* Rev. Walter Knight, \* Mr. and \* Mrs. J. L. Metcalf.
- UXBRIDGE—First Congregational Society: Rev. C. A. Roys, Daniel W. Taft.
- WALTHAM—First Parish: Rev. W. Hanson Pulsford, Mr. John E. Loper, Mrs. John E. Loper.
- WATERTOWN—First Congregational Society: Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Haynes, Mrs. Mary Russell.
- WELLESLEY HILLS—Unitarian Society: Col. Albert Clark.
- WESTBORO—First Congregational Society: Rev. H. S. Mitchell, Mr. John L. Brigham, Mr. R. J. Forbush.
- WESTFORD—First Congregational Parish: Rev. L. H. Buckshorn.
- WESTON—First Parish: \* Rev. Charles F. Russell, Frances Hastings, Anna C. Hastings.
- WEST TOWNSEND—Liberal Christian Society: \* Rev. George S. Shaw, \* Mr. and \* Mrs. Morton Barrett. Alternates: \* Mr. and \* Mrs. Nelson Barrett.
- WESTWOOD—First Parish: Rev. George M. Bodge, \* Samuel C. French, \* Miss Laura Fisher.
- WINCHENDON—Church of the Unity: \* Rev. A. J. Culp, \* J. N. Richardson, \* Mrs. J. B. Maberry.
- WINCHESTER—Unitarian Society: Rev. W. I. Lawrance, Dr. D. C. Dennett, Miss E. A. Stevens.
- WOBURN—First Unitarian Parish: \* Rev. H. C. Parker, C. W. Carswell, D. H. Richards, Mrs. C. W. Casswell.
- WORCESTER—The Second Parish: Rev. Austin S. Garver, Mr. and Mrs. James P. Hamilton.  
South Unitarian Congregational Society: \* Mr. and \* Mrs. James A. Norcross, \* Mr. Henry B. Keith.

## MICHIGAN.

- ANN ARBOR—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Joseph H. Crooker, Prof. Charles E. Greene, Prof. William H. Pettee.

## MISSOURI.

- KANSAS CITY—All Souls' Church: \* Rev. George W. Stone, \* Mr. and \* Mrs. O. F. Page.
- ST. LOUIS—Church of the Unity: Mrs. Rachel W. Stevens.

## NEBRASKA.

OMAHA—First Unitarian Church: \*Rev. Newton M. Mann, [Mrs. H. I. Bettis,  
\*Arthur B. Smith.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

BATH—All Souls' Church: \*Rev. W. J. Leonard, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. Arthur Woods.  
CONCORD—Second Congregational (Unitarian) Society: \*James O. Lyford, Mr. and  
Mrs. George L. Stratton.  
DOVER—Unitarian Society of Christians: \*Miss Jennie Pierce, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. H. A.  
Worthen.  
FRANKLIN—First Unitarian Congregational Society: Mrs. M. G. MacDougall, Mr. and  
Mrs. Edward G. Leach.  
HAMPTON FALLS—First Congregational Society: \*Rev. Samuel C. Beane, D.D.,  
\*Lester B. Sanborn, \*Rev. William A. Cram.  
KEENE—Keene Congregational Society: Rev. Charles B. Elder, Mrs. Mary M.  
Bryant, Dr. S. M. Dinamoore.  
LANCASTER—First Unitarian Society: Rev. Joseph Aubrey Chase.  
LITTLETON—First Unitarian Society: \*Rev. Charles Graves, \*Gen. George F. Cruft,  
\*Mrs. John Smilie.  
MILFORD—First Unitarian Society: \*Charles Richardson, \*Miss Caroline K. Fuller,  
Miss E. A. Livermore.  
NASHUA—First Congregational Society: Miss Lucy F. Thayer, Miss Katherine M.  
Thayer.  
WILTON—First Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. W. F. Furman, Mrs. Ella R.  
Putnam, \*Mrs. Gardner Blanchard. Alternate: Mrs. J. G. Walker.  
Liberal Christian Church: Rev. W. F. Furman, Mr. and Mrs. George G. Blanchard.

## NEW JERSEY.

HACKENSACK—Unitarian Congregational Church: Rev. Henry Jeschke.  
MONTCLAIR—Unity Church: \*Rev. Arthur H. Grant, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. Edward C.  
Seward, Mrs. Arthur H. Grant.  
ORANGE—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Walter Reid Hunt, Miss Sylvia Delano Hitch,  
Henry Foster Hitch.  
PLAINFIELD—First Unitarian Society: Rev. and Mrs. Alfred C. Nickerson.  
RIDGWOOD—The Unitarian Society: Rev. Henry Jeschke, \*Daniel W. Williamson,  
\*Miss Rebecca W. Hawes.  
RUTHERFORD—The Unitarian Society: Henry G. Bell, Charles Burrows, Mrs. Sarah  
E. Burrows.

## NEW YORK.

BROOKLYN—Second Unitarian Society: \*Rev. John W. Chadwick, \*Monroe B. Bryant,  
Mrs. L. H. Buckingham.  
Church of the Saviour: Rev. John P. Forbes, Mrs. Francis D. Fisher, Isaac H.  
Cary.  
Third Congregational Society: \*Rev. D. M. Wilson, \*Ethan Allen Doty, Mrs.  
Alonzo Chase. Alternates: Mrs. Ely, Mrs. Ethan Allen Doty.  
BUFFALO—Church of Our Father: Rev. Adelbert L. Hudson, Mrs. Richard Williams,  
Josiah G. Monroe.  
GOVERNEUR—First Unitarian Church: \*Rev. Hasket D. Catlin, \*Hon. and \*Mrs.  
G. S. Conger.  
ITHACA—First Unitarian Society: Rev. U. G. B. Pierce, Mrs. G. H. Baker, Mrs.  
Lyman Smith.  
MIDDLETOWN—Free Christian Church: Rev. Charles M. Winchester, Fanny F. Win-  
chester, Juliette S. Thorne.  
NEWBURG—Church of Our Father: Rev. John B. Green, Mr. and Mrs. Asa Meade.  
NEW YORK CITY—Church of the Messiah: \*Rev. Robert Collyer, Mr. and Mrs. James  
M. Drake.  
(Manhattan)—First Congregational Church: Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, Hon. Dorman  
B. Eaton, George F. Baker.  
(Manhattan)—Unity Congregational Society: \*Rev. Merle St. C. Wright, Mr. and  
Mrs. Thomas Wilson. Alternates: \*Mr. and \*Mrs. Wm. H. Riley.  
(New Brighton)—Church of the Redeemer: \*Rev. Hobart Clark, Mrs. Percy R.  
King, Mrs. H. D. Joy, Mrs. George F. Hicks.  
ROCHESTER—First Unitarian Congregational Society: Mrs. M. T. L. Gannett.  
SYRACUSE—Unitarian Congregational Church: Rev. Samuel R. Calthrop, Mrs. Oliver  
Burt, Mrs. Agan.  
TROY—First Unitarian Society: Rev. R. H. Greaves.  
YONKERS—First Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. James T. Bixby, Miss  
Sarah Williams, L. J. Schlesinger.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

FARGO—First Unitarian Society: Mrs. H. C. Plumley, Mrs. W. A. Scott.

## OHIO.

CLEVELAND—Unity Church: Arthur Bradley, \*A. E. Convers, C. H. Benjamin.  
 MARIETTA—First Unitarian Society: Rev. E. A. Coil, H. W. Craig, Mrs. Julia Flanders.

## OREGON.

PORTLAND—First Unitarian Society: Miss Ellen S. Eliot.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

ERNE—First Unitarian Church: Rev. and Mrs. Leon A. Harvey, Mrs. H. C. Sailors.  
 GERMANTOWN—Unitarian Society: Rev. James C. Hodgins, Thomas B. Harned, Esq.  
 MEADVILLE—Independent Congregational Church: E. P. Cullum, Mrs. Caspar W. Tyler.  
 PHILADELPHIA—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Joseph May, Enoch Lewis, \*Frank R. Toby, Mrs. T. C. Hill.  
 Spring Garden Unitarian Church: \*Rev. Frederic A. Hinckley, Mr. Hector McIntosh, \*Mrs. Alisen W. Cranes. Alternates: \*Mr. Edward D. Barker, \*Mrs. Katherine M. Phillips.  
 PITTSBURG—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Charles E. St. John, Miss M. P. Semple, R. Q. Whitten.

## RHODE ISLAND.

PROVIDENCE—First Congregational Society: Rev. Augustus M. Lord, Charles Wetter Bowen, Charles H. Sheldon.  
 Olney Street Congregational Society: \*Rev. Joseph H. Jones, \*A. M. Hawkins, \*G. D. Nelson. Alternates: L. M. Stelley and Miss S. Eddy.  
 Westminister Congregational Society: Dr. Frederick N. Seabury.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

CHARLESTON—Unitarian Church: S. G. McComb.

## TENNESSEE.

CHATTANOOGA—First Unitarian Church: Rev. Marion Ham.

## VERMONT.

BRATTLEBORO—Unitarian Congregational Society: Rev. E. Q. S. Osgood, Mrs. Charles Warder, Mrs. George H. Rider.  
 BURLINGTON—First Congregational (Unitarian) Church: Rev. Joel B. Metcalf, Henry Greene, \*Mrs. Fred Johannotte.  
 MONTPELIER—Church of the Messiah: Rev. J. E. Wright, \*Col. A. C. Brown, \*John G. Farwell.  
 WINDSOR—All Souls' Unitarian Church: \*Rev. C. E. Ordway, \*Mr. and \*Mrs. F. A. Kennedy. Alternates: \*Mr. and \*Mrs. L. F. Cabot.

## WASHINGTON.

OLYMPIA—First Unitarian Society: Mrs. C. H. Redington.  
 SPOKANE—First Unitarian Church: Rev. O. J. Fairfield, Mrs. E. G. Fairfield, Mrs. F. C. Loring.

## WISCONSIN.

MILWAUKEE—First Unitarian Society: Rev. W. G. Eliot, Jr., Mrs. W. O. B. Wingate.

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

WASHINGTON—All Souls' Church: Rev. E. Bradford Leavitt, Henry F. Blount, George A. King.



## ASSOCIATIONS.

- AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION: Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Rev. Samuel A. Eliot, Francis H. Lincoln.
- BENEVOLENT FRATERNITY OF CHURCHES: \* Rev. John Cuckson, \* William P. Fowler, \* Rev. Edward A. Horton.
- CAPE COD CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES (Brewster, Mass.): Rev. E. G. Spencer.
- CHILDREN'S MISSION TO THE CHILDREN OF THE DESTITUTE (Boston): \* Mrs. Elizabeth L. Tuttle, \* Rev. Christopher R. Eliot, Henry Pickering, Miss Georgina Merrill.
- CHRISTIAN REGISTER ASSOCIATION: Rev. George Batchelor, George H. Ellis.
- CONNECTICUT VALLEY CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN CHURCHES: \* Hon. Herbert C. Parsons, \* Ernest L. Staples, Esq., \* George A. Denison.
- ESSEX CONFERENCE: E. C. Browne, William A. Horton.
- HANCOCK COUNTY CONFERENCE, MAINE: \* Mrs. A. Hunt, \* Mr. and \* Mrs. D. B. Flint.
- MAINE CONFERENCE: \* Hon. and \* Mrs. Seldon Connor.
- MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL: Nicholas P. Gilman, \* F. W. Huidekoper, \* Henry Huidekoper.
- MICHIGAN CONFERENCE: Rev. Leslie W. Sprague.
- MINISTERS' INSTITUTE: Rev. George Batchelor, Rev. William W. Fenn, Rev. Russell N. Bellows.
- MINISTER'S LEAGUE FOR PRACTICAL WORK: Rev. H. C. McDougall, Rev. Alfred Manchester.
- NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN: Mrs. B. Ward Dix, Mrs. R. H. Davis, Mrs. Emily A. Fifield.
- NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATE BRANCH ALLIANCE: Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells, Miss Mary L. Hall.
- NEW YORK LEAGUE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN: Mrs. A. Wendell Jackson.
- NEW YORK UNITARIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION: \* Wm. C. Gardner, A. Wendell Jackson, \* Mrs. G. L. Becker.
- NORFOLK CONFERENCE: \* E. J. Lewis, Jr., Charles H. Stearns, Mrs. Joanna Rotch.
- NORTH MIDDLESEX CONFERENCE: Rev. George C. Wright, Thomas H. Elliott. Alternates: Mrs. George C. Wright, \* Mrs. Thomas H. Elliott.
- PLYMOUTH AND BAY CONFERENCE: \* Dr. H. H. Filon, Miss Susan A. Smith, \* E. L. Ripley.
- SOUTH MIDDLESEX CONFERENCE (Weston, Mass.): \* Horace S. Sears, \* Rev. H. C. Parker, Rev. L. B. Macdonald.
- SOUTHERN CONFERENCE (Louisville, Ky.): Rev. A. W. Littlefield, Rev. W. S. Vail, Rev. Marion F. Ham.
- THE CHANNING CLUB (Boston): Courtenay Guild, \* Frederick W. Porter.
- UNITARIAN CLUB OF BOSTON: \* C. W. Birtwell, Francis H. Brown, William Howell Reed.
- UNITARIAN CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA: Thomas B. Harned, Edith D. Steele, Mrs. Elizabeth J. May.
- UNITARIAN CONFERENCE OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND CANADA: Hon. Dorman B. Eaton, Rev. D. W. Morehouse, \* Howland Davis.
- UNITARIAN MINISTERS' MONDAY CLUB: Rev. E. R. Butler, Rev. Alfred E. Mullett, Rev. J. Henry Wiggin.
- UNITARIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY: \* Rev. Edward A. Horton, Richard C. Humphreys, Miss Louisa P. Parker.
- UNITARIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION (Boston, Mass.): George Pierce, \* Benjamin James, \* Miss Frances Rust, and Leonard Stone.
- UNITARIAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY: Rev. Charles F. Dole, Rev. Richard W. Boynton, \* Mrs. Abby C. Woude.
- WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE: Rev. Wm. G. Eliot, Jr., Rev. F. C. Southworth.
- WORCESTER ASSOCIATION: \* Rev. S. B. Flagg, \* Rev. George M. Bartol, D.D., \* Rev. George S. Ball.
- WORCESTER CONFERENCE: \* Rev. George S. Ball, \* John C. Otis, E. F. Toleman.
- WORCESTER LEAGUE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN: \* Mrs. Nathaniel Seaver, Mrs. Austin S. Garver, Mrs. \* A. B. R. Sprague.
- YOUNG PEOPLE'S RELIGIOUS UNION: Walter P. Eaton, \* Jesse C. Suter, Miss Emma R. Ross, Miss Elliott.

# CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.

---

## PREAMBLE.

The Conference of Unitarian and other Christian Churches was formed in the year 1865, with the purpose of strengthening the churches and societies which should unite in it for more and better work for the kingdom of God. These churches accept the religion of Jesus, holding, in accordance with his teaching, that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man.

The Conference recognizes the fact that its constituency is Congregational in tradition and polity. Therefore, it declares that nothing in this Constitution is to be construed as an authoritative test; and we cordially invite to our working fellowship any who, while differing from us in belief, are in general sympathy with our spirit and our practical aims.

## CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I. The churches and other organizations here represented unite themselves in a common body to be known as the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches.

ART. II. This National Conference shall be composed of such delegates, elected once in two years, not exceeding three from any church or other affiliated organization, as may be invited by the Council, and accredited to it by a certificate of their appointment.

ART. III. The Conference shall meet biennially, at such time and place as it may designate at its successive biennial sessions, unless otherwise directed by the Council.

ART. IV. Its officers shall consist of a President; six Vice-presidents; a general Secretary; a Treasurer; a Council of twelve, including the general Secretary and Treasurer, of whom not more than half shall be ministers; and a Committee on Fellowship, consisting of fifteen,—three from the Eastern States, three from the Middle States, three from the Southern States, three from the Central Western States,

and three from the Pacific States,—who shall be elected at each meeting to hold their offices for two years, or until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The Council, during the intervals of the biennial sessions, may fill vacancies in the board of government, and shall have charge of all business having reference to the interests of the Conference, and intrusted to it by that body, which is hereby declared a purely advisory one.

ART. VI. The National Conference, until further advised by its experience, adopts the existing organizations of the Unitarian body as the instruments of its activities, and confines itself to recommending to them such undertakings and methods as it judges to be in the heart of its constituency.

ART. VII. This Constitution may be amended, at any regular meeting of the Conference, by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the delegates accredited thereto, provided public announcement of the proposed amendment has been given three months in advance.

#### BY-LAWS.

1. Three months at least before the time fixed by the National Conference for its biennial meeting, the Council shall issue a circular letter of call to the churches and organizations in its fellowship, accompanying it with a form of certificate, the production of which shall be the proof of membership of the Conference until others are elected, unless otherwise ordered by the Conference.

2. The General Secretary shall keep a full report of the proceedings of the body, which shall be published at the expense of the Conference, and a copy sent to every delegate.

3. The Council, at the conclusion of each Conference, shall issue an address to the churches and organizations in our body, whether members of this Conference or not, to be published with the proceedings of the Conference, containing such advice and encouragement as it may deem appropriate; but especially communicating to the churches and organizations the recommendations of the Conference in regard to plans and methods of work, the amount of money required for the uses of the year, the special objects to which they would advise its appropriation, with such suggestions, as to a just apportionment of the burden, as they may judge expedient and becoming.

4. The Council shall have for its duty to keep itself accurately informed of the plans and operations of the various organizations in our body, and of the state of the individual churches; inviting correspondence and soliciting reports, to be sent in one month before the biennial meeting, in which the general condition of the parish, its Sunday-school, charities, and general working may be set forth, to the end that the Conference may know what the wants and the wishes of the churches are, somewhat more particularly than it is possible to learn in the necessary hurry of the biennial meeting.

5. The general secretary of the National Conference shall be the person to whom all letters and communications shall be addressed; and he shall be, *ex officio*, a member of the Council, and constitute its secretary.

6. The list of delegates, churches, and organizations represented in each Conference shall be part of the Biennial Report. The archives of the Conference shall be in the keeping of the General Secretary, subject to inspection and temporary possession by the Council.

7. A collection shall be taken up among the delegates at each Conference, to which any others may contribute, to defray the incidental expenses of the Conference,—such as printing the Report, etc.

8. Each church in this Conference is recommended to defray the expenses of its delegates.

9. All motions and resolutions, not merely of a formal or incidental character, which propose any action or declaration on the part of the Conference shall, unless the Conference shall otherwise specifically order, be referred without debate to the Committee on Business, whose duty it shall be to make seasonable reports thereon. In case any action by the Conference shall be recommended in a report, a suitable time for the same shall be therein designated; and, unless objection shall be made to any report, it shall be deemed approved by the Conference.

10. The Fellowship Committee shall include in its scope the extending of fellowship to ministers from other countries coming to America, and desiring to engage in ministerial work among our Unitarian churches.

11. No one admitted by the Fellowship Committee shall be entitled to claim insertion in the list of ministers until after being settled in some parish or other regular ministerial employment for at least one year.

## RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FELLOWSHIP.

The Fellowship Committee elected by the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches, under the provisions of its Constitution and By-Laws, and acting under the authority of instructions embodied in votes passed by the Conference and by the American Unitarian Association, has jurisdiction over the authorized list of Unitarian ministers published in the Year Book of the Denomination.

This Committee has power to cause the name of any person to be removed from the list, when it is satisfied that in conduct and character said person has become unworthy to continue to hold the office of a Christian minister in the Unitarian Fellowship; but in no case shall unfavorable action be taken till a minister has had full opportunity to be heard in the matter.

The Fellowship Committee also has power to add to the list of ministers the names of those who, coming into the Unitarian ministry otherwise than through the theological schools of the denomination, are in its judgment worthy to be thus enrolled. All churches are hereby warned of the serious danger they incur by settling a minister whose name does not appear in the authorized list, or who has not received the approval of the Fellowship Committee.

In deciding upon the fitness of a candidate for admission to the Unitarian Fellowship, the Committee will be guided above all by such proofs of the moral earnestness and integrity of the applicant as may be discovered under a careful investigation. It may also take into account the amount and kind of preparation that has been made for the work of the ministry, and may advise with the candidate as to any further course of study that he may seem to require. Should he take a special course at Cambridge or at Meadville, the certificate of the Faculty of either of those schools that he is qualified to preach will be received by the Committee, and will entitle him to have his name placed upon the list of ministers. In all cases, however, the Committee may, at its discretion, refuse to put the name of a student or candidate upon the list before he has been regularly settled over a Unitarian church.

Applicants for recognition as Unitarian ministers are requested to make known their desire to the Chairman of the sub-committee having jurisdiction over the territory in which they reside. Each sub-committee, after thorough investigation, shall report its decision, together with all material facts.

in the case, to the Secretary of the General Committee, who shall at once notify all the other sub-committees of the action that has been taken.

Unless within thirty days after the mailing of such notice, objection to the finding of the sub-committee having original jurisdiction over the case is filed with the Secretary of the General Committee, the action of the sub-committee shall be regarded as approved by the General Committee, and, in case of the acceptance of an applicant, publication of that fact shall immediately thereafter be made in one or more of the denominational papers, over the names of the Chairman and Secretary of the General Committee.







