
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>



ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 278C D

06 Bapt.

50
29

Proceedings of the Baptist Congress

at New York City, 1909

Topics

- I. Can Pragmatism Furnish a Philosophical Basis for Theology?
- II. Is the Present Tendency toward a Co-operative Social Order Desirable?
- III. How Is Salvation Mediated to Us through Christ?
- IV. Recent Tendencies to Change Denominational Practice. Are They Desirable?
- V. How Can Ethics Be Taught in the Public Schools?
- VI. Realizing the Presence of God.

Baptist Congress

Treasurer's Report, October 1, 1908, to September
30, 1909

Receipts

Balance	\$ 54.40
General Committee.....	670.10
Annual Members.....	335.00
	<hr/>
	1,005.10
Sales of Proceedings.....	156.14
Donations.....	185.00
Grand Rapids Church.....	10.00
Red Bank Church.....	10.00
Advertising.....	15.00
Collections.....	49.89
	<hr/>
	\$1,485.53

Expenditures

Traveling Account.....	\$740.10
Proceedings.....	500.75
Stationery and Printing.....	75.95
Postage and Express.....	64.03
Clerical Help.....	56.00
Incidentals.....	12.75
	<hr/>
	\$1,449.58
Balance	\$35.95

0

Twenty-Seventh Annual Session

OF THE

Baptist Congress

HELD IN

The Madison Avenue Baptist Church
New York City

November 9, 10, and 11, 1909

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO AND NEW YORK

29 Jan 1910
Harvard University.
Divinity School Library.
(1909)

Published December 1909

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ADDRESS OF WELCOME	I
REV. CHARLES A. EATON, D.D.	
THE PRESIDENT'S RESPONSE	2
I. CAN PRAGMATISM FURNISH A PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS FOR THEOLOGY?	4
PROFESSOR MELBOURNE S. READ, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR DOUGLAS C. MACINTOSH, PH.D.	
PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, D.D.	
REV. CLIFTON D. GRAY, PH.D.	
REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.	
II. IS THE PRESENT TENDENCY TOWARD A CO-OPERATIVE SOCIAL ORDER DESIRABLE?	41
REV. HARRIE R. CHAMBERLIN	
DEAN J. W. A. STEWART, D.D.	
MR. GEORGE W. COLEMAN	
REV. HERBERT S. JOHNSON, D.D.	
REV. LEMUEL C. BARNES, D.D.	
PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, D.D.	
III. HOW IS SALVATION MEDIATED TO US THROUGH CHRIST?	73
PROFESSOR JOHN B. ANDERSON, B.D.	
PROFESSOR CORNELIUS WOELFKIN, D.D.	
PROFESSOR DELAVAN B. REED, D.D.	
REV. W. G. FENNELL, D.D.	
PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, D.D.	
REV. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.	
IV. RECENT TENDENCIES TO CHANGE DENOMINATIONAL PRACTICE— ARE THEY DESIRABLE?	112
T. O. CONANT, LL.D.	
REV. E. A. HANLEY, D.D. (letter)	
PRESIDENT W. H. P. FAUNCE, D.D.	
REV. GWILYM O. GRIFFITH	
REV. H. W. BARNES	
REV. CHARLES R. McNALLY	
REV. ROBERT G. BOVILLE	
REV WILLIAM H. BAWDEN	
REV. ALFRED H. C. MORSE	

V. HOW CAN ETHICS BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?	144
PRESIDENT JOHN H. HARRIS, LL.D.	
MR. CLARENCE E. MELENEY	
PRESIDENT JOHN L. ALGER	
REV. R. G. BOVILLE	
REV. E. F. MERRIAM, D.D.	
REV. GEORGE U. WENNER, D.D.	
REV. ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D.	
REV. H. W. BARNES, D.D.	
VI. REALIZING THE PRESENCE OF GOD	176
REV. G. G. JOHNSON, D.D.	
REV. JOHN F. ELDER, D.D.	
VII. CLOSING WORDS	193
THE PRESIDENT, REV. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.	
REV. CHARLES A. EATON, D.D.	
REV. ADDISON MOORE	
REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.	

BAPTIST CONGRESS

PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

1. *The object* of the Congress is to promote a healthful sentiment among Baptists through free and courteous discussion of current questions by suitable persons.

2. *The work* of the Congress shall be subject to the control of a General Committee of one hundred members or more. The Committee shall be composed of persons who have consented to contribute five dollars or more annually toward the expenses of the Congress.

3. *The General Committee* shall elect a permanent Executive Committee of fifteen persons residing in or near the City of New York, at the meetings of which Executive Committee any member of the General Committee may be present and vote; and to this Executive Committee shall be entrusted, except as may have been already provided for by the General Committee, entire control over the public meetings—e. g., determination of the time and place, the number of days and sessions each day, selection of the presiding officer, the topics, the appointed writers and speakers, the provision for volunteer speakers, and rules of discussion. The Executive Committee shall also secure a full stenographic report of the proceedings, and funds to meet any other necessary expense.

4. *A Secretary* shall be elected, who shall also be Secretary of the Executive Committee, and of the public meetings, the expenses of whose correspondence, etc., shall be met by a tax levied by the Executive Committee upon the General Committee.

5. *The General Committee* shall meet in connection with the public meetings, and where called together by the Executive Committee.

6. *The Executive Committee* shall secure the appointment of a local committee in the city or town where a public meeting is to be held, which shall provide a suitable place for the Congress, and entertainment for the officers and appointees of the Congress.

7. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation may become an Annual Member of this Congress, and thus be entitled to all its privileges, and to a copy of the published proceedings, by the payment of the sum of two dollars.

RULES OF DISCUSSION

1. *The Chairman* of the Congress shall be appointed by the Executive Committee, and on all points of order his decision shall be final.

2. *Any member* of a Baptist Congregation who, by sending his card to the Secretary, shall signify his willingness to speak on the topic under discussion, may be called upon by the Chairman.

3. *All writers* and speakers shall take the platform, address only the Chair, and confine themselves to the subject assigned for the occasion.

4. *No person* shall speak twice on the same subject.

5. *Readers of papers* shall be allowed twenty-five minutes, appointed speakers¹ twenty minutes, and volunteer speakers ten minutes. The Secretary shall notify all participants by stroke of the bell three minutes before, and also at the expiration of their time, beyond which no one shall be allowed to proceed.

6. *No paper* shall be read in the absence of its writer, nor shall any paper be printed in the proceedings except it has been read at the meeting.

7. *No resolution* or motion shall be entertained at the public conferences.

¹Appointed speakers must not use MS, the object of their appointment being to encourage the volunteer discussion which follows their addresses.

OFFICERS OF THE NEW YORK MEETING

President

REV. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.
New York

Secretary

REV. THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D.
Landing, N. J.

Treasurer

REV. W. B. MATTESON, D.D.
Red Bank, N. J.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS

REV. HENRY M. SANDERS, D.D., *Chairman*
No. 9 E. 39th Street, New York

REV. JAS. M. BRUCE	REV. WILLIAM M. LAWRENCE, D.D.
REV. CHAS. A. EATON, D.D.	REV. ALBERT G. LAWSON, D.D.
REV. HARRY E. FOSDICK	REV. ROBT. MACDONALD, D.D.
REV. FRANK M. GOODCHILD, D.D.	REV. I. HERMAN RANDALL, D.D.
REV. W. A. GRANGER, D.D.	REV. E. T. TOMLINSON, PH.D.
REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D.	REV. RIVINGTON D. LORD, D.D.
REV. W. B. MATTESON, D.D., <i>Treasurer</i> ,	Red Bank, N. J.
REV. THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D., <i>Secretary</i> ,	Landing, N. J.

THE GENERAL COMMITTEE

Aked, Charles F., D.D.	New York City
Alger, President J. L.	Providence, R. I.
Anderson, Professor John B.	Hamilton, N. Y.
Anderson, T. D., D.D.	Albany, N. Y.
Andrews, President E. Benjamin, LL.D.	Lincoln, Neb.
Anthony, Professor A. W., D.D.	Lewiston, Me.
Applegate, Hon. J. S., LL.D.	Red Bank, N. J.
Armstrong, Hon. E. A.	Camden, N. J.
Baldwin, Mr. Jesse A.	Chicago, Ill.
Barbour, C. A., D.D.	Rochester, N. Y.
Barbour, T. S., D.D.	Wollaston, Mass.
Barnes, H. W., D.D.	Binghamton, N. Y.

Barnes, L. C., D.D.....	New York City
Barney, Mr. E. J.....	Dayton, Ohio
Batten, S. Z., D.D.....	Lincoln, Neb.
Beaver, Mr. F. P.....	Dayton, Ohio
Berry, Professor George R., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Bigelow, Mrs. L. H.....	New York City
Bitting, W. C., D.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Boville, R. G., D.D.....	New York City
Boyd, Mr. S. G.....	Covington, Ky.
Braislin, Edward, D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Brooks, Rev. Arthur C.....	New York City
Brown, Rev. A. Watson.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Brown, Mr. Samuel N.....	Boston, Mass.
Brownell, Rev. Clark T.....	Newark, N. J.
Bruce, Rev. James M.....	New York City
Bryan, President E. B., Ph.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burdette, Robert J., D.D.....	Los Angeles, Cal.
Burggraf, Mr. G. A.....	New York City
Burnham, Professor S., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Burton, Professor Ernest D., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Burton, N. S., D.D.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Butler, Mrs. Maria E.....	New York City
Calley, Walter, D.D.....	Jamaica Plains, Mass.
Case, Rev. C. D., Ph.D.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Cate, Carter E., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Chamberlin, Mr. Willard D.....	Dayton, Ohio
Cheney, Rev. J. L., Ph.D.....	Wheaton, Ill.
Clarke, Mr. E. J.....	Baltimore, Md.
Clarke, Professor W. N., D.D.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Clinch, Hon. Edward S.....	New York City
Colby, Hon. Everett.....	Newark, N. J.
Colby, H. F., D.D.....	Dayton, Ohio
Colgate, Mr. James C.....	New York City
Colgate, Mr. Richard M.....	West Orange, N. J.
Colgate, Mr. Sidney M.....	New York City
Colwell, H. S., D.D.....	Granville, Ohio
Conwell, Russell H., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Cook, R. B., D.D.....	Wilmington, Del.
Craig, W. B., D.D.....	Denver, Colo.
Crandall, L. A., D.D.....	Minneapolis, Minn.

Davis, Mr. F. H.....Elizabeth, N. J.
 de Blois, A.K., Ph.D., LL.D.....Chicago, Ill.
 Dickerson, Mr. Frank.....New York City
 Dimock, Mr. G. E.....Elizabeth, N. J.
 Dodd, Charles H., D.D.....Baltimore, Md.

Eaches, O. P., D.D.....Hightstown, N. J.
 Evans, Professor M. G., D.D.....Chester, Pa.

Farnham, E. P., D.D.....Richmond Hill, N. Y.
 Faunce, President W. H. P., D.D., LL.D.....Providence, R. I.
 Ferris, George H., D.D.....Philadelphia, Pa.
 Fosdick, Rev. H. E.....Montclair, N. J.
 Foster, Professor George B., D.D.....Chicago, Ill.

Garabrant, Mr. D. G.....Bloomfield, N. J.
 Gates, Professor Errett, Ph.D.....Chicago, Ill.
 Gates, Mr. I. E.....New York City
 Gessler, T. A. K., D.D.....Landing, N. J.
 Gifford, O. P., D.D.....Brookline, Mass.
 Goodchild, F. M., D.D.....New York City
 Goodchild, Mrs. F. M.....New York City
 Granger, W. A., D.D.....Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
 Gray, Rev. Clifton D., Ph.D.....Boston, Mass.
 Grenell, Z., D.D.....Detroit, Mich.
 Grippin, Mr. William A.....Bridgeport, Conn.
 Gurley, Mr. W. F.....Troy, N. Y.

Hagerman, Mr. Joseph G.....Red Bank, N. J.
 Harris, President J. H., LL.D.....Lewisburg, Pa.
 Haywood, Oscar, D.D.....New York City
 Hegeman, Mr. John R.....New York City
 Hillman, Mr. Wm.....Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
 Hills, Mr. William.....New York City
 Hobart, Professor A. S., D.D.....Upland, Pa.
 Holton, H. D., M.D.....Brattleboro, Vt.
 Horr, President George E., D.D.....Newton Centre, Mass.
 Hubbard, Mr. Harry.....New York City
 Hughes, Governor Charles E., LL.D.....Albany, N. Y.
 Hunt, President Emory W., LL.D.....Granville, Ohio
 Hyde, Rev. J. Chester.....Cleveland, Ohio

Jackson, J. L., D.D.....	Sharon, Pa.
Jefferson, Albert W., D.D.....	Portland, Me.
Johnson, Rev. Herbert S.....	Boston, Mass.
Johnston, R. P., D.D.....	New York City
Jones, Carter Helm, D.D.....	Oklahoma City, Okla.
Jones, Howard L., D.D.....	Charleston, S. C.
Jones, M. Ashby, D.D.....	Columbus, Ga.
Judd, Mr. Orrin R.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Judson, President H. P., LL.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Keen, Professor W. W., M.D., LL.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kenyon, Hon. James S.....	Providence, R. I.
Lawrence, William M., D.D.....	East Orange, N. J.
Lawson, Albert G., D.D.....	Waterbury, Conn.
Lent, Rev. Frederick, Ph.D.....	New Haven, Conn.
Levering, Mr. Eugene.....	Baltimore, Md.
Lincoln, Mr. William E.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Logan, Professor John H.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Lord, Rivington D., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Loux, Rev. Edward.....	New York City
MacDonald, Robert, D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
MacDonald, Mrs. Robert.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
McDonald, Mr. William.....	Albany, N. Y.
McKibben, Rev. W. K.....	Seattle, Wash.
McLeish, Mr. Andrew.....	Chicago, Ill.
McNally, Rev. C. R.....	New London, Conn.
Marston, Mr. Edgar L.....	New York City
Mathews, Professor E. B.....	Baltimore, Md.
Matteson, W. B., D.D.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Mauck, President Jos. W., LL.D.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Meeser, Professor S. B., D.D.....	Upland, Pa.
Metcalf, Mr. Edward P.....	Providence, R. I.
Milbank, Mr. Joseph.....	New York City
Moore, Addison, D.D.....	New York City
Mott, Mrs. E. E.....	New York City
Mullins, President E. Y., D.D., LL.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Murray, Mr. George Wellwood.....	Montclair, N. J.
Nuveen, Mr. John.....	Chicago, Ill.

Parker, A. K., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Parmly, Mr. Randolph, A.M.....	New York City
Parsons, Major Charles B.....	Red Bank, N. J.
Parsons, Mr. Charles W.....	New York City
Pierce, Robert F. Y., D.D.....	New York City
Porter, Hon. H. K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Randall, J. H., D.D.....	New York City
Rauschenbusch, Professor Walter, D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Rhees, President Rush, D.D., LL.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Rosselle, Rev. W. Quay, Ph.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rowland, A. J., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Rullman, Mr. Henry D.....	Baltimore, Md.
Sampey, Professor John R., D.D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Samson, Thomas S., D.D.....	Germantown, Pa.
Sanders, Henry M., D.D.....	New York City
Schulte, Mr. Theo. E.....	New York City
Scott, Rev. Walter.....	North Cambridge, Mass.
Shalenberger, Hon. William S.....	Rochester, Pa.
Shaud, Mr. Miles M.....	Washington, D. C.
Slocum, President A. G., LL.D.....	Kalamazoo, Mich.
Snape, Rev. John.....	Utica, N. Y.
Spalding, C. H., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Stevenson, Mr. George K.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Stickney, Hon. W. W.....	Ludlow, Vt.
Stilwell, H. F., D.D.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Stoddard, Ira J., D.D.....	Germantown, Pa.
Stott, W. T., D.D.....	Kingstown, Md.
Strong, President A. H., D.D., LL.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Strong, Professor J. H.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sutphen, Mr. C. Edgar.....	Newark, N. J.
Thresher, Mr. E. M.....	Dayton, Ohio
Thresher, Mr. J. B.....	Dayton, Ohio
Tomlinson, Rev. E. T., Ph.D.....	Elizabeth, N. J.
Torrence, Hon. Francis J.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Tustin, Hon. Ernest L.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Waldbach, Rev. William F.....	Chicago, Ill.
Welch, Mr. Pierce N.....	New Haven, Conn.
Wells, Mr. F. A.....	Chicago, Ill.

White, Mr. Edward D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
White, Mr. Josiah J.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Williams, Leighton, D.D.....	New York City
Wishart, Rev. A. W., Ph.D.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Woods, E. A., D.D.....	San Francisco, Cal.
Woodward, Mr. S. W.....	Washington, D. C.

ANNUAL MEMBERS

Abbott, Mr. Augustus L.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Adams, George D., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Anderson, Professor F. L., D.D.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Arthur, Rev. F. P.....	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Ashworth, Rev. Robert A.....	Meriden, Conn.
Barry, Mr. Charles C.....	Melrose, Mass.
Bates, President Miner Lee.....	Hiram, Ohio
Bawden, Rev. William H.....	Perth Amboy, N. J.
Betteridge, Professor W. R., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Bickmore, Professor A. S., LL.D.....	New York City
Blair, Rev. V. W.....	North Tonawanda, N. Y.
Bonsall, Rev. A. J., Litt.D.....	Allegheny, Pa.
Bosworth, Rev. R. B.....	New York City
Bovenizer, Mr. George W.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Bowman, Mr. E. M.....	Chicago, Ill.
Bradbury, Rev. Woodman.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Brockett, Hon. E. J.....	East Orange, N. J.
Bronk, Rev. Mitchell, Ph.D.....	Bayonne, N. J.
Brown, Professor Charles Rufus, D.D.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Brown, Rev. John R.....	Providence, R. I.
Brown, T. Edwin, D.D.....	New Britain, Conn.
Bullen, George, D.D.....	Needham, Mass.
Burnham, Rev. F. W.....	Springfield, Ill.
Bustard, Rev. W. W.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Butler, Professor Nathaniel, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Cant, Mr. Andrew.....	Buffalo, N. Y.
Carman, Rev. A. S.....	Granville, Ohio
Carpenter, Mr. I. W.....	Omaha, Neb.
Carroll, Professor Mitchell.....	Washington, D. C.
Carver, Professor W. O.....	Louisville, Ky.
Chamberlain, Rev. Harrie R.....	Newton, Mass.
Chard, Mr. James F.....	Buffalo, N. Y.

Clare, Rev. Daniel H.....	Hamilton, N. Y.
Clyde, Rev. J. A.....	Yonkers, N. Y.
Colby, Mr. Gardner.....	New York City
Cole, Rev. Arthur S.....	Manasquan, N. J.
Coleman, Mr. George W.....	Boston, Mass.
Coler, Professor S. P.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Conant, Thos. O., LL.D.....	New York City
Conklin, Rev. J. C.....	Trenton, N. J.
Crossley, Mr. J. H.....	Bridgeport, Conn.
Davis, Mr. E. G.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Dayton, Mr. A. A.....	Albany, N. Y.
DeWolf, Rev. D.....	Newark, N. J.
Dickerson, Mr. J. S.....	Chicago, Ill.
Dickinson, J. T., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Donovan, Professor W. N.....	Newton Centre, Mass.
Dunning, Mr. Amos W.....	Haverhill, Mass.
Dussman, Rev. John.....	Gurzalla, India
Elliott, Mr. A. J.....	Peoria, Ill.
Elmer, Rev. F. D.....	Winsted, Conn.
Evans, Rev. P. S.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Fennell, W. G., D.D.....	Hartford, Conn.
Fortune, Rev. A. W.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Foster, Rev. Allyn K.....	Worcester, Mass.
Fowler, Mr. B. F.....	Haddonfield, N. J.
Francis, J. A., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Franklin, Rev. J. H.....	Colorado Springs, Colo.
Garrison, J. H., LL.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Garton, Rev. J. V.....	West Somerville, Mass.
Glover, Mrs. H. R.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Greene, B. A., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Greene, President J. P., D.D.....	Liberty, Mo.
Greene, S. H., D.D., LL.D.....	Washington, D. C.
Greul, Frederick B., D.D.....	Haverhill, Mass.
Grout, Mr. T. J.....	New York City
Haggard, F. P., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Hare, Rev. J. Madison.....	Jersey City, N. J.
Hartwell, Mr. F. W.....	Providence, R. I.
Haskell, Mr. Edward H.....	Boston, Mass.

Hayden, Rev. W. L.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Henderson, Professor C. R., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Henson, L. L., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Hoben, Professor Allan, Ph.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Holmes, Rev. H. C.....	Lawrenceville, Ill.
Holyoke, Edw. M., D.D.....	Providence, R. I.
Howe, Rev., T. C.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Hudson, Rev. Birney S.....	Atlantic City, N. J.
Huhns, Rev. F.....	Houston Heights, Tex.
Hull, Rev. R. C.....	Summit, N. J.
Jennings, Mr. A. E.....	Detroit, Mich.
Jones, Mr. L. B.....	Wilmington, Del.
Jones, Rev. O. E.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Jones, Philip L., D.D.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Kelly, Claude, D.D.....	Bellevue, Pa.
Knapp, Rev. A. E.....	Amsterdam, N. Y.
Knox, Superintendent George Platt.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Laws, Curtis Lee, D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Lawson, Principal George B.....	Saxton River, Vt.
L'Hommedieu, Rev. J. B.....	Greenwich, N. Y.
Leshner, Mr. A. L.....	New York City
Lewis, F. G., Ph.D.....	Upland, Pa.
Lindsley, Mr. Irenaeus H.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Loxley, Mr. B. Ogden.....	Philadelphia, Pa.
Lyell, John W., D.D.....	Camden, N. J.
Macintosh, Professor Douglas C.....	New Haven, Conn.
MacMurray, Rev. D. A.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
McGarvey, Rev. J. F.....	Detroit, Mich.
McGlothlin, Professor A. J.....	Louisville, Ky.
McLean, Rev. A.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Magill, Rev. David T.....	Chicago, Ill.
Marble, Rev. F. E., Ph.D.....	Cambridge, Mass.
Mathews, Professor Shailer, D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Maxson, Rev. C. H.....	Marquette, Mich.
Merriam, E. F., D.D.....	Boston, Mass.
Moody, Rev. Thomas.....	New York City
Moore, Mr. Paul.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Mosely, Mr. John.....	Needham, Mass.

Moss, Rev. C. H.....	Malden, Mass.
Nash, Rev. C. E.....	New York City
Needham, President C. W.....	Washington, D. C.
Neubauer, Rev. Eugene.....	Goshen, Ind.
Norton, Rev. F. W.....	Hiram, Ohio
Oeschger, Rev. Wm.....	Vincennes, Ind.
Osborne, Mr. Thomas D.....	Louisville, Ky.
Owen, Rev. William Russell.....	Baltimore, Md.
Parker, Rev. F. C. W.....	Portland, Ore.
Partridge, Warren G., D.D.....	Pittsburg, Pa.
Pattison, Mr. F. W.....	East Boston, Mass.
Pattison, Harold, D.D.....	St. Paul, Minn.
Peaver, Mr. Frank W.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Penny, Rev. F. D.....	Burlington, Vt.
Phillips, J. W., Ph.D., D.D.....	Binghamton, N. Y.
Philputt, Rev. Allan B.....	Indianapolis, Ind.
Philputt, Rev. James M., D.D.....	St. Louis, Mo.
Pinkham, Rev. Henry W.....	Denver, Colo.
Pollard, Professor E. B., Ph.D., D.D.....	Chester, Pa.
Powers, Frederick D., D.D.....	Washington, D. C.
Quay, George M., M.D.....	East Cleveland, Ohio
Reed, Rev. Delavan B.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Rhoades, W. C. P., D.D.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Richardson, Rev. W. S.....	New York City
Rowland, Mr. Ed. A.....	Rome, N. Y.
Rowlison, Rev. C. C.....	Iowa City, Iowa
Ryrie, Mr. James.....	Toronto, Canada
Sage, Mr. John D.....	Cincinnati, Ohio
Sears, Rev. Charles H.....	New York City
Schwartz, Rev. Albert.....	Clinton, Ill.
Skevington, Rev. Samuel J.....	Newark, N. J.
Slater, Professor John R.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sloper, Mr. A. J.....	New Britain, Conn.
Smith, Professor Gerald B.....	Chicago, Ill.
Smith, Professor J. M. P.....	Chicago, Ill.
Stevens, Professor W. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.

Stewart, Dean J. W. A., D.D.....	Rochester, N. Y.
Sweet, Rev. F. W.....	Adrian, Mich.
Taylor, President J. M., LL.D.....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Thomson, Hon. D. E., K.C.....	Toronto, Canada
Thresher, Mr. Albert.....	Dayton, Ohio
Tomes, Rev. O. E.....	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Van Arsdale, Rev. G. B.....	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Vander Roest, Mr. William.....	Pelham, N. Y.
Van Kirk, Rev. J. M.....	Kinross, Iowa
Vosburgh, G. B., D.D.....	Denver, Colo.
Vose, Rev. Riley A.....	Owego, N. Y.
Walker, Rev. Louis A.....	Demarest, N. J.
Wallace, Mr. H. S.....	New York City
Wallace, W. B., D.D.....	Cleveland, Ohio
Waterman, Professor L.....	Hillsdale, Mich.
Watson, Charles H., D.D.....	Arlington, Mass.
Whidden, Howard P., D.D.....	Dayton, Ohio
White, C. L., D.D.....	New York City
Whitman, B. L., D.D.....	Seattle, Wash.
Whitney, Mr. Geo. C.....	Worcester, Mass.
Willett, Herbert L., D.D.....	Chicago, Ill.
Williams, Professor C. L.....	Granville, Ohio
Williams, Mr. Mornay.....	New York City
Woods, Rev. F. C.....	Baltimore, Md.
Woods, Rev. J. R.....	Mason City, Neb.
Wright, Mr. W. J.....	Cincinnati, Ohio

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS, 1909
FIRST DAY

Afternoon Session

MADISON AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY

Tuesday, November 9, 1909

3 o'clock P. M.

REV. THEO. A. K. GESSLER, D.D.: In the absence of Dr. Sanders who is the Chairman of the Executive Committee, it is my duty to inform you that the Executive Committee has requested Rev. Leighton Williams, D.D., of this city to act as President of these sessions of the Congress.

REV. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS, D.D.: The Congress will come to order and be led in prayer by Rev. J. Hervey Appleton, of the Episcopal church of this city.

REV. J. H. APPLETON: O Thou who art the truth, in whom is all purity and all grace, may thy spirit abide upon us and upon these our brethren all, in the deliberations of this Congress. For thy glory are they met and to thee above all human reasons or predilection we would look that thy grace may lead us into all truth. Move upon our hearts; give us the surrendering of even our choicest thought to the power of thy blessed truth. So may the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ his Son enter every heart, move every speech, and bring all into that blessed unity which shall correspond to the unity of thy church triumphant to which we are looking forward and for which we are seeking and laboring here on earth. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Savior. *Amen.*

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Eaton, the pastor of the church, will give the address of welcome.

DR. EATON: *Mr. President, members of the Congress, visiting friends:* I have been asked by Dr. Sanders to extend to you a welcome. He mitigated your sentence, however, by assuring me that I must not consume more than two minutes. I therefore extend to you on behalf of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church a most cordial welcome to our home.

Back of these walls (*indicating*) is a very beautiful building which we place at your disposal. In addition to this we hope that you will enjoy being here and will make use of our building as seemeth unto you good. You are welcome to this church; you are welcome to the city, and to everything else that you and I can think of without mentioning.

And now in closing permit me to say that we are all expecting from this Congress a spiritual and intellectual uplift. We expect to see unfolded before us a clearer vista of those divine truths to which we have surrendered our lives; and perhaps in the light of the discussions which are to come we shall get a clearer vision of Him for whom and by whom and unto whom are all things and in whom all things hold together.

We are glad you are here, and we hope and pray that this Congress will meet the highest expectations of us all.

THE PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Congress it becomes my pleasant duty to reply to these words of courteous welcome.

It has been said that the Baptist Congress often is received with suspicion and it departs in high favor and approval. That seems to be its history in the past, more, perhaps, than in these more recent years, and the reason for it is not far to seek. For we Baptist people, while we do believe in liberty of conscience and in liberty of prophesying, have found as a matter of experience that this liberty tends rather to union than to disunion; and we have therefore come to feel a very high sense of the importance of views that seem to us correct views and that are views generally held and received by our people. But the Baptist Congress has always maintained that liberty of conscience meant primarily in practice liberty to differ. Liberty to agree is a very unnecessary privilege, if it be a privilege at all; it becomes a real privilege when we are allowed to differ and yet hold full rights in the fellowship. And yet the Baptist Congress, while it believes thus in the widest expression of diversity of views, is not in any way careless of the conception of orthodoxy, for orthodoxy is a matter of immense importance. It certainly must be as important if not more important in religion, as in science, but the Baptist Congress has always stood for that scientific idea of the method of attaining orthodoxy and maintaining orthodoxy,

namely, the continual reverent study of the facts and a willingness always to learn. The Baptist Congress in that attitude has gone forward through its twenty-eight years of history, and I think has now clearly fixed itself in the affections of our people.

I remember years ago when I was invited to become its secretary that I consulted a very well-known leader among our people in this city and he said to me, "Don't accept it." He said, "It is a dying body; it is not likely to last long." It has lasted a good many years since then—more than I like personally to recall very often, and it has now proved its right and duty.

After all, my friends, such a book as that which has had a good deal of prominence this last year or so, Edmund Gosse's book, *Father and Son*, has shown us that the older method of seeking and maintaining an orthodox opinion sometimes becomes a very sad and bitter failure, as it did between that noble father and his son—both admirable men. We have, I say, not lost our conception of the value of orthodoxy; we have simply studied other methods of maintaining it.

I would like also to remind the brethren present that the Baptist Congress, while not in name founded for the purpose, has had a very considerable influence in extending the unity of our Baptist people. We, I think, were among the very first to become in any sense international. We crossed the border into Canada and held one of our sessions—now many years since—in Toronto: one of the very best of them. And in our recent session at Chicago the Free Baptists and the Disciples of Christ were accorded an equal place with our own denomination on the platform. We believe in full freedom of discussion; we have, however, very strict rules. I think it will be my duty, in a moment, to call upon the secretary to read these rules and to remind the audience that while no action is taken in a Baptist Congress, no votes are allowed, we do preserve very strict rules of order. While we allow full freedom of opinion, we allow only the recognized and restricted expression of it within the limits and according to the rules prevailing in all deliberative bodies.

I hope that the meeting may keep up to the high rank of those that have preceded it. Permit me to say how deeply I

feel the pleasure and honor of presiding over this gathering to which you have elected me.

I will call upon our secretary to read the rules here.

The Secretary then read the Rules of Discussion.

THE PRESIDENT: Our first topic this afternoon on this rich programme is "Can Pragmatism Furnish a Philosophical Basis for Theology?" I call first on the writers, and the first of these is Professor Melbourne S. Read, Ph.D., of Colgate University. (*Applause.*)

PROFESSOR MELBOURNE S. READ, PH.D., of Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., then read the following paper:

DOES PRAGMATISM FURNISH A PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS FOR THEOLOGY?

The great claim and merit of pragmatism lie in its appeal to the realities of experience. These are its realities, and philosophy becomes for it the setting-forth of the general conditions under which these realities present themselves. On what experience frankly shows does this philosophy rest its case. In this it is not altogether unique, for there have been and are other empiricisms; but the appeal to experience, one's whole experience, and nothing but experience, is here especially insistent and full of meaning. Religious experience takes its place along with other phases of experience, none the better and none the worse for being religious. And if theology be the result of reflection upon this religious experience, we naturally have the expectant inquiry which appears as the topic which this paper is to introduce.

Without attempting an exposition of pragmatist doctrine, it is desirable to call to mind some of its main characteristics and contentions.

The springs of the movement are many. First in importance, in my judgment, is the view of the human consciousness in terms of biological evolution. All preserved variations have a genuine utility in the development of the world's processes. The function of knowledge, and of consciousness in general, becomes the illumination of the pathway of the organism and its guidance along the way. The development of mental processes is justified

and secured by the unique and invaluable services they render. When once consciousness is looked upon in this way as a product and helper in the struggle, like unto the eye, or the vertebral column, it becomes difficult to distract one's attention from this its primary significance. Knowledge, feeling, and determination here find their origin and their obvious task and opportunity. Forms of perception and categories of the understanding lose their lordly position of static, immovable domination, and acquire a history and a new significance. They become fluid characteristics of the knowledge gropings of the race, postulates, hypotheses, to persist or disappear as their efficiency in interpretation and guidance seems to warrant.

Another spring of the movement has been the method of the sciences and the practical application of scientific knowledge to human needs. For the scientist a theory is true if it works. By the tested theory the scientist can control the further development of experience. The applicability of this theory in experimentation, and in devising new methods of satisfying human needs, shows, or makes, its truth. For the scientist then knowledge is decidedly instrumental in character.

A third spring of the movement, and somewhat justifying its rather peculiar name, goes back farther in the history of thought. A world whose essence consisted in merely being known, or a world standing apart in solid isolation from the inner life of man, however satisfactory to the idealist or the realist, has ever failed to be taken with deepest seriousness by some pragmatic souls. To illustrate the point, I need mention in modern philosophy only two names, Kant, who urged for the primacy of the practical reason, and Schopenhauer, who held that the world is fundamentally will rather than idea. The realities of the world of feeling, faith, and determination have been also set forth in literature and believed in by humanity as being of unquestionable right as worthy as those of reflective thought.

The pragmatic method is that of empirical trial carried out consistently in interpreting the realities of experience. Thoughts, ideas, judgments, become working hypotheses, instruments by which one attempts to control the flow of events. If the tool will

not work, does not lead one anywhere, or in any satisfactory way control life's fluid course, it is discarded, no matter what ancient trademark the tool may be imprinted with. If the idea fails in this practical test an honest soul following the pragmatic method will have none of it. If this idea cannot show what it is good for, how it differs from some other idea in the practical issues of life, it can hardly be taken seriously. Furthermore the idea is essentially just what it can show itself to be in the way of *making* a difference. If it *makes* no difference, then it is just indifferent, trifling, of no account. The proper mission of the idea, or judgment, as used in pragmatic method, is shown by the function of consciousness biologically considered, by the scientist in his quiet quests, and by every son of man who tries to be really at home in *this* world.

This method of course suggests the pragmatist meaning of truth—not truth in the abstract, but truths about the world of real experience. Ideas, judgments are true when they fulfil their proper function, when they become means for ordering well the refractory elements of a flowing and overflowing world. That hypothesis which enables man to master nature is the true one. That conception which enables one satisfactorily to handle, change, and direct the fluid experience, is the true one. And not only is its truth thus tested by its satisfactory workability, but this constitutes the truth of the conception or really makes it true. The agreement of truths with reality is not that of mere mirroring, but means genuine hearty co-operation in the thick of the battle. Judgments *become* true just in so far as they actually do their work satisfactorily in the particular exigencies of understanding the world and controlling life's experience.

Experiences are genuine revelations of reality for the pragmatist. We find in pragmatism no contrast between reality and experience, as Kant and the agnostics would hold, nor indeed between an absolute experience and human experiences, of which the idealists make so much. Experience is rich in the variety of its manifestations but these are all self-characterizations of reality. The soul or the knowing process should not be looked at as something apart from the real world, but as just as real as the world of matter. They are all a part and parcel of the same

world, as the evolutionist has shown; and when we make distinctions we make them in reality itself, one aspect of experience being set over against another aspect for certain life purposes. Indeed these distinctions and the many limitations and conditions of the varied experiences are themselves just the forms under which reality exists, while experience itself is fully able to take account of these various aspects. Against the old distinction between the phenomenal and the real, pragmatism protests, regarding these as but useful distinctions within experience, expressing fundamentally for the will and the affections its better and worse phases.

Experiences, we are warned, must not be identified with the objective, the material, that of which the physical sciences treat, or that which is *experienced*. A philosophy of reality must not be merely a philosophy developed from these physical sciences. Nor again should experience be identified with the subjective, the conscious as personal, the *experimenting* aspect. Philosophy cannot be merely a following-out of psychology. Experience is richer than either of these distinctions for they both come out of it when reflection becomes necessary. Philosophy must take account of all the riches of experience as represented by the mental and social sciences as well as the physical. The pragmatist insists on keeping his ear to the ground in order that all the varied rumblings and whisperings may be heard.

The world as a world of knowledge, as a world of action for this purpose or that, as a world of feeling and of values—for the pragmatist philosophy must be true to all these as features of a world really active, changing, developing, through and through.

Reality reveals itself or experience functions in several ways. We may speak of the way of knowledge, or the scientific way. Then there is the economic, utilitarian, or technical. Related to this is the world of art, the aesthetic-artistic phase of reality. Then we have the moral or ethical, and finally the religious aspect of reality, or experience as religion. From the pragmatist point of view these are all to be considered as valid, each for its purpose. As to the purpose and purport of the religious aspect of reality some further inquiry must be made.

I am not aware that we have from the official pragmatists any

thoroughgoing statement of the nature, validity, and function of religion in the world. Nor is there anything like an attempt explicitly to answer the question which is the subject of this paper. It is rather from the scattered material available, and still more from what seems the drift and meaning of the doctrine, that these questions may be definitely considered.

Certainly it is held, as we have already said, that religious experience must be considered as much a part of real immediate experience as any other phase or aspect of it. The world is not merely a world known through the medium of scientific knowledge, it is just as really a world aesthetic and artistic, a world of moral values and endeavors, a world of economic stress, and finally just as really a world of the kind which religious experience reveals or makes. In the present as in the past there is the great fact of experience experienced religiously. There is a candor in pragmatic doctrine at this point which should not be overlooked. In its insistence on the realities and values of experienced religion it is not surpassed by the religious devotee. Whether pragmatism affords a basis for theology or not, there is no doubt as to its serious manner in regarding religion.

For the pragmatist religion has the same claim as have science, art, and industry, in that it is on the whole useful and satisfying. It really belongs of right in this world because it works. Knowledge in all its forms, truths—these are justified by, and really consist in, instrumental value in achieving, as we have seen. The development of the fine arts evolving the ideal products which are our delight, moral and social struggle and reform, industrial wonder-working with its still more wonderful promise—all these for the pragmatist are but experience or reality constantly modifying itself into more useful and satisfying forms. Religion, too, in its progress from primitive crudity through many devious ways to its present high vantage ground, is the inevitable expression of the human spirit ever making its career in experience more satisfying and ever becoming more capable in determining the realities of the present and future. It is a necessity in the struggle for life, in the interpretation of the world, and in the spirit's part creation of its further world adventures. The pragmatic philosophy is thus in line with what seems to be the main

trend of religious study in our day, the investigation of actual religious experiences giving us our psychologies of religion with the inevitable philosophizing thereon.

Dewey has called religion essentially a sense of ratio between what is under our control and what is not. James makes it consist of those "feelings and experiences of individual men in their solitude so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine."

These religious emotions and beliefs have in all the ages been potent factors in molding future experience. If we acted by sight alone and not also by faith there would hardly be room for religion. The further reaches of possible experience, those which we cannot with exactness define and control, but which we must in a way reckon with, these mysterious phases of reality which we experience personally in the way of non-cognitive processes, faith, awe, communion, these are in their nature essentially religious. These experiences are real, they are and have ever been of the greatest service in the evolution of man and society. Their very persistence under many forms indicates their vitality and the fact that they are products and partners of the actual world in its development. They are facts of individual life, are native to the human spirit and cannot be let go, they have been tested and believed in so far as experience reaches. That which is regarded as objective in this experience has been, in its unsophisticated state of the tension of sentiment, vague and ill-defined but most deeply believed in, while reflection on what these non-controlled factors may be has produced all the theologies and all the dogmas of religion, which have seemed solutions to the elated but sorely perplexed spirit of man.

This religious experience is very fluid, adapts itself marvelously to the exigencies of events, has satisfactions unique and unspeakably valuable, pieces out the unsatisfactoriness of the other phases of reality, has high heaven for its witness and its helper, believes in the dark, is satisfied with scant measure, and in its triumph over the ills of life issues a challenge to all other forms of experience, that it possesses the secret of the world and is that which is most satisfactory, works best, is truest. Its values

are the supreme values and all else seems something tributary or something to be overcome.

But according to pragmatism there is a deeper meaning in the claim of the reality of religious experience. It has not only proved a useful expedient in man's journey through the world, not only a refuge and a sustaining comfort when other values are blotted out, nor yet merely a spur to high endeavor. It is nothing less than a call to remake or help remake the world. Experience is as really fluid as it seems and the issues no one can safely prophesy more than in small part. Reality is made day by day, and moment by moment, as experience modifies itself according to the various situations and crises which arise within it. The field is free. The results of the races are not outlined beforehand on the paper of agreement. The game is not meaningless. What the religious consciousness needs and calls for, that it really has the opportunity to bring to pass. If the world is as yet a place of ill repute and shifting satisfactions, it may be made by strong endeavor a place where the ideals of the religious consciousness shall become a genuine part and parcel of the world. The economic stress calls for many inventions for a certain control of experience. These really come and the world of economic experience is different from what it was, different really, and not merely on its surface. It is a genuine remolding of elements. It is none other with the world of real experience from the artistic or from the ethical point of view. The whole process of organic evolution tells the same story of need of re-adjustment of control of new beings in a new world. For the ideals of religion there is the same opportunity and clear call to go up and possess the land. According to the pragmatic conception of religion it is a real enterprise which is on foot, a real battle which is being or may be fought, and the issue, what of that? It is what it is made to be. There is a real chance for defeat or for victory. As in the sphere of organic evolution, in the realm of scientific research, in that of economic prosperity vs. adversity, reality is constantly reasserting the elements called the better, and ignoring or destroying the elements called the worse; and as this is all a metaphysically real world-struggle, so like unto these others is the religious experience with its own

peculiar better and worse, its own real struggle to achieve the one and conquer the other. Reality is thus to its very core involved in the religious life, its very quality is in the issue, its fortunes thus dependent. The contests are real contests; and the ideals of a religious faith valiantly striven for may transform the very depths of being. Pragmatism thus lays the deepest stress in action upon those very events and deeds which the religious spirit of our day is making so prominent, and regarding as all-important.

When one reflects on the possible consequences of these pragmatic views for theological thought, one may at least conclude that the world really lends itself to the realization through human endeavor of the ideals set up by the religious consciousness of man. Whether or not reality actively co-operates in this holy enterprise pragmatism does not assert. But it is possible that the pragmatic method may indirectly yield something of a satisfactory answer.

And for this we must return to some pragmatic ways of regarding the structure and function of knowledge. The forms of perception and the categories of the understanding, to use Kantian terms, and the so-called laws of thought, are not fixed and unalterable, static molds, as it were, of experience. They have had a long evolution, and have developed from timid, tentative, as yet ill-formed methods of mastering or controlling the flux of events, to the clear, decisive, practically necessary methods of determination of the pure reason of man. They are not the rationalistic axioms they were once supposed to be, but mere postulates after all, racial hypotheses which have been perfected and tested by experience, and have proved and constituted their validity in that they have worked. It has proved satisfactory to interpret reality in these ways. These ways of judging are useful instruments, only relatively fixed, fundamentally adjustable. They are the ways by which the spirit of man has been able to interpret and control his world. They are the active productions of the spirit, justified in experience in so far as that experience is regarded as object of knowledge. So with all empirically inferred scientific hypotheses. These too are trials of the mind to be proved or disproved in the issue.

But the spirit of man has never been willing to stop here. In Kantian terms the practical reason has always asserted its claims. Life is more than knowing. Experience is affectional, appreciative, and active, as well as cognitive. Pragmatism is the champion of these aspects of reality. And if indeed the scientific interpretation of reality is at bottom itself practical, if it proceeds by hypotheses set up in faith to be proved or disproved by the issue honestly lived, if truth is fundamentally satisfactory, it is not surprising that the spirit of man should have its ambition fired to further exploits of interpretation. The faiths of the spirit of a moral and religious sort have the same claim to be tried as have those of purely scientific intent. They may not have as manifold and sharply defined a concrete perceived material to work upon, the actively imaginative nature of the spirit may be more decidedly manifest, the relative proportions between fact and postulated belief may be changed, but after all, the exploits of the so-called practical reason or spirit of valued faiths in men are not decidedly unlike those of the purely cognitive sort, there being a difference in degree rather than in kind. But what faiths and what beliefs are we entitled to hold as valid, on this general certificate of worth? Here pragmatism warns us that we must not be too hasty. It does not give, Professor Dewey has said, "an uncontrolled field for some special beliefs to run riot in. . . . Any one of our beliefs is subject to criticism, revision, and even ultimate elimination." That this does happen to beliefs in the wear and tear of experience no one can doubt. The pragmatist is entitled on his philosophy to those beliefs, projections of the affections and the will, which in any way tend to make more satisfactory the actual exigencies of experience. Beliefs in the moral order of the world over and above specific human endeavor, beliefs in a personal God, the friend and helper of men in their struggles, such beliefs it would seem are in accord with pragmatic doctrine, just in so far as they make actual concrete experiences of life more full of abiding satisfaction, not of the order of the fool's paradise, but the kind resulting from a better grip of life's realities, making them more amenable to ideals. In other words, beliefs that actually work. But the tests must be real, and this is not an easy matter for an honest man,

not content with empty words with a high sound, and a sickly sentimentality.

If these beliefs, subjected to a fair trial and genuine criticism, actually work satisfactorily in any real sense, they become in just such measure true. They are true in the sense that they are really justified in understanding our total experience, hypotheses which work in the sense that they really do straighten out life's crooked ways. There is much of faith and comparatively little definite proof in them when compared with strict scientific research; but, if we have interpreted the pragmatic method correctly, the difference is one of degree, for all search for truths is of one kind, the attempting to find out what will work satisfactorily in interpreting and controlling the flux of events.

A recent critic of pragmatism has maintained that according to pragmatic doctrine one is deprived of the right to talk about God and belief in him because he is not included within our experience, while all truth and meaning according to the pragmatist must be confined to matters within human experience. But if pragmatism is right in extending the term experience beyond that of sense-perception, and if such a hypothesis as that of a God of some character should enable one to understand that experience better, be more at home with it and better satisfied in relation to it, then the gulf between the empirical and the so-called transcendent would be in a manner bridged. A God that could not be in this manner explanatory of experience, that would make no practical difference in experience, such a God would, as the critic implies, have no place in the pragmatic philosophy. Beliefs that transcend life's varied experience in the sense of making no actual and advantageous differences in it, the pragmatist must forego. It is friendly to such beliefs as will submit to the test of being really worth something in actual experiences. In its scheme of reality and in its epistemology it seeks to give them a place and a valid claim.

There are some doctrines and beliefs, however, which pragmatism is not friendly to. The pragmatists one and all repudiate the God or Absolute of the monistic idealists. Their reasons for this rejection are fundamental, and have been vigorously set forth in the controversial literature on the subject. The Absolute is

generally held to be a mere abstraction and essentially helpless to perform its august tasks. It cannot get into the world of reality, and can really make no difference in men's actual experience. With this rejection one loses the basis of that theology which has been so dominant in somewhat recent times and of which I suppose the late Principal Caird was the chief exponent.

Pragmatism would fail to recognize as valid the traditional intellectualistic proofs of the existence of God. It would be as stern a critic of these as Kant himself. And so with the proofs of the doctrine of immortality and many a theological dogma. Theologies constructed upon such an intellectualistic basis would find pragmatism very destructive. Beliefs must be tested in the fiery furnace of practical endeavor, and their effective and satisfactory usefulness clearly shown. We are called upon to accept those beliefs or faith hypotheses which stand this test.

The theology of pragmatism will not consist of speculative reasonings of traditional metaphysics, any more than of the piecing-together of supposedly authoritative dogmas. In keeping with its method, its conception of truth, and its view of reality, it will be essentially an inductive study of concrete religious experience and a testing of faith constructions by the facts of developing experience, a very decided testing of faith by works. It will seek to ascertain common factors in religious experiences, and working faiths, to establish those hypotheses which seem to be implied in these actual experienced realities, and to bring them into harmony with those other phases of reality which are within the realm of science, morals, art, and industry.

The theoretic basis afforded to religion and theology by pragmatism is thus akin to that afforded to the subject-matter and method of science. It limits theology's range, questions some of its fundamental tenets, makes light of many of its metaphysical dogmas and intellectualistic methods, and for this will in turn be cavalierly dismissed by many. On the other hand, the new reading of reality giving religious experience a fundamental significance, the conception of truth and the place of faith coupled with test, in science as in religious belief, the patient inductive method insisting on finding all values in actual concrete experiences of actual human beings, these and other features of prag-

matism will commend it to many who take most seriously the stress and struggle of the world, who look on religion as an active participant in the great world drama, and who believe that theology most valuable which keeps in closest touch with human need and human hope.

THE PRESIDENT: I will call next on Professor Douglas C. Macintosh of the Yale Divinity School, New Haven.

PROFESSOR DOUGLAS C. MACINTOSH, PH.D., then read as follows:

CAN PRAGMATISM FURNISH A PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS FOR THEOLOGY?

In order to establish a negative answer to this question one would simply have to show either that pragmatism itself is not tenable, or else that it can afford theology no adequate support. To establish the affirmative, however, it would be necessary to show in the first place that pragmatism is in itself tenable, and in the second place that it is compatible with and gives some real support to theology. But for the would-be theological pragmatist himself neither of these positions can be readily accepted as established without the other. On the one hand he cannot say that pragmatism supports theology unless it is itself tenable, for if untenable, so far from being the philosophical basis of theology, it cannot be a real basis for anything. On the other hand, the person who finds religion essential cannot, on pragmatic principles, accept pragmatism, if it is not at least compatible with the fundamentals of religion and theology—unless, indeed, he needs pragmatism more than he needs religion. While beginning, then, by inquiring whether pragmatism is tenable or not, it must be recognized that a final affirmative answer cannot be given until we have considered the question of the bearing of pragmatism upon the essential affirmations of religious faith.

The investigation of the question, Is pragmatism tenable? involves, of course, the preliminary inquiry, What is pragmatism? To answer this question fairly is no small task in itself.

A common attitude toward the whole pragmatist movement is expressed in the criticism, "If it is new, it is nonsense; if it is

old, it is obvious."¹ When it is affirmed that true judgments must be ultimately satisfactory, and that none but true judgments can be really satisfactory as working principles in the service of legitimate human interests; that indeed all true judgments about reality are actually or potentially useful, so that the experienced usefulness of a belief indicates with more or less probability its truth, most thinkers agree that this is obviously true. There is an intimate relation between the truth and the practical utility of judgments, but the truth, they say, is something to be established independently of the usefulness; we test the truth first and find it useful afterward. Such a position may be called *semi-pragmatism*, but it is not pragmatism proper.

Many of those who criticize pragmatism seem to regard it as the doctrine that all satisfactory judgments are true, simply by virtue of their giving satisfaction to some particular desire; that all judgments found useful in the realization of purposes are, to the extent of their usefulness, true. Now it is undoubtedly true that much of the popular so-called pragmatism is of this sort. And Professor James himself often uses such unguarded expressions that he has to complain, in spite of his popular style, that he is very generally misunderstood as teaching some such doctrine. For example, in his book entitled *Pragmatism* he says, "Truth is only the expedient in the way of our thinking,"² and again, "On pragmatic principles we cannot reject any hypothesis if consequences useful to life flow from it."³ And yet in his latest work, *The Meaning of Truth*, he characterizes as "silly" and "an obvious absurdity" the view attributed to him "that anyone who believes a proposition to be true must first have made out clearly that its consequences *are* good, and that his belief must primarily be in that fact,"⁴ or "that whatever proves subjectively expedient in the way of our thinking is 'true' in the absolute and unrestricted sense of the word."⁵ Now this doctrine which Professor James seems at times to teach, but which he strenuously repudiates, is very evidently, as it has been characterized, nonsense. It is what the newspaper wit had in mind when

¹ E. E. Slosson, in *The Independent*, February 21, 1907.

² P. 222.

⁴ Pp. 272 f.

³ P. 273.

⁵ P. 231.

he wrote, "The Eskimos would seem to have a strong natural leaning toward pragmatism." But this is better called *pseudo-pragmatism*, for it would be a very superficial judgment which would identify the essence of the whole pragmatic movement with this absurd doctrine.

But if the essential nature of pragmatism consists neither in the doctrine that all true judgments are useful, nor in the doctrine that all useful judgments are true; if it must be differentiated from semi-pragmatism, which is obvious, and from pseudo-pragmatism, which is nonsense, just what then is it? What escape is there from the horns of this dilemma? Now it is the fault of the typical absolutist critic of pragmatism that he has a passion for expressing every movement and tendency in the form of a universal principle, and it is his mistake to suppose that when he has refuted the principle he has virtually annihilated the movement. And it may very well be that the proper pragmatist easily avoids both horns of the intellectualist's dilemma.

The fairest way to answer the question, What is pragmatism? is to settle it pragmatically. In pragmatism, then, what is the practical attitude? What does it really propose to do? To this the answer is that it proposes, in any crisis in which a judgment is demanded, to take the most promising suggestion as a working hypothesis and test its truth by the way it *works*. If the hypothesis has been thoroughly tested and has worked satisfactorily, it is properly called not only useful but true. Thus usefulness is taken as a mark of truth, although it is not claimed universally, that all judgments that are subjectively useful or temporarily satisfactory are objectively true. But further, pragmatism takes as its working hypothesis that every test there is for truth can be stated as a test of working, and that the results of speculation are problematic until verified in the experiences of life.

It will be seen then that pragmatism proper does not make for a greater laxity of thought, but rather for a more rigorous and extensive application of the principles of scientific method. Now in all scientific judgment the predicate is regarded as a mere *trial*-predicate and the judgment is made purely hypothetically at first, in order that by acting as if it were true it may be shown by the manner of its working whether the best hypothesis was used, that

is, whether the best trial-predicate was employed. And pragmatism, as we have intimated, does not propose to find a substitute for science in the study of nature or history, nor to change scientific procedure, nor to discredit in any way the results of scientific investigation. On the contrary it takes scientific procedure as its model, and undertakes to make philosophy, with which it is chiefly concerned, more scientific. If there is to be thinking about any reality beyond the reach of the phenomenal sciences, that thinking must imitate those sciences as far as possible; it must refer to experience wherever possible and find truth only through some kind of verification of working hypotheses. This surely is a tenable position.

But pragmatism is young and vigorous, and it has exhibited a good many overgrowths and excrescences that will doubtless be pruned away in time. To some extent this is already taking place. Early pragmatism tended to discredit system, consistency, and the so-called theoretical interest. Schiller of Oxford was especially pronounced in this respect. But now it is more usual to find the practical set forth, not as opposed altogether to the theoretical, but as including it as a special type of the practical. Science was described by Professor Dewey six years ago as "just the forging and arranging of instrumentalities for dealing with individual cases of experience."⁶ But what shall we say about the pursuit of science as something interesting apart from its further application; what about the interest in truth for its own sake? This is now interpreted as an instance of the shift of interest whereby the process of securing means to possible practical ends becomes interesting and an end in itself, the original practical purpose being lost sight of, and this new purpose being now itself an active principle, organizing other activities into its service as means.

It is to be expected also that pragmatists will give up the somewhat dogmatic assertion that any particular truth has only temporary value. There is a manifest contradiction, as has been repeatedly pointed out, in stating universally that there is no universal truth, assuming that it will be permanently satisfactory to hold that no truth will permanently satisfy, that all things else

⁶ *The Logical Conditions of Scientific Treatment of Morality*, p. 8.

are in a flux but only pragmatism has come to stay. To guard his position the pragmatist must say that it is simply his working hypothesis that all truths will prove ephemeral; but as a matter of fact he tacitly assumes that some truth at least will be permanently valid, and he might more consistently adopt as his working hypothesis that some human judgments will be abidingly true.

Again, there is a decided tendency among pragmatists to go beyond the hypothesis that the only way to test truth is by an experience of its working, and to assert that truth is a species of utility. Of course this does not necessarily involve the crass utilitarianism that has been charged against pragmatism, but which really belongs to what we have styled pseudo-pragmatism. And yet it is questionable whether pragmatists may not prematurely identify their position with this doctrine, for the following reasons. In the first place the doctrine that truth can be defined accurately and adequately in terms of utility can be established, if at all, only after a thorough analysis of the psychology of meaning and of the judging process, and after an adequate examination of the representational theory of truth. Again, the statement lends itself very readily to misinterpretation on the part of critics, thus hindering the acceptance of what truth there is in pragmatism. In addition to this, when taken as a principle, it tends to lead one into making statements which come dangerously near to pseudo-pragmatism. And, lastly, since one can set forth, as above, the essence of pragmatism without making use of this disputed principle, on the pragmatic ground that no difference should be recognized unless it *makes* a difference, the pragmatist should perhaps content himself with the irreducible minimum definition of pragmatism as the hypothesis that there is no test of truth which is not essentially a test of usefulness in some concrete situation. The *necessary*, that is, what man really *needs* to believe in order to live as he ought, is true. And this fundamental hypothesis of pragmatism is still a working one; it has not been shown to be scientifically untenable.

But even if one should accept the essential postulate of pragmatism, it does not follow that he must accept all that can truly call itself pragmatism. For even in essential pragmatism wide

is the gate and broad is the way that leads to theological destruction, and many are they that enter in thereby.

At the very gateway of pragmatism there is an obvious downward path whose finger-post points in the direction of animalism. It is undoubtedly true that originally consciousness and in man the judging process were valuable chiefly as means of better adjusting the animal organism to its environment, so that the physical life might be preserved and propagated. In that primitive situation the biological function of judgments, that is, the way in which they functioned in the service of the physical life of the individual and of the race, was, roughly speaking, an index to their truth. But when it is assumed that not only then but now and always the only test of truth is its function in man's struggle for physical existence, we have an animalistic pragmatism which cannot be adequate to the demands of man unless he is satisfied to live simply as an animal. In criticism of this type of pragmatism attention may be called to the notorious fact that in conscious life new interests are constantly developing, many of which are not centered in the fate of the physical organism at all. Moreover, these new interests peculiar to man as a spiritual personality may lead to a transvaluation of all former values, so that instead of life being interpreted in its lowest terms, as the physical existence of the individual and of the race, it is interpreted in its highest terms as the spiritual development and efficiency of the individual and society. Then instead of consciousness and judgments being regarded as mere means for the promotion of the physical life, the physical life is regarded as simply or chiefly instrumental in the promotion of the conscious life in its spiritual aspects. The ideal interests no longer exist for the sake of the physical, but the physical life for the sake of the ideal. Or, as Professor Montague puts it, "Man began to think in order that he might eat; he has evolved to the point where he eats in order that he may think."⁷ Instead of the animalistic type, then, we are led to a *humanistic pragmatism*, in which the truth of judgments is tested by their utility in the service of that life of the individual and of society in which all the peculiarly and legitimately human interests are recognized as

⁷ *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. VI, p. 489.

being of primary importance. Once the ends in view are thoroughly accredited it may be assumed that those judgments that are ultimately necessary for the achievement of these ends are valid. Thus, in the sense of what is humanly necessary, necessity remains the test of the truth of judgments.

But sometimes humanistic pragmatism presents itself in an extremely *individualistic* form. That Dr. Schiller does not entirely escape this is shown by his assertion that two men "with different fortunes, histories, and temperaments *ought not* to arrive at the same metaphysic, nor can they do so honestly."⁸ But over against individualistic pragmatism which would make usefulness or necessity for the individual the sole criterion of truth, pragmatism is coming to state more clearly that it is the function of ideas in the *social* situation that is the test of their truth. For example, Professor A. W. Moore says, "When the pragmatist talks of attention and thought as arising at the point of a need for readjustment, this need must not be taken to mean the need of some one lone, marooned organism or mind *only*. The readjustment is always in and of a 'social situation.'"⁹ The humanistic pragmatism then, to be defensible, must be of the social rather than of the individualistic type. It is not in merely individual but in social utility and necessity that truth is assuredly to be found.

But once more, even this type of humanistic pragmatism may vary according to the interests which are recognized as genuinely and legitimately human. For example, there may develop on the one hand a *positivistic pragmatism*, in which the distinctly religious interest is repudiated, and on the other hand a *religious pragmatism* in which, along with the social, scientific, aesthetic, and moral interests, the distinctly religious interest is recognized as essentially human and valid, so that judgments which are really indispensable to the promotion of the highest type of religious life are regarded as validly claiming our acceptance as true.

Just here is the crux of the question as to the relation of pragmatism to theology. There are some with whom pragmatism is a methodological principle for accrediting the postulates of

⁸ *Studies in Humanism*, p. 18.

⁹ *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. VI, pp. 382, 383.

religious faith with regard to realities that transcend phenomenal experience. There are others who employ their pragmatism to discredit speculation and assertions about transcendent reality generally; they do not recognize as legitimate and significant for philosophy the religious interest which requires to express itself theologically. But theistic religion must accept, and, I take it, is ready to accept the challenge of pragmatism. Any pragmatic philosophy which is to satisfy the whole man at his highest and best, and the race at its highest and best cannot afford to ignore a religion which meets fundamental spiritual need with abiding satisfaction, and which necessarily expresses itself in a theology for which it just as necessarily claims objective validity.

Now pragmatism in alliance with religion is not a new thing under the sun. Exactly that which gave to the Ritschlian theology its vitality and appeal was its religious pragmatism. But the Ritschlian pragmatism was partial; it was applied to religious judgments only, leaving scientific and philosophical judgments apparently on an entirely different footing. In keeping with this absolute distinction between theoretical and value-judgments, it refused to mediate philosophically between its dogmatics on the one hand and the sciences and philosophy of nature on the other. Its pragmatism was thus dualistic in its tendency. It encouraged the impression that certain judgments were valuable and valid in theology, but not in philosophy. The outcome in many cases was that instead of being a thoroughgoing religious pragmatism to the exclusion of positivism, Ritschlianism became a partial and *dualistic pragmatism*, religious in theology and positivistic in philosophy. This ignoring of the logical principle of contradiction is a characteristic of pseudo-pragmatism. Ritschlianism began well in its pragmatic doctrine of religious value-judgments; it should have gone farther and recognized the pragmatic character of all real live judgments as opposed to fossilized propositions, and then, instead of keeping the religious value-judgments in unhealthy solitary confinement, it should have brought them out into the philosophical arena to try conclusions with other judgments about reality. In other words, Ritschlianism made its chief mistake in not seeking to mediate between the scientific

and religious views of the world, taking the essential ideas of religion as working hypotheses in philosophy.

But it is not to philosophy alone, but to life generally, that we must look for the solution of our ultimate problems. The lack of finality in speculation is due to the limitations of philosophy when abstracted from life. With regard to the most fundamental convictions, what is lacking in philosophical demonstration is to be made up by the demonstration of life. Reflection can never furnish a philosophy of reality which can afford to dispense with its bearing upon the moral well-being of society as a test. And indeed, a philosophy that settled all problems apart from life would be no servant of life, but a substitute therefor, such as mediaeval scholasticism often tended to be.

Still it must be equally emphasized that it is not to life without systematic reflection, such as philosophy is, that we must look. That would not be fulness of life that ruled out philosophy. Life is to be guided by reflectively developed hypotheses which subsequent life experience either confirms or rejects. Or, to state it differently, the verification of consistency is to be regarded as an essential part of the verification of life, for, after all, the interest in consistency or rationality is the interest in harmonizing the various practical interests recognized as valid.¹⁰

Thus it will be seen that the kind of use one makes of pragmatism in philosophy depends upon the kind of interests and purposes one has, and so, ultimately, upon the kind of man one is. He who uses pragmatism—or pseudo-pragmatism, to speak accurately—in order to justify the rejection of scientifically obtained results in any department of human investigation, is dishonest at heart. And on the other hand, as Dr. Schiller significantly says, "A perfect and complete metaphysics is an ideal defined only by approximation, and attainable only by the perfecting of life. For it would be the theory of such a perfect life."¹¹ And, we may add, philosophy must make room for a saving gospel for the individual and society, if it is to be pragmatically verified.

So much then may be expected to result from pragmatism in

¹⁰ Cf. Professor A. K. Rogers, *The Religious Conception of the World*, p. 71—a suggestive book in connection with our present topic.

¹¹ *Studies in Humanism*, p. 21.

epistemology: religious knowledge must be integrated with other knowledge in the final philosophy. If we turn now to a very brief consideration of the bearing of pragmatism upon ontology, we find that the standing of ontology is in dispute among pragmatists; there are some who profess to dispense with it altogether as either unimportant or impossible or fictitious. Nevertheless it must be evident that wherever there is room for epistemology there is room for ontology; if there is knowledge there must be reality known.

Professor Dewey has indicated what he conceives to be the pragmatist theory of reality in two articles entitled respectively, "The Postulates of Immediate Empiricism,"¹² and "Does Reality Possess Practical Character?"¹³ In the former he says that if we want to know what anything is we must go to immediate experience and ask what the thing in question is experienced as. In the latter essay he says that pragmatism means the doctrine that reality possesses practical character; that knowing reality changes it; that, in fact, knowledge *is* reality changing itself in a definite way. Now it would be very easy to interpret this in terms of a solipsistic pragmatism, according to which reality would be just what the individual takes it to be, and individual psychology would be the only possible ontology.

But the charge of solipsism pragmatists meet with a vigorous disclaimer,¹⁴ and we are given to understand that it is to social psychology that we are to make our ultimate appeal in order to know what reality is. The ideas we use are social products; the realities we recognize are social achievements, and they are what they are to the social consciousness.

But are we to understand then that this exhausts their whole reality? What about realities which we know to exist, but of which humanity has never had immediate experience? What about the center of the earth, the other side of the moon, and the south pole, for instance? It is evident that the postulate of

¹² *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. II, No. 19.

¹³ *Essays Philosophical and Psychological in Honor of William James*, pp. 53-80.

¹⁴ See, e. g., article by A. W. Moore in *Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. VI, No. 14.

immediate empiricism, while valuable as far as it goes, is not a sufficient criterion for the definition of reality so long as it does not recognize an experience which transcends not only the individual man but all humanity. Common-sense and pragmatism are both right in affirming that we know reality, and that we know it as it is, in immediate experience. But it is equally compatible with common-sense and pragmatism to say that we do not and cannot know reality completely, because we do not experience it fully. But we have to think about this reality which transcends immediate human experience and as a matter of fact we do think of it and have to think of it as it would be to someone to whose experience it was immediately present. Why not assume, then, according to pragmatic principles that this necessary way of thinking it indicates the true way, and that in reality, although not present to immediate human experience, it is immediately present to some experiencing subject?

To sum up then: We have criticized pragmatism as it is and attempted to depict it as it might be and ought to be. Our main results are two. Pragmatic epistemology, to be consistent, must make room in its philosophy for the essential postulates of the religious consciousness. Pragmatic ontology, with its postulate of immediate empiricism, to be consistent, must make room for a philosophy of reality transcending all human experience. These are two points. Taking the shortest distance between these two points we get a straight line indicating that pragmatism *can* furnish a philosophical basis for theology.

THE PRESIDENT: We have heard from Professor Read a very lucid presentation of the ground offered by pragmatism for theology, and the very searching analysis by Professor Macintosh. The subject is so clearly before you that I hope the secretary will have a snowstorm of cards from those who would like to take part in the discussion. While you are preparing those cards, those already invited to open that discussion will be called on, and I will remind them that their time will be five minutes less than that given to the readers of the papers. I will call first on Professor George B. Foster, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, PH.D.: *Mr. President:* Inas-

much as the authors of these able and instructive papers have elected to begin with the conception of pragmatism, and pass to its bearing upon theology, I think I shall vary the programme by beginning with the conception of theology, and inquire whether pragmatism can render any contribution to theology.

It was remarked by the author of the first paper that no definite literature exhibiting the position of pragmatism, or its attitude toward theology was in evidence. That is quite true, but the reason is significant. Theology being reflection—possibly, I should say, speculation—has been historically most alien to pragmatic interests. The pragmatic interest has been in religion rather than in theology. In so far as pragmatism has concerned itself with theology at all, it has been quite skeptical as to the possibility, certainly the justification, of theology.

Only recently Professor Dewey in a brilliant article in the *Hibbert Journal*, entitled "Is Nature Good?" closed by warning the pragmatists that if they took a certain tack, pragmatism would go the way of theology, he said, meaning by that, that long journey into the bourne whence no traveler returns.

As a matter of fact, thinkers have never been in agreement as to whether there can properly be theology at all or not, and very much of the reflection of theologians has had to do with the justification of the right of theology to be, with somewhat ambiguous success so far. If psychology and history of religions observe, describe, and explain the personal and historical religious experience; and if—a little in advance of these—the science of religion presents, shall I say, the morphology, and physiology of religion, its structure and its function; and if, in addition to this, the philosophy of religion ascertains the validity of the religious idea, and the value of the religious motive, what else is there left for theology to do? Is there any other religious subject-matter than this? Is there any other method of which theology has some sort of esoteric control? Is there a regenerate logic and epistemology different from the unregenerate? It would seem not, and on account of these things one may conclude that there is no subject-matter and no method of which theology has peculiar and exclusive use.

The right of our theology to be, therefore, is not the right

of so-called pure science, but of so-called applied science; and theology must come under the same head with medicine and law and pedagogy. Its justification must be found in its practical ecclesiastical end, rather than in the independence of its subject-matter, or of its method. But it has then the same right to be that medicine and law and pedagogy have so long as we have churches dependent upon pastors, on the supposition that the reality and end with which it has to do are certainly of equal importance with that with which these sciences have to do.

Now, from such a point of view, in its threefold capacity as apologetics, dogmatics, ethics, apologetics is concerned with the certainty or validity of our religious ideas, and dogmatics with the content of our religious faith, looked at from a strictly religious point of view, while Christian ethics treats of the same content viewed from a practical point of view. It will appear therefore that if pragmatism shall have any abiding concern with theology, it must be more fully with apologetic theology, than with either the dogmatic or ethical theology; for pragmatism is a theory of truth, primarily, better, perhaps, it is a search for a new criterion of truth; and searching for a new criterion of truth, it at the same time, simply as implicated with this search, pensions many concepts of reality which have ceased to be true according to the pragmatic test of truth. Now, a possible effect of pragmatism upon theology so understood, since its effect is yet to be seen in the modern world, may perhaps be set forth by reference to pragmatism as it cropped up in a religious way in an era of the ancient Orient more than 2,500 years ago—not quite 2,500 years ago. Gautama Buddha was a pragmatist, and I should like to indicate to you the situation and outcome of the movement then. Preceding him was the period of speculative Brahmanism which arrived at a fixed static absolute, at the All-One engulfing all existence in the way of the famous story of the lion's den in which all tracks entered, but none returned. Gautama Buddha considered his mission as a protest against that absolutism and that idealism. Hence he said that it was not his mission at all to furnish philosophical metaphysical information concerning the last essence of being, or concerning the origin of the world, or concerning the origin of good and evil, inasmuch as these specu-

lative questions did not in any way vitally bear upon the great concern of life as he counted life, namely, release from the pain of existence. And so his was a reform, which, like all reforms, made progress, not by an addition, but by a subtraction, limiting reflection solely to that which had value for experience and eliminating all those concepts, however venerable and sacred, which interfered with, or did not serve, the progress of vital experience as he counted vital. When he was asked certain questions about Nirvana even, he said that it did not make any difference which way the question was answered, inasmuch as the question was not fruitful, either in producing or controlling valuable experience in the world. Such is an illustration from Gautama's pragmatism. It was a reduction of the conceptional burden of life in the interests of practical experiences of redemption and consummation of life as he counted redemption and consummation. It has also an adjustment to the skepticism that had grown up in his day.

Now, the outcome of his movement was significant. This exclusively practical life on the part of Gautama Buddha ended, and I think logically ended, in a system of rules legalistically controlling experience, ended in ascetism and monasticism, ended in the mechanicizing and in the ecclesiasticizing of life; ended in casuistry and a system of external control, and it is simply a question now whether exclusive emphasis upon practice, upon work, will not terminate in our case in casuistry, asceticism, and ecclesiastical control, rather than in precisely just that which we have most of all in mind, namely, that we may have life and have it more abundantly. I do not say that it will be so. I say it is something to think about that we may keep our practicism from making life juiceless and joyless.

Now, our modern pragmatism variously called by radical empiricism, instrumentalism, and humanism is, as a matter of fact, neo-positivism; our modern pragmatism is an extension of the Darwinian theory of the struggle for existence, and of natural selection, to the realm of the spirit. It is biology applied to ideals, standards, and judgments. Whereas once there was a mechanical explanation of the teleology of organisms, there is now teleological explanation of the mechanism of organisms, and that is the

fundamental thing in the whole movement. In psychology pragmatism is voluntarism; in epistemology, it is nominalism; in metaphysics, it is agnosticism; in natural philosophy, it is what Oswald would call energetics; in ethics, it is meliorism, utilitarianism; and in every respect it is anthropomorphizing of existence. And the only question is, since we cannot escape the anthropomorphizing of existence at all—we are built that way—the only question is whether we are going to humanize existence intellectually and have rationalism, or sentimentally and have romanticism, or voluntarily and have pragmatism. Voluntaristic humanization of existence is making our word-view pragmatic.

Now, how does all this square with scientific psychology? According to scientific psychology, there is a moment of intellection, of emotion, and of volition in every pulse of human consciousness. You cannot alienate either of these moments. And their mutual relations are invariable and fixed, except that at one time any one of them may be more vividly in evidence than the others. But while this is true, it is also the verdict of scientific psychology—the great contribution of modern times to the study of man—that primacy belongs to the willing moment of human nature. Therefore in humanizing reality voluntaristically, we do the best that we can do, we make the deepest in us the measure of all things. But inasmuch as we are also intellect and feeling, beginning at that central point of will, pragmatism must improve upon itself—indeed, it has already done so—by intellectualizing and emotionalizing reality. That is, then, interpreting existence in terms of ourselves, we must personize existence. But here possibilities burden, perhaps frighten us. Personalities such as ours are an outcome of the cosmic process. But may they not be transitory by-products? May not the end of the human race be—not a temple of the universe—but a museum visited curiously, perhaps pathetically, by other bearers of cosmic progress, as we now visit the museums of the sub-human and pre-human bearers of life? Or may we think of the universe as structurally and functionally such that it must ever create and conserve the human? Shall we affirm that the essence of the world is a personality-producing essence? Or shall we be able to go what is perhaps a step farther and contend that personality

is not simply the outcome of the cosmic process, not simply a temporary phase of the cosmic process, explicable in terms of the evolutionary hypothesis, but also *Principle* of that process? It is the modern attitude to this great question which has brought on the crisis of all crises in religion. What shall the answer be? The human seems to be but a line in the great cosmic poem or drama or tragedy—however you wish to think of this everlasting mysterious becoming. What right have we to judge the whole scheme and process of things, the whole poem or play—some would say farce, some vaudeville, but some grand opera, indeed—in terms of the line which we are, and on which account alone we know? Some hopeful answer to this question is required if there is to be a theology at all, such as our churches can live upon and work with.

Now, it is here that pragmatism may come in. Not, however, with the assurance which burned in the heart of the faith of the fathers and made them a living fire. Pragmatism, this definitive formation of specifically English philosophy, courageously draws the relativistic consequences of the evolutionary hypothesis and system. Pragmatism is the doctrine of the evolution of the a priori basis of all knowledge and all evaluation. Pragmatism holds that these supreme theoretical and practical principles are nothing but results of the adaptation of the human spirit to the life-conditions of the individual and of the race. Therefore the sense and worth of these principles do not consist in their being truth that is objectively determined. They are at all, and as they are, because they have proven to be effective instruments as man has sought to orient and satisfy and fulfil himself in his situation. Thus the old theoretical concept of truth is gone—seriously gone. No longer the naïve task of bringing ideas into harmony with reality! The essence of truth is not in that. No longer the agreement of ideas among themselves. That is not the basic criterion of truth. But according to the pragmatic hypothesis only those ideas are true which empirically evince themselves to be usable and effective means in the life of conduct.

Now, applying this pragmatic test to the ideas—those three possibilities of interpreting and explaining the world which I was

stating a moment ago, which one of those possibilities is most serviceable? If, accordingly, the basis of the universe is personal, of course we can then have a theology founded upon pragmatism. Even if the universe was not personal in this sense, but personality-producing, we could still have a pragmatic theology. This is about my own position at present.

But, in the vast future transformations and adaptations of human nature, will such theistic or approximately theistic hypothesis—I say hypothesis, for pragmatism knows no “eternal truth”—be a needful function of human life? Pragmatism, being relativism, is agnostic at this point. It is just there that I would leave the matter. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Foster's quotation from Dr. Dewey suggested a half-humorous reflection: To what other bourne would you have theology go than to that from which no traveler returns, namely, heaven. (*Laughter.*) The second appointed speaker is Rev. Clifton D. Gray, Ph.D., pastor of the Stoughton Street Baptist Church, Boston. (*Applause.*)

REV. CLIFTON D. GRAY, PH.D:

CAN PRAGMATISM FURNISH A PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS FOR THEOLOGY?

I have never realized until the present moment how a solitary layman feels who takes part in a discussion where all the other speakers are ministers. I am a layman in philosophy, and make but little, if any, pretension to technical knowledge in this department. You have been listening to those who are qualified to speak as experts. Whatever value there may be in what I have to say will be due, not to any contribution of my own, but to the fact that my point of view is that of any serious-minded person, interested in theology in particular, in so far as it bears directly upon personal religion, and in the movements of philosophy in general, in so far as they affect the ethical and social temper of the present age. This is, I confess at the outset, a very pragmatic attitude toward these sciences, and in this respect no doubt we are all pragmatists. Whether we are in some other senses remains to be seen.

Professor James has defined metaphysics in a well-known phrase as "an unusually obstinate attempt to think clearly and consistently." One cannot read long in the history of philosophy without now and then having the suspicion that it is an unusually obstinate attempt to think with neither clearness nor consistency. Rightly or wrongly, we somehow feel that Browning's line,

Oh, men spin clouds of fuzz where matters end,

is not altogether unjust to the situation. George Eliot has put it even more precisely:

Small words held mighty meanings: Matter, Force,
Self, Not-self, Being, Seeming, Space, and Time—
Plebeian toilers on the dusty road
Of daily traffic, turned to Genii
And cloudy giants darkening sun and moon.

In the light of this, it may seem to some a rather useless task—this attempt to bring philosophy down from the stars to the city streets. That it is a difficult one cannot be denied, but it ought not to be more difficult for the average man to get into touch with the "world" of philosophy than it has been for philosophers to get into touch with the "world" of the average man. One of the greatest needs of philosophy today is its popularization, the careful translation of its technical concepts into the language of those of ordinary education. For science this is already being accomplished; for philosophy it has hardly been begun. This reason alone would justify the present discussion, and all the more because of the claim of pragmatism to be a popular philosophy. But there is a still more cogent reason, which I can best give you in the classic words of Francis Bacon: "Howsoever these things are in men's depraved judgments and affections, yet truth, which only doth judge itself, teacheth that the inquiry of truth, which is the lovemaking or wooing of it, the knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying of it, is the sovereign good of human nature." You see, therefore, that it is no idle problem that confronts us.

The best approach to the discussion of the question at issue is a brief survey of the significant events of the world of thought in the last half of the nineteenth century. To some of these

reference has already been made, but for the sake of clearness I ask you to look at two important considerations.

1. The first is the growth of the biological sciences, the starting-point of which, as you know, was the publication just fifty years ago of Darwin's famous book and which has since affected every department of human thought. In two rather important particulars it has changed greatly our conceptions. (a) That old friend of ours, the human mind, with its ancient endowment of abstract faculties, has been relegated to the Museum of Philosophical Antiquities, and we now study in lieu thereof the phenomena of consciousness from the biological point of view. Thus it has come about that functional psychology has raised the black flag against metaphysics, and has claimed not a little of the territory formerly under the latter's suzerainty. Logic, aesthetics, and ethics, from this point of view, have become simply elaborated forms of the psychology of judgment, feeling, and volition, respectively. Even metaphysics has been called upon to abdicate and become nothing more than the psychology of cognition. In other words, under the influence of the biological sciences the attempt is being made to subsume all reality under terms of experience. (b) No less radical a change has been brought about by the same process in the field of history. All human customs, social, ethical, religious, are subjected to the keenest of analysis, and the genetic method is the method of the hour. The result of this has been to discredit absolutism in philosophy on the one hand and dogmatism in theology on the other. Systematic theology has given place to what the Germans call *religionsgeschichtliche Methode*. Truth is no longer conceived of as static, but dynamic. The so-called laws of science are seen to be nothing more than convenient, shorthand symbols for summing up and unifying experience.

2. While this revolution has been going on in the realm of thought, human society has been passing through an equally remarkable series of changes. Politically it has been the day of democracy, ever growing in strength and becoming more and more impatient of authority. It has also been the day of marvelous achievement in the physical sciences, when men as never before have controlled and utilized the forces of nature for their

own ends. In consequence of this there has arisen an exalted belief in human power, which refuses to recognize any non-human limitations. This in its turn has reacted upon our reflective thinking, with the result that we are inclined, as Schopenhauer did, to subordinate the intelligence to the will and to set great store by the prevailing voluntaristic psychology. The philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche is thoroughly characteristic of an age when men believe they have become super-men, and no God is worshiped but Success, whose followers are not the weak, but the strong.

This is the *milieu* in which current theology finds herself. All the old props are slipping away. Like a New Bedford whaler, tied up to the wharf for the last quarter of a century, and unexpectedly put into commission for a new voyage, theology has exchanged the quiet harbor of her institutions and axioms for a sea full of unknown perils, and is in constant danger of being run down by strange craft. It is not that the ship is without a rudder, but that theology has not yet gotten her bearings. She is still making a circle in the fog. She hears certain sounds, but cannot tell exactly whence they come. It is not strange, therefore, that some on board the ship have turned to pragmatism in the hope that it may set her once more upon her proper course. What is the justification of their hope?

Pragmatism has many aspects. Giovanni Papini says that it cannot be defined, but follows this statement immediately with a very full description of its attitude toward almost everything under the sun. Perhaps he fairly represents the vigorous Italian variety of this popular philosophy. Of two things at least we may be certain. Those who have studied pragmatism on the outside have very diverse opinions as to its tendencies. This diversity of judgment is due in no small measure to the fact that it has not been thoroughly worked out. Its supporters have been obliged to give so much time to controversial aspects of the subject that they have not been able as yet either to clarify their own ideas on many vital matters or to present a thoroughly consistent theory. We are, therefore, evidently dealing with what is by no means a well-defined and certain tendency of modern philosophy. The baby is yet too young to know what sort of a boy

it will turn out to be. The answer to our question depends entirely upon what we mean by pragmatism.

Of pragmatism as a method in philosophy many favorable things can be said. Men's ways of thinking are like clothes. The latest style is but an ancient one come again into fashion. Long ago Plato gave utterance to a famous dictum which has since become the watchword of the new movement: *πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἄνθρωπον εἶναι* ("man is the measure of all things"). That which commends it most is its emphasis upon the practical character of our knowledge, a matter which philosophers have rarely denied, but have frequently forgotten. We cannot too quickly banish the abstract from our thinking. Furthermore, pragmatism has rendered a most valuable service to philosophy by its insistence upon the concrete, psychological nature of our human truths. That old Platonic world of innate ideas seems as strange to us today as one of Cimabue's alter-pieces. Thus a way has been opened for a process of discrimination between matters of opinion which are genuinely vital and matters which are of a trivial nature, or, to use a technical phrase, pragmatism is a method which determines the relative importance of propositions.

From this standpoint, pragmatism cannot fail to have anything but a wholesome effect upon theology, who, like her sister science, metaphysics, has often wandered in the arid alkali of speculation. It is good that both return to the places where men dwell. But it may fairly be asked whether this is due to something which is peculiar to pragmatism itself, or rather to something quite outside this particular movement in philosophy and at whose breast other lusty infants beside pragmatism are receiving nourishment. Perhaps we shall find that functional psychology is the nurse of pragmatism as well as of current theology.

The heart of pragmatism is its theory of the nature of truth. That is true, it says, which can be defined in terms of experience. This statement in itself is innocent enough, but when it is explained serious difficulties present themselves. Starting with the practical or instrumental origin of truth, as disclosed by a teleological psychology, pragmatism makes a thoroughgoing application of this to a theory of knowledge. "If truth originates as

a means for the control of experience as an instrument to guide to useful action, then the obvious test of truth will be its success in the accomplishment of its practical purpose." In other words, truth is that which will "work," that which is in the long run useful, not to the individual alone but to society at large—*Was fruchtbar ist, das allein ist wahr*. The only way, therefore, to conceive of truth is to think of the practical consequences which follow from possessing true ideas.

This is the citadel around which the warfare has waged most hotly, and not without considerable success on the part of the besieging army. From the point of view of abstract logic, the keenest attack is a paper by Mr. G. E. Moore recently read before the Aristotelian Society of London. We may not enter into the pros and cons of this discussion except to remark that the defenders of pragmatism as a logical theory fail apparently to distinguish between the real nature of truth and the test of its validity, and that they seem to identify the process of proving an idea true with the process of making it true.

Pragmatism has not offered us as yet a theory of knowledge that is not open to serious objection, but even if it should ultimately do so, I have grave doubts whether it will ever furnish a philosophical basis for theology. The very form of the question under discussion is highly inconsistent and at variance with the fundamental principle which underlies both pragmatism and functional psychology. The word "basis" is not to be found in the pragmatists' vocabulary, at least in its usual sense. We mean by the word "basis" something fixed, permanent, that upon which a structure may be raised, and in the present connection a foundation upon which to build our reasoned-out thoughts about God, duty, and immortality. But pragmatism tells us that we do not live in a static world, that truth is not fixed, but fluid, that reality itself is something that grows. It is like the rip off No Man's Land where the tide ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours. The subject-matter of theology itself is carried along with the current. It is literally *current*, flowing theology, here today, yonder tomorrow. The only basis that pragmatism can offer to theology is that there is no basis.

We must doubtless become reconciled to this aspect of reality.

We have long recognized the gradual and continuous unfolding of Christian doctrine, but not for a moment have we imagined that this was a modification in reality itself, but was rather a change in our own conceptions of truth. But pragmatism tells us that truth itself grows, and that we have something to do with its growth.

No one can deny that the study of theology from the functional point of view has given to faith a philosophic standing which it has never before possessed. The postulates of religion are seen to rest upon an equally valid basis with those of science, all of them being essentially matters of faith and awaiting verification at the bar of experience. The emotional and volitional interests, long held in bondage to the tyranny of abstract reasoning, have at last come to their own. The impulses of religion seem thus to have been a constituent and even necessary part in that slow and never-ending process of development of which the human mind is the highest product. Put to the test of serviceability, the place of religion holds its own with science, contributing also its share to the successful achievements effectuated by the ideals of the human race. These are great gains. But is this the end of the story?

The gist of this point of view which I have just outlined can best be put in a quotation from a recent book, with the main conclusion of which I am totally at variance, for the author of which, however, I hold the warmest admiration because of his fearless and unsparing honesty in laying bare some of the deepest problems confronting our theology. "If religion stands the test by which you try every other human creation—namely, the test of contributing to the rich and full development of the ideal interest of humanity—if, in a word, religion stands the test of workability and of service equally with other subjective creations like art and language and morality, what more have we a right to demand?"

This question which Professor Foster asks lays open the marrow of the problem at present under discussion. What does religion become under the implication of this statement? The answer is plain. Such a point of view puts religion into the same category with aseptic surgery, symphony concerts, express

steamers to Europe, and a thousand other equally valuable products of human need. What more have we a right to demand? It is true that men have made gods just as they have made signposts. Both have been useful adjuncts to the development of the human race, in spite of the fact that neither gods nor signposts have always told the truth. The fact that a signpost says the distance is one mile when it is really two is not specially important. If you keep on, you will get there anyway. The deeply significant thing about a signpost is the direction of the finger. It points to something *beyond*. The deeply significant thing about the gods which men have made is that they, like signposts, point to something *beyond*.

This is precisely what functional psychology denies. Pragmatism has a strong aversion for *metaphysics*. It points to nothing *beyond*. While it indignantly repudiates solipsism, it denies the existence of any truth that is trans-experimental. It would hardly be fair to say that it is a twentieth-century revival of what Carlyle called "pig-philosophy," but it does shut up humanity in a huge prison with no windows open to the greater world beyond. The prisoners may dream of the green fields of Eden, and functional psychology says that the dreams are just as valid as, nay, *are* reality itself.

Before closing, I wish to turn aside to make the briefest reference to what is, in my mind, the most important aspect of the entire subject, but which is only indirectly connected with the particular question at issue. I mean the ethical problem. This is the point at which pragmatism as a philosophy comes immediately into touch with human life. From the point of view of pragmatism absolute truth is a fiction of the mind. The values of an action determine its truth, not vice versa. Life consists in results—by these it is to be judged. Right and wrong do not belong to the vocabulary of pragmatism. I am indebted to a friend for suggesting a very interesting analogy between the ethical aspects of pragmatist philosophy and the Jesuit theory of probabilism, both of which are based upon the assumption that exact knowledge is impossible. Philosophy makes queer bed-fellows. Ignatius Loyola and William James are as far apart as black from white, but when the latter says that the true is the

expedient in our way of thinking, he is making a statement capable of ethical implications not dissimilar to those regulative principles which commended themselves to the founder of the Society of Jesus. Of all the strange things that have sprung out of this wooden horse, the strangest of all is the casuistic ethics of the sixteenth-century doctors of the church.

To sum up the entire matter in a word: Pragmatism cannot furnish a philosophical basis for theology without being fundamentally, not only from the logical but from the metaphysical point of view, inconsistent with itself. No matter how exalted or transcendently holy are the gods it offers us, they are still made, not as of old by human hands, but by human minds. Pragmatism apparently hesitates to make that leap from the self to the not-self, which we all sooner or later must make to avoid the insanity of solipsism. On the other hand and over against this point of view, the inalienable moment of the deepest religious conviction is the belief in the existence of an eternal reality, upon whom we may depend, to whom we may go, and of whom theology may predicate at least some things of certitude. Our highest thoughts about God are more than the palace of music reared by Abt Vogler, never to be again! Seated with him at the organ, after the last echoes have died away, our souls shall sing with his:

Therefore to whom turn I but to thee, the ineffable Name?
 Builder and maker, thou, of houses not made with hands!

.
 All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist:
 Not its semblance, but itself; no beauty, nor good, nor power
 Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives for the melodist
 When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.
 The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard,
 The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the sky,
 Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard;
 Enough that he heard it once: we shall hear it by and by.

THE PRESIDENT: Drs. Johnston and Lawson have been soliciting cards indicating the willingness of those present to participate in the discussion, but up to this moment none has reached the chairman.

DR. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON: I cannot get any cards, so I will hand you my own.

I am not so sure that pragmatism will furnish a basis for theology, but I am sure that it furnishes a solvent for a good deal of it, a dissolver for a great deal of it, and I am very much interested in the question as to whether pragmatism will furnish, not a basis for theology, but a guide, and an assistant in practical application of teachings and of doctrines to the life we are trying to live. I think that our Savior was a pragmatist when he said, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and if we should apply that test to a vast deal of our dogmatics and of our creeds and of our teachings, I wonder how much of them we would have to throw overboard in our own denomination. Not trenching on the subject that will come, possibly tomorrow evening, how much would we have to throw over if we put it to the test of the superiority of the fruit it produces in the actual practical life of the man and woman who make the profession? Whether pragmatism will furnish a basis for theology, or not, I do not know, because I am neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but I am quite sure that if a doctrine which we continue to preach and which we hold as divine, and specific in our denomination, does not result in a higher type of Christianity than is to be found in other denominations, we may take it as pretty sure that the doctrine does not meet the highest test of truth. And so it seems to me that apart from the philosophical and theological side of this question, there is a very practical side of it which we could discuss, and which we could put into practice with a great deal of benefit to our denomination, as well as in our own individual lives. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: The evening session will take place at eight o'clock in this audience room. The topic, one that we may expect to attract a large audience, is, "Is the Present Tendency Toward a Co-operative Social Order Desirable?" I presume that under that long title "Co-operative Social Order," something like socialism is hinted at. The audience will be adjourned after the benediction by Dr. McArthur.

REV. DR. R. S. MACARTHUR then pronounced the benediction. An adjournment was here taken until eight o'clock P. M.

FIRST DAY

Evening Session

November 9, 1909

8 o'clock P. M.

THE PRESIDENT: We will be led in prayer by Rev. Dr. T. Edwin Brown, of Philadelphia.

DR. T. EDWIN BROWN then offered prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: We will proceed at once with the topic of the session: "Is the Present Tendency Toward a Co-operative Social Order Desirable?" The first reader is Rev. Harrie R. Chamberlin, of Morgantown, West Virginia.

REV. HARRIE R. CHAMBERLIN read the following paper:

IS THE PRESENT TENDENCY TOWARD A
CO-OPERATIVE SOCIAL ORDER DESIRABLE?

Our theme tonight is not the *fact* of the drift in modern society toward socialism. We assume at the outset, what all thoughtful men must perceive, the presence through all our civilization of a strong impulse toward a co-operative social order flooding in like a rising tide. As Dr. Washington Gladden said recently, "All the signs indicate that modern society is being forced by the disastrous failure of the methods of strife to entertain the possibility of co-operation as the fundamental social law."

After we accept that fact I must admit that it may seem to some absurd and futile to ask whether that fact is to our liking. If we argue that the socialistic tendency is undesirable we may find ourselves in the difficult position of Mrs. Partington by the seashore facing a similar "tendency." After all our protests there is sure to be some troublesome socialist in the audience to rise with the disconcerting question, "But what are you going to do about it?" And, on the other hand, if we approve the tendency we only lay ourselves open to that dry and biting comment of Thomas Carlyle, when someone told him that Margaret Fuller had said, "I accept the universe." Carlyle's brief response was, "Gad, she'd better."

There is, however, one other attitude—not acquiescence, but

enthusiastic faith in socialism as expressing a large part of our hope for the future of the world. I do not approve of everything that claims the name of socialism. A Christian ought to understand above all others that the ideas and ideals of a great movement have a right to broad and adequate interpretation. Neither Christianity nor socialism ought to be judged by the assertions and arguments of narrow-minded and intolerant advocates, however earnestly such men may claim to be the only orthodox, the true defenders of the faith. Socialism as much as Christianity has suffered from the hard dogmatism of some of its exponents. Socialism also has harbored prosaic souls who have tried to reduce its noble vision of the "Comrade Kingdom" to the description of certain stiff and mechanical arrangements for the Socialist State—arrangements that would make it as a place of residence rather less desirable than the heaven of certain Christian writers. But socialism broadly and worthily interpreted is more than a new system of economics, or a new conception of history, or an opportunist political programme with a definite aim, or a specific ideal for the future organization of industrial society. Like our Christian faith socialism surpasses the eloquence of its most brilliant advocates and the insight of its wisest teachers.

I am prepared to state frankly, therefore, at the outset, that I believe the tendency toward a broadly defined socialism is desirable. And I will try to defend my faith by presenting three definite contributions that the socialist philosophy has made to my Christian interpretation of the social order. Socialism gives a clear diagnosis of the inherent wrong of our present economic order. In its immediate aims and methods socialism expresses the best idealism of our time, and, finally, socialism shows the essential part that Christianity must take in the coming stage of social evolution, and thereby reveals the next great enterprise of the Christian church.

I. Socialism gives a clear diagnosis of the inherent wrong of our present economic order. Not that this evil is the only one in our modern world. Christian teachers maintain with truth that there are inherent evils in the hearts of individuals which no ideal social arrangements will eradicate. But the socialist replies that there is also a fundamental wrong in our present economic

system which casts a blight over the lives of all men, good and bad, rich and poor alike, and which might be remedied.

Let me try to show in a paragraph the socialist's view of our modern world.

Whenever a society reaches the stage of a commercial civilization, and above all in our own age of machinery, the distribution of the products of labor becomes highly complex. Capital, the necessary social tool of production, becomes concentrated in relatively few hands. Presently the return paid to capital from being the reward of abstinence and industry becomes increasingly the reward of foresight and greed and even of chance. Only by eternal vigilance can society prevent its public resources, which are potential capital, from being appropriated by individuals and used for private benefit. From the unearned increment of land and public franchises, capital now grows of itself with increasing rapidity. And presently its greatest aggregations, becoming larger year by year from sheer momentum, come to be inherited in fortunate families precisely as was despotic power in a former age. And capital then becomes no longer money, but a new kind of power, the right of a private individual to tax up to the limit of revolt the masses of the people.

We may not stop to think of the evils that flow indirectly from such a capitalistic régime. The appetite for profits grows by what it feeds upon. And every movement for social betterment finds the interests of capital as such arrayed squarely against it. But to speak of the direct social result of capitalism. It is more and more completely a denial of that equality of opportunity which is democracy. When some men come to citizenship equipped with all that wealth can give, and when other men are handicapped at the start because they have not had the chance to get an adequate education or the opportunity to choose a congenial occupation, when they are hampered by meager wages and the constant fear which the possibility of loss of work imposes, when the thought of the coming of old age brings only anxiety and dread, there can be no equality.

Then going deeper to that human relation in which a man ought to face his fellows as a brother upon equal terms, capitalism prevents real brotherhood. In the words of Professor Rauschen-

busch, it is "a prime divisive force in actual life. It wedges society apart in horizontal strata between which real fellow-feeling is paralyzed." In the simple life of a small community this may not be felt so keenly. But in the life of a great modern city the barriers are hard as steel.

Now Christianity has always had a blind perception of something wrong in the relations of rich and poor. In the times of her clearest insight she has repeatedly developed a spirit of distrust and antagonism toward wealth. All of the monastic orders, founded by earnest Christian men who were seeking in evil times to realize in small societies withdrawn from the world the spirit of Jesus, made the vow of poverty a prime essential. There could be no rich and poor in a truly Christian brotherhood. In that morning glow of love and faith in which the Christian church in Jerusalem was born, for those who believed, to be "together" and to have "all things common" seemed the inevitable expression of their new Christian spirit. The fact that as their numbers grew the Christian brotherhood could not maintain a family relation so naively simple detracts no whit from the ideal beauty of the picture.

And then there is the teaching of Christ himself. It is time we were done trying to reconcile the selfishness of individualism with the spirit of Jesus. It may be true that the "needle's eye" means only a comparatively small gate through which a humble-minded camel might readily pass. Those most caustic words of Jesus about the rich that Luke records may perhaps be whittled down a good deal by skilful exegesis, or even laid gracefully aside by vague references to Ebionitic sources. But the most ingenious commentator cannot entirely eliminate a spirit which pervades the whole gospel story. What is the obvious reason why Jesus would not allow the rich young man to become a disciple bringing his wealth with him? The man was worthy and sincere. Is not Professor Rauschenbusch's explanation the most natural, when he maintains it was because Jesus knew that one rich man would destroy the simple fellowship of their little company? In a phrase, for one man to be rich and his neighbor to be poor is unbrotherly. And Christianity is the very spirit of brotherliness. That all men are brothers is Jesus' first deduction

from his great teaching that God is the Father of all men. But a rich man and a poor man, the rich man living partly on the labor of the poor man, cannot be brothers.

Now socialism points out clearly this inherent contradiction between our present economic order and a truly Christian society. It has no quarrel with the rich man as an individual. He is often a man of great ability, perhaps as an organizer and administrator most useful to society. His opportunities of travel and of wide acquaintance usually make him personally agreeable and often a man of genuine culture. He may even feel the anomaly of his position as a rich man and a Christian and endeavor to make to society the only reparation in his power by using his wealth wisely and for the good of all. But he is none the less the product of a system that is evil because it is based upon essential injustice.

And this economic system, urges socialism, because it is unjust injures all that it touches. It harms the rich man by putting in his hand an unrestrained and lawless power. It narrows and debases the life of the poor man whom it daily robs. As the wise man said of old and as Dr. Devine has lately verified, "the destruction of the poor" is not their laziness or their intemperance, but "their poverty." And because it is the enthronement of a wrong it corrupts the whole community. As Mr. Gifford Pinchot said the other day in New Orleans, "The present economic order, with its face turned away from equality of opportunity, involves a bitter moral wrong, which must be corrected for moral reasons and along moral lines."

II. Second, in its immediate aims and methods socialism expresses the best idealism of our time. We need not dwell now on the ultimate aims of socialism. To criticize the Utopian dreams of individual socialists is quite beside the point. It is enough to say that socialism aims at equality of opportunity through eliminating the unequal handicap of private capital, and seeks to make possible among all men real brotherhood, through making labor a direct service to society instead of a competitive struggle for personal advantage. Socialist writers are becoming more and more modest in their forecasts of the distant future.

Interest is now centered on the next steps and the means by which these may be realized.

This, to be sure, marks a striking change in the attitude of socialism. It began with the expectation of an almost immediate revolution. Mr. John Spargo has described how vivid was this hope at the first.

I remember [he says] that when I joined the Socialist movement, many years ago, the Revolution was a very real event, inevitable and nigh at hand, to most of us. The more enthusiastic of us dreamed of it; we sang songs in the spirit of the *Chansons Revolutionnaires*, one of which, as I recall, told plainly enough what we would do "when the Revolution comes." Some comrades actually wanted to have military drill at our business meetings, merely that we might be ready for the Revolution, which might occur any Monday morning or Friday afternoon.¹

It is not for us Christians to doubt either the sincerity or the high idealism of all this. Our Christian faith began with a very similar eschatology. Mindful of our own past we can afford to have sympathy for those who, feeling keenly the evil of this present age, looked for the bloodiest of revolutions to overturn it all in a moment and usher in the better day. Even now there crops out occasionally among sincere and tender-hearted Christians the expectation and hope for a millennium soon to be ushered in by a series of world-catastrophes beside which the dreams of the socialist revolution fade into insignificance.

But just as we Christians have become more modest in our knowledge of God's plans for the future, so the socialist programme is becoming in the minds of its wisest teachers less comprehensive and omniscient. And the socialist, in common with all thoughtful men, now trusts in the universal methods of evolution. Mr. Spargo, whose earlier expectation I have just quoted, writes thus of his present hope:

What we must bear in mind is that the social fabric of tomorrow, like that of yesterday, whose ruins we contemplate today, will not spring up complete, in response to our will, but will grow out of social experience and needs.²

¹ John Spargo, *Socialism*, p. 324.

² *Ibid.*, p. 280.

So also writes that brilliant English socialist, Mr. H. G. Wells :

Socialism is no garment made and finished that we can reasonably ask the world to wear forthwith. It is not that its essentials remain in doubt, it is not that it does not stand for things supremely true, but that its proper method and its proper expedients have still to be established. . . . The battle for socialism is to be fought not simply at the polls and in the market-place, but at the writing-desk and in the study. To many questions the attitude of socialism today is one of confessed imperfection.*

A like change must be noted in the modern socialist's analysis of the factors of social evolution. The first presentation of the materialist conception of history was rightly criticized for ignoring the factor of human will and effort. But to call even Marx's faith in evolution fatalism does his thought injustice. We might equally well call the Book of Revelation fatalism. Marx firmly believed that the ideal social order would surely come, regardless of human help or opposition, and expressed that faith in what we call the inadequate terms of science. The author of the Apocalypse had the same sort of hope, and expressed it in the personal language of religion.

But socialism rapidly learned the same lesson that Christianity learned before it. Evolution does go forward. God's purpose in the world is fulfilled. But men are the means. We Christians believe in the certain coming of God's kingdom among men. And yet we daily pray, "Thy kingdom come." And century after century brave-hearted men and women have in every land laid down their lives in the great world-enterprise of bringing that hope to realization. We have learned that faith and works go together. Sometimes we can bend all our energies to the task of pressing forward toward the high ideal. And sometimes we confront the dark waters of an open lead, and can only wait until it closes again and the road is clear to the pole of our endeavor. Socialism now accepts this paradox which all Christians understand. And it too makes the sure expectation of the final triumph of the cause the motive to inspire the enthusiastic loyalty and devotion of its followers.

* H. G. Wells, *New Worlds for Old*, p. 222.

It is because of this larger interpretation of its own philosophy that socialism as a movement is coming now into close touch with all the ideal movements of our own time, and its spirit is being diffused among all earnest men. Whatever may have been true of its early aims as a class movement, it ought now to be recognized as wholly a democratic movement. Much objection to it has arisen from a false conception that socialism was to be imposed upon an unwilling society. It must at last be imposed, I fear, upon a few; just as the present law of the land concerning burglary has to be imposed today upon a few unusually energetic individualists. But socialism must be self-imposed upon the great majority of men before it can succeed. And its spirit of devotion to the good of all alike, kindling men's hearts to loyalty and willing service, must permeate the socialist state. Marx himself recognized in part this need, and said to his followers that it would take fifty years, "not only to change existing conditions but to change yourselves, and make yourselves worthy of political power."⁴ "A compulsory religion," someone has said, "is the same as no religion at all." In the same sense a compulsory socialism is no socialism at all.

And from the recognition of this truth modern socialism is also increasingly opportunist and Fabian. It does not propose to wait until all have come up to the socialist ideals of brotherhood and mutual service before incorporating the spirit of brotherhood into the social order. But each step in the long process is made possible by the hearty approval and support of the majority of men toward the steps already taken. And the successful working of each application of socialism will prepare the way for further advance.

Like feudalism in the different countries of Europe, socialism will probably come in different ways and take on different forms. Perhaps only very slowly will these be amalgamated into one. It may be that the socialist parties in the various countries will have small share in its actual adoption. In England the Liberal party is now doing most to further the socialist programme. In Germany the Emperor, in his effort to weaken the socialist forces, is himself carrying into effect their measures. In the United

⁴ Quoted in Spargo, *op. cit.*, p. 327.

States socialism as a political force is still very weak. But it may well be that not only the remarkable growth of our great trusts, but even such anti-socialist plans as that of the United States Steel Corporation in selling stock under favorable conditions to their employees may actually prove to be long steps toward socialism. When the control of capital and the ownership of capital become widely separated socialism is almost here. But whether friend or foe be the agency at work, the socialist is content if he can only see the cause go forward. The ultimate goal may be more distant than we thought at first; it may be that we cannot see into the future as far or as clearly as we once believed; but we are on the road.

III. Last, socialism shows the essential part that Christianity must take in the coming stage of social evolution, and thereby reveals the next great enterprise of the Christian church. The finding of a place for religion among the factors of social progress has been a curious story. The first evolutionists were not inclined to give it any place at all. Then came a strange doctrine perhaps best developed in Benjamin Kidd's *Social Evolution*. Civilization, he taught, proceeds in common with all living forms according to the law of the survival of the fittest. But as society becomes self-conscious in its members the less fit individuals become restive at a régime which so completely ignores their personal aspirations. The survival of the fittest is a beneficial and beautiful law—except to the unfit. But among such unfortunates Christianity, with its promise of another and happier world beyond for the meek and lowly ones of earth, becomes a soothing medicine to quiet their restlessness. To use the figure of another, it makes the less perfect roses more contented to be prematurely plucked for the sake of producing thereby one full-blown American beauty. So Christianity is useful to evolution in that it persuades its adherents patiently to submit to the ruthless sacrifices the stern law of progress demands.

In comparison with this the ordinary individualist philosophy is far more worthy of respect. Here the work given to religion is at least honest and humane. Instead of duping its adherents to their own destruction religion leads them to strive to mitigate as much as possible the stern stress of competition. Like the

rule-makers for football, religion tries to get laws adopted which will make the game of life somewhat less brutal. It provides for certain institutions like Sunday, which from the industrial viewpoint is a sort of intermission for rest between the halves. Like the football referee, religion tries to penalize certain overt acts in the competitive strife as unfair among gentlemen—if they are seen. Like the crowded bleachers religion applauds courage and endurance, sometimes the pluck of the defeated, almost always the success of those who win. And like the physician in attendance by prearrangement, religion hurries first upon the field to assuage, if may be, the sufferings of those thrown down and trampled in the strife. And how many there are beaten down in the terrible struggle—the sick and the injured, the ill-trained and the inefficient, women and children and old men who can work no longer, all sorts of failures and broken men left behind upon the field as our reckless, heartless civilization sweeps forward on its triumphant way! To do all this is indeed a noble task for religion, and so long as injustice and misery endure Christianity must stand ever ready to protect the weak and to raise up the fallen.

But for us Christians who have caught something of Jesus' enthusiasm for the kingdom of God it seems impossible that there is no place for us upon the fighting line. For an energy so strong and vital as Christianity there must be some essential place among the forces that make for social progress. The socialist philosophy finds for religion just such a place and makes our Christian motive necessary to its success. We have come now, says socialism, to a stage of evolution where other factors enter besides the stern law of competition. A new self-respect in the individual, the struggle for the life of others side by side with the old struggle for personal advantage—these now have their place in the law of progress. And the only motive able to make these forces effective is religion.

There is the restraining influence of the new self-respect and personal aspiration that religion gives. Malthus a hundred years ago showed truly that population will increase to the limit of the possibility of human existence. The first inference from this was that false one that to help the poor was therefore of no

avail. They will only increase in numbers till they are as badly off as they were at first. A later and truer observation was that the level of what is regarded as a "bare existence" is gradually rising. In Malthus' day it was vastly higher than in the times of our first savage ancestors. Since his day it has risen higher still, and it is yet rising. Whenever a minimum wage is established in an industry it recognizes and legalizes the fact that a decent living on a less income than that minimum is not possible. And the motive power behind this constant rise of the minimum that makes life worth while is a moral and religious one. We see it strikingly illustrated in the rapid rise of the standards of living in every heathen community where Christianity is established. One may note it among the genuine converts in every mission church in our cities. Shortly after a man in the slums becomes a Christian he is almost sure to move away to a better neighborhood. Now socialism requires an almost universal demand for this higher standard of living. Unless it can supply this insistent ambition to all, social progress must drop back to dependence on the iron law of struggle. And to provide this aspiration religious faith has so far proved to be the only adequate and constant motive.

Finally, in socialism is the first practical recognition of altruism as a necessary factor in social progress. Since Henry Drummond developed the doctrine that as civilization advances the struggle for the life of others plays an ever-increasing part, this factor of social evolution has in theory been accepted. But only socialism has taken it seriously, has shown faith in it as a present force among men, and has prophesied the coming of a time when even in the economic field it should become the dominant force.

Socialism has recalled the large part that altruism has already played in history. It has told how even primitive man labored and sacrificed first for his family, and by successive steps for his tribe, for his nation, for his fellow-men. And on the belief that this motive among men is always growing stronger—the love of the mother for the child, the care of the father for his home, the loyalty of the tribesman to his clan, the devotion of the patriot to his nation, all these coming into largest expression in the allegiance of the citizen to the socialist state—upon this faith

the hope of socialism is based. And these are every one moral motives, fostered above all by our Christian faith, and finding in the thought of the Fatherhood of God and the consequent brotherhood of man their perfect justification. Socialism and Christianity are thus found to be complementary. Socialism has given to a Christianity that too long cherished only an other-worldly hope, a new vision of what it will mean when God's will is done on earth. And Christianity alone can give to socialism the motives adequate to its realization.

I have tried to show that socialism gives in clear economic terms a genuinely Christian view of our present social order, and that it also greatly enriches our Christian thought of that ideal society which is to come. Let me briefly summarize my argument. Socialism presents a clear diagnosis of the moral wrong in our economic system of which Christian consciousness is already vaguely aware. Socialism, because it combines radical aims with methods which are evolutionary, democratic, and opportunist, is in accord with the only way of social progress. And socialism gives to Christianity, as the individualist philosophy does not, a significant place among the positive and essential forces that are to bring in the new order.

It has become a commonplace for Christian teachers to assert that while socialism would be ideal, yet it will not work without the Christian motive. As a socialist I admit that this is true. But as a Christian I add that if socialism does express the Christian ideal then we ought to begin to supply that motive. Instead of treating socialism as only a beautiful dream of the far-distant future the Christian ought to be working for its coming. Already we delayed too long. Would that we might learn the spirit of the young Russian about whom Miss Jane Addams told in her *Newer Ideals of Peace*. He belonged to that strange sect called Doukhobors, who believe in non-resistance. On his refusal to enter the army he was brought for trial before a judge who reasoned with him about the folly of his course, and in return received from the young man a homily on the teachings of Jesus. "Quite right you are," said the judge, "from the point of abstract virtue, but the time has not yet come for us to practice the literal sayings of Christ." "The time may not have come

for you, your Honor," was the answer, "but the time has come for us."

For all of us who believe that in the strife and the injustice and the widespread suffering of our present social order God's will is not being done, but that it ought to be done and in large measure can be done, for us the time has come to enter on that noblest enterprise. The old order is already dying of its own brutality and human cost. The new order is waiting to be born. If we Christians really hold in our hands, as we profess to do, the leaven that some day will transform society, we ought to thrust it deep into the life of our industrial and social order now. If the power of a new life for our old world has indeed been entrusted to us, then for the love of God and for the love of our fellow-men let us begin to use it.

THE PRESIDENT: The second writer on the theme is the highly honored and beloved dean of the Rochester Theological Seminary, Mr. J. W. A. Stewart. (*Applause.*)

DEAN J. W. A. STEWART, D.D., Rochester Theological Seminary, then presented the following paper:

IS THE PRESENT TENDENCY TOWARD A CO-OPERATIVE SOCIAL ORDER DESIRABLE?

I would suggest that there is an ambiguity in the question. A *tendency* may be desirable, and yet the specific goal to which it tends may not be desirable. Many an enterprise in history, many a movement in society has never reached the definite result that was aimed at and yet has resulted in untold good, a far greater good than the one consciously sought. A tendency in society may be desirable because it indicates an awakened conscience, a revolt against and a departure from conditions which are evil and oppressive; it is a sign that a better day is coming. And the tendency itself may have in it large elements of good. The spirit it expresses, the comprehensive, general conception for which it exists may be vital to human welfare. And yet the specific end at which it aims, the specific way by which it would have the good accomplished, may be undesirable, may indeed be something which would be a serious evil. There may be a wrong way of trying

to get at a good thing. To illustrate, the general result, the emancipation of women, the throwing-open to her of privilege and opportunity is greatly to be desired; but it is by no means so clear that the specific end known as "political equality," the giving of the franchise to women is desirable. So here, the present tendency toward a co-operative social order may be desirable because it represents a struggle toward a better day for the toiling millions, and yet the specific thing, "a co-operative social order," the thing known as "socialism" may not be desirable. One may rejoice in the great social movement of our time, may see in it the foregleams of a more righteous social order than the world has ever known, and yet one may not be a socialist.

But I understand the question to mean not simply, is the tendency desirable? but is the goal itself, a co-operative social order, desirable? Should we pray and talk and work for this specific end?

What then is meant by a co-operative social order? I understand by it the economic and industrial order known as socialism. And by socialism I do not understand only an increase of a fraternal spirit among men, or an extension of municipal or government ownership of public utilities, or an increase of what is known as paternalism in government. This mild diluted kind of socialism is not the kind which on the one hand inspires the earnest socialist propaganda of our time, or which, on the other hand, excites the fears and the deadly opposition of conservative minds. By socialism I understand something definite, thorough-going, a genuine reconstruction on a new foundation, along new lines, of the industrial and economic order. Socialism means three things: (1) the replacing of private capital by collective capital, the collective instead of private ownership of all the instruments of production, land, factories, machinery, tools, means of transportation, warehouses, *et cetera*; (2) corporate organization and management of the process of production, in the place of private business; "public organization of the labor of all on the basis of collective ownership of all the working materials of social labor;" (3) distribution of the collective output of all kinds of manufacture in proportion to the value and amount of work done by each worker.

Of these three the first and second are the essential factors of socialism: as to the third, the basis of distribution of the products of labor, socialists are not agreed. But they are agreed as to the collective ownership of the instruments of production, and the corporate organization and management of the process of production.

Suppose just now, in order to a clear understanding, that we are not socialists, how much can we concede to the socialist's position?

1. For one thing we gladly acknowledge the genuine Christian spirit of many socialists. Socialists today are far from being all alike. There are still plenty of them who strike at true marriage and the Christian home, who seem to be enemies of everything sacred, whose spirit is very bad. On the other hand, in the ranks of socialists Christ has now some of his sincerest followers, the purity of whose motives, their magnanimity, their devotion command our reverent regard.

2. For another thing, we can only be in deepest, sincerest sympathy with the aim to advance the common man, to raise the level of life for the toiling millions. To quote Professor Ely, "The labor movement in its broadest terms is the effort of men to live the lives of men. It is a systematic organized struggle of the masses to obtain *primarily* more leisure and larger economic resources. But that is not by any means all, because the end and purpose of all is a richer existence for the toilers and that with respect to mind, soul, and body." It is at root a struggle for the development of manhood, the realization of the possibilities of life according to the manifest purpose of the Creator. Why should the few have more privileges than they can possibly use and the many be cramped and narrowed and find it impossible to live lives worthy of men? The progress of mankind thus far has meant the gradual emancipation of the toiler. This process of emancipation is far from being complete, why should it come to a standstill? The Bible idea is that privilege is given to one that he may pass it on to the many. How any man can call himself a servant of God and a disciple of Jesus and not be in sympathy with the great struggle of the millions to rise to truer, richer life I do not know.

3. For a third thing conditions will and must change. The status of the toiler is not going to remain what it is, the relations of capital and labor are not going to continue as they are. Has not even Mr. Carnegie tried to tell us "How Labor Will Absorb Capital"? It is not merely that this is a world of change, but it is also and especially that we are seeing more and more the advance of democracy—democracy, not the rule of one, or of the few, but the rule of the people. We already have the political enfranchisement of the common man. We are all working for the education, the enlightenment of the common man. We have political equality of men; we are striving for something more like intellectual equality; think you that we can have these things and not have something more like economic equality? Mr. Carnegie has written on "Triumphant Democracy;" do you suppose that there are not other triumphs for democracy yet to win? John Stuart Mill pointed out that once the few had the wealth and the political power; that now the few still have the wealth but the many have the political power; and he added that inevitably that power will be so used that in the end the many will have the wealth as well as the power. This does not forecast spoliation of the possessors, or violent revolution, or communism of property; it just means that the evolution of civilized society is going on and that some day it will be something better than the world has yet known. Moreover not only does the common man now possess the franchise, but in addition there is a great and increasing awakening of public conscience; in a large and growing number that conscience is getting very sensitive, it is causing a good deal of unrest, it is inciting to discussion, investigation, agitation, effort, and that awakened conscience will not let things remain as they are. What is really at the root of all this is the principle of spiritual equality of all men, enunciated by Jesus Christ. That principle of spiritual equality contains exhaustless meaning for the life of mankind here and now.

4. For a fourth thing we concede that the indictment against things as they are has sufficient foundation. There is neither time nor is there need in this presence for me to cite any of the facts which sustain this indictment. We may grant that in the last few decades there have been some marked improvements in the

condition of the toilers, and that there are movements on foot now which will result in further improvement. But granting this, the injustice, the inhumanity, the misery which still remain are often appalling. Most of you will recall that chapter in Brooks's *The Social Unrest* entitled "The Inevitableness of the Social Question," in which the author gives quotation after quotation from a number of the ablest economists, thinkers, and writers of Great Britain, the Continent, and the United States, all of them in withering condemnation of the present order. And you all recall that chapter in Professor Rauschenbusch's book, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, entitled "The Present Crisis." That chapter is the most effective indictment against things as they are that I have ever seen, and the substantial truth of it can hardly be called in question.

5. Further still, we concede that natural resources belong primarily not to individuals or corporations, but to the people as a whole. Governments have made tremendous mistakes in allowing great natural resources to become the property of private owners without sufficiently safeguarding the conditions of that ownership in the interests of the people at large. I do not say that there should not be private ownership of great natural resources such as mines and forests, but I do say that the only principle which can justify a government in permitting such ownership is that that is the most practicable way by which to develop these resources and to place them at the service of the people. And in permitting this private ownership and development the government should see well to it that the private owner is faithful to his trust, and that the people are not exploited and robbed by him, but are efficiently and economically served. Mr. Rockefeller accepts this same principle when he says in *The World's Work*, "It is the duty of men of means to maintain the title to their property and to administer their funds until some man, or body of men shall rise up capable of administering for the general good the capital of the country better than they can." Efficient administration for the general good is according to this the one and only sufficient guarantee of the title to private capital and the right of its control. Where that guarantee is not forthcoming the title to a great natural resource should revert to the

state, and no longer should the government hand out titles to such resources in the reckless way it has done in the past and so assist in exploiting and impoverishing the people.

6. We concede also that there may be and we believe that there will be, a considerable extension of governmental and municipal control of public utilities. The banks will not always be able to prevent a system of national postal savings, nor the express companies a parcels-post system, nor the telegraph companies a telegraph post. Some day the government will be less dominated by great money-making interests and will approach nearer the ideal of "government of the people, by the people, for the people," and then it will be found that there are several utilities upon which all the people depend, the control of which the government may very well assume.

7. Lastly, in this list of concessions we are agreed that the end before us in this great social movement is justice, and not charity. It is certain that for a long time to come there will be plenty of room in society for the exercise of charity, for deeds of philanthropy. Indeed the need for this may never cease in man's life on this earth. Further still, I would not for one moment discount the value of those great gifts to educational and philanthropic objects with which we Americans are familiar. And yet it is as clear as day that no number or size of such gifts can solve the industrial and economic problem which confronts us. And this for the simple reason that charity can never be the foundation of a rightly ordered and peaceful society. Only one thing can be that foundation—justice. As long as it is believed that the prevailing system results in injustice, that there are large sections of society which do not receive their equitable share of economic good, that the labor of the wage-earner is exploited in the interest of the profits of capital, so long will there be unrest and conflict and bitterness. Some way must be found to prevent the piling-up of vast fortunes for which no proportionate service is rendered, some way must be found to bring about an equitable distribution of the whole product of the industrial and commercial process or there will never be such a thing as "peace on earth."

These seven points seem perfectly clear: that the spirit of many socialists is eminently Christian; that we ought earnestly

to seek the advance of the common man; that conditions will and must change; that the indictment against things as they are is well founded; that natural resources belong primarily to the people; that there may be a considerable extension of government ownership and control of public utilities; and that nothing but justice, equity, can solve the problem of society. Still other things might be conceded. But to concede things like these is not to adopt socialism as the remedy and the goal. That there will be a great deal more of co-operation, that large numbers of individuals and of companies, that many capitalists and laborers will come together on a co-operative basis, that, as Mr. Carnegie prophesies, labor will to a considerable extent absorb capital, this I believe. More and more labor will have a voice in the management and control of industry. But all this does not mean that a co-operative commonwealth is desirable, that co-operation is to be established by law. It is one thing for individuals in the exercise of their individual liberty, in the control of their own capital and labor, to come together in co-operative relations; it would be quite another thing to have the capital and enterprise of the country taken over by the government and co-operation practically enforced upon nearly all.

As I view it a co-operative commonwealth, the scheme known as socialism, is not desirable, and my business now is to tell why I hold this view. The question assigned for this paper does not require that I propose a solution of the social problem, and there is time only to suggest a part of the argument against socialism.

Let us look first at the question of distribution. How, under socialism, shall distribution be made? To each according to his need, say some. This would destroy the co-ordination of work and reward, and would make charity rather than justice the basis of government, would modify we know not how much that great stimulus to work which our economic needs supply, and would rob multitudes of whatever independence of spirit they still possess. Human nature being what it is this method is impossible. Shall it then be an equal distribution for all kinds of work? This would be unjust, for one kind of work is worth more than another, and one worker earns more than another. So far as the economic question is concerned this also would do away

with equitable reward, and would so far destroy the motive to superior work. And how under this method would the disagreeable work be done? Shall distribution be made according to the amount and value of each one's work. This will have to be if justice is to rule, if there is to be any co-ordination of work and reward. But how all the decisions are to be made as to the relative values of all the different kinds of work, and how it is to be secured that all the people will peacefully accept these decisions are questions which are beyond me. From the point of view of distribution socialism seems to me either an impossibility or an insufferable tyranny.

Another serious and indeed fatal objection to socialism is found when we consider its bearing upon individuality. One of the supreme services which Jesus rendered was the emphasis he laid upon the worth of the individual man. One of the greatest achievements of history is that, in a measure, we have come to Jesus' point of view in this regard and we recognize the immeasurable worth of the individual. In this latter time the individual has at last come to his own, and this fact has been the motive power of reformation in religion and of the rise and progress of democracy. In ancient times the individual existed for the sake of the state; now the state exists for the sake of the individual. Society is not an end and the individual just a means. The individual is the end; the individual personality is the thing of intrinsic and supreme worth. True, the individual can only come to self-realization in relation to society. The mission of the state is to aid the person, to give him room and opportunity. Certainly in the past century there has been an excessive individualism and it has wrought untold harm. It is the business of government to restrain the excesses of individualism and to secure for every man a fair field. Individual enterprise has achieved the enormous economic development of the modern world. Upon individual initiative and enterprise no check must be put excepting only those which justice enjoins. Honestly to determine what justice requires and to enforce that is the first business of true government.

Individuality, self-realization requires that a man be at liberty to choose his work. If the state assumes the right to dictate to

me what my work shall be I am no longer a free man, and the state has exactly reversed its function which should be to safeguard my liberty. Can socialism provide for freedom in the choice of work? Having chosen his work, individuality requires that a man be allowed to pursue it in his own way, to bring to bear upon it his own intelligence, his own capacity, his own devotion. If I am restrained from using my intellectual powers and my full capacity for work, if individual initiative and enterprise are denied me, if I am only a cog in the enormous wheel known as the State, I am not free. Having chosen his work and having done it according to his capacity, individuality and justice require that a man shall receive his due reward. For the state to enforce it that he shall not receive his due reward, but that a part of what he has earned shall go to others who have not earned it is wrong. In the exercise of his powers and the use he makes of the rewards of his labor the man has his probation and is accountable to God. Of course this man exists in relation to society and the state must stand for equal liberty to all. It may be said that the liberty I advocate is possessed by only a fraction of our citizenship. What then? Shall we take it away from this fraction and reduce all to bondage? Or shall we struggle on toward the emancipation of all? In other words shall the goal toward which we strive be a lessening of individual responsibility, a curtailing of individual initiative, a great process of leveling down, or, shall it be a process of leveling up, a holding fast by the great principles of individuality and liberty which in their present imperfect application have been won at such cost, a relentless struggle until these principles are made the conscious possession of every man? I know that solidarity is as true a principle as individuality, that brotherhood is as precious as personal liberty. But brotherhood cannot be forced; for beings constituted as we are brotherhood can only be built upon the free exercise of individual liberty and personal character. There is no short cut to the kingdom of God by which the long and tedious process of the making of personal character can be evaded. Long before that general sense of brotherhood predominates which socialism must presuppose if it is not to be the biggest tyranny the world has yet seen—long

before that the evils of individualism will be so far overcome that socialism will not be needed as a corrective of them.

THE PRESIDENT: I will now call for the first of the appointed speakers who are to take up the discussion for this evening. I am very glad to welcome as the first of them Mr. George W. Coleman, whose work at Ford Hall along similar lines to our Congress, and among other movements that a great many of us are deeply interested in is well known. Brother George W. Coleman, of Tremont Temple, Boston. (*Applause.*)

MR. GEORGE W. COLEMAN, of Boston, Mass., said:

IS THE PRESENT TENDENCY TOWARD A CO-OPERATIVE SOCIAL ORDER DESIRABLE?

Understanding "a co-operative social order" to mean a democracy in material things, I believe most profoundly that the present tendency in that direction is highly desirable. And these are my reasons for that belief.

1. The tendency in the direction of a co-operative social order, which this discussion takes for granted, is one that is natural, logical, and reasonable. It does not aim to destroy our civilization, which has cost so much; it aims to fulfil it. It does not do violence to our best instincts; it seeks to develop them. It does not look for a better day to come by magic; it expects that day will come by gradual processes through much toil and trouble.

The co-operative social order tallies precisely with our fundamental and almost universal religious beliefs wherein we profess to love our neighbors as ourselves and to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us. The new order waits only on an intelligent and sincere application of these elements of faith to the world of material things.

The co-operative social order accords with our democratic ideals which acknowledge every man's inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have but to safeguard these rights of the citizen in the realms of industry, commerce, and finance to secure him their substance as well as their shadow; for, to be politically free and industrially, commercially, or financially enslaved, is to take the shadow for the substance.

The co-operative social order is but the necessary outcome of our history. Civilization has been working toward this end from the beginning. De Tocqueville, years ago in this country, foresaw the necessity for it if he did not define its method. It will come just as surely as the flower and fruit follow the bud.

The co-operative social order provides naturally and reasonably for the satisfaction of that universal unrest of the common people so clearly manifest wherever they have any power of expression. Just as political democracy was the only thing that would satisfy the unrest of the people in the eighteenth century, so now nothing less than democracy in material things will satisfy the unrest of today.

And, furthermore the present tendency toward a co-operative social order is desirable because all current-day signs tell us that the time is already fast ripening for its coming, if indeed the day is not already at hand. Surely the quickening can already be felt. Very likely we are right now in the midst of it.

2. The tendency toward a co-operative social order is desirable not only because it is natural and reasonable, but also because it is necessary. Without it there would be hopelessness, sullenness, or reckless indifference, whereas now there is the liveliest faith, the utmost expectation, and a tremendous activity. It is necessary that the people should see a way out of their sorrows and distresses even though it may not be the best way. Even mistaken zeal is better than stagnation.

This tendency toward a co-operative social order is necessary in order to save an anti-social order from destroying itself. Under the present order of things a system that was perhaps good enough in its day has, through the exhaustion of free land, the development of manufactures, the growth of great cities, the increase of inventions, and the spread of popular education, become so overgrown as to be not only incompetent, but grotesque and destined to fall of its own weight. Just as the Roman Empire contained within itself the seeds of its own destruction, so has the Empire of Business gone to such extremes that it cannot much longer be maintained on its present basis.

The co-operative social order is necessary in order to save society from the enormous wastes of life and capital which the

present system entails. The nation is already alarmed over the frightful waste of our national resources due to unrestricted competition and we sacrifice tens of thousands of lives every year through preventable industrial accidents and preventable diseases, all for the lack of a co-operative social order.

It is necessary that the co-operative social order should follow political democracy just as democracy, autocracy, serfdom, and slavery in turn followed each other. A nation cannot survive as half-slave and half-free—democratic in politics and autocratic in business. It must be one principle or the other throughout.

3. And, lastly, the co-operative social order is desirable because it is inevitable. It is a wise man, and fundamentally a religious man, who tries to find out in which direction the laws of the universe are moving in order that he may keep step with them. That is like thinking God's thoughts after him.

The present order in the world of material things, which is based on the principle of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost, is out of harmony both with the world of science and the world of religion and, looking at it through the telescope of the ages, it is not too much to say that it is on its last legs.

The extremes of wealth and poverty between citizens of the same municipality, where a few men have their millions and a million men have nothing, is fast becoming "impossible," however fine the casuistry may be that supports it. The natural outcome of the present order is fast showing itself to be a logical absurdity, entirely apart from the right or wrong of it. Such absurd extremes cannot continue in the face of popular education.

It is the demands of our economic life that incite nations to war. And here again, the cost of war and preparation for war have gone to such lengths as to have become already impossible and absurd. While war has grown too expensive to indulge in, the expense of preparation for war has become well-nigh insupportable in Europe at least. It is inevitable that some relief must be found from this vortex of indebtedness into which an unrestricted competitive order is hurrying the nations.

Then again, on the positive side, a co-operative social order is made inevitable through the breaking-down of barriers by

means of universal communication and education. Mutual acquaintance and knowledge is a forerunner of co-operation.

And finally the co-operative order becomes inevitable because of the very lessons in co-operation which the present order of things is teaching us. Commerce and industry have shown us very clearly and emphatically that the most widely divergent peoples can be united in co-operation for a given end when the motive is strong enough. And, what is more, the world of business all unconsciously and unwittingly is developing to a very high degree the methods that will be necessary in a co-operative society and is also training men to handle vast co-operative enterprises.

If men are now co-operating on a vast scale to perfect production, transportation, and distribution of material things, it is only one step farther to co-operate in a distribution of the fruits of that co-operative labor—wealth and power.

I am, therefore, emphatically of the opinion that the present tendency toward a co-operative social order is desirable, because I believe that tendency is natural, logical, reasonable, necessary, and inevitable.

THE PRESIDENT: The second of the appointed speakers is Dr. Herbert S. Johnson, Pastor of the Warren Avenue Baptist Church, Boston. (*Applause.*)

DR. JOHNSON: *Mr. President and Gentlemen:* Let me say to you that I will ask the privilege of defining the question which is before us, as the other speakers have done; the line of the argument of each one is dependent, of course, on the definition of the question. I wish to say that I will speak on it from a slightly different point of view than has been presented, namely, from the point of view of the masses of the people of the United States. I shall not discuss the socialism introduced here tonight by the first speaker of the evening, a socialism held by a comparatively small number of all the people, and not by the masses; they know nothing of it whatsoever; but I shall speak to you about the socialism with which I myself come continually in contact as pastor of a church in a great metropolitan center of the

United States, and that is the socialism of the masses of the laboring people of this country.

One of the old socialists of the world said not long ago that we must rid ourselves of the very first idea of religion before the great economical problems of the world could be solved, and that idea is this—"In the beginning, God." Another of the great socialist leaders of the country has also said that the doctrines of modern Christianity are probably as distasteful to the real socialist of today as were the heathen rites in the temples of the Greeks and the Romans to the ancient Christians.

As I read the literature of socialism of today, and as I come into contact with laboring men, I have come to the opinion that the tendency of modern socialism is away from God, and that it sets up socialism itself, the organization, or the brotherhood of man, in the place of God as the object of worship. Now against this type of socialism I wish to say I have the greatest antipathy, and that for two reasons. It throws away the two profoundest motives that are known to man to induce his greatest activity, his productivity, and the development of his individual character. This socialism of the masses of the laboring people of today is founded upon a sociological falsehood, namely, that a man in the co-operative régime when wages have become practically equal, under spur of what you might call patriotism, or because of the spirit of brotherhood, however that is to come about, will be just as energetic in the activity of production as he would be under the motive of self-interest. I should hate to have the sun and the stars torn out of the sky, and the fields robbed of their corn, and the roses robbed of their perfume, and the whole world reduced to the bare monotony of the drab desert; so I fight against socialism, because I should hate to see the greater evil of its bare monotony resulting from destroyed individuality, and men changed by the thousand into parasites and sluggards to be carried along by society as long as society would bear it—which would be a precious short time in my opinion.

If I have learned anything since I left the Theological Seminary as a result of my contact with men, it is that one of the greatest motives known to man to make him active is self-interest. I say this of Christian men as well as of non-Christian men.

I know a gentleman recognized today as one of the financial powers in the United States. Twelve years ago he was a mere butterfly of society interested in the breeding of dogs and horses, and in the dancing of his beautiful wife. Suddenly he lost his fortune. For twelve years this failure, this financial parasite who inherited his wealth from his father, has climbed up until he is vice-president of one of the greatest railroad systems of the United States. And what may I ascribe as the spur that induced him to show what was in him? It was the compulsion of self-interest, and everything that socialism, as I see it, is trying to throw out of society.

Then the second great motive that this socialism of which I speak disregards, is the motive, or the series of motives, that inhere in the Christian system, in the doctrines of Jesus Christ.

It is a well-known fact in the history of the world that men in their productivity have followed their ideas, or as we ministers say, their ideals. If we look into the history of Jacob, a mere materialist before he found his God, we will find that while he accomplished much in a material way through self-interest, nevertheless his life was very much like the bare desert about him. But that when Jacob found his God he began to build his altars. And so has it ever been in the history of the world. Men whose minds have been set upon material things, upon cobble-stones, or the petty profits of the barnyard, have been builders of chicken coops, not builders of cathedrals and palaces. The great architects, the great artists, the great moral and philanthropic leaders of the world, in almost every case have been men and women who have had the clearest and profoundest vision of God. I charge against the socialism of today, that is, the practical everyday socialism of the laboring man, that it leaves out the profoundest, sweetest, finest, and most beautiful of all motives that exist, that which we see in the face of Jesus.

Now I am not bringing anything new to you, but I would like to remind you that when you take away religion, even though you achieve the ideal material order of a Godless socialism, you have left only a miserable husk.

The last thing I did before coming here tonight, and in leaving my home, was to leave a dying woman who loves life; and the

first thing that I do when I return to my own parish, and to my own city, is to see that woman if she still be alive; and she will ask me to pray; and what shall I say if there be no God? Suppose that you pave your streets of your city with cobble-stones of marble or of gold; suppose that the corn grows twice as high, and the sky were twice as blue, and the sun were twice as bright; without God the world in which we live would be simply a splendid tomb.

I urge you ministers of the gospel in every way to combat the present socialism that really exists in American life, in order to save the world of the modern practical socialist from being a husk, from being a tomb.

Now, having said this much, let me close by saying that I am thoroughly in sympathy with the modern tendencies toward co-operation in so far as they mean simply the correction of the terrible abuses that exist under the modern order of competition. I do not deny them. I meet them every day. I see them in the lives of the men, and especially the women, with whom I have to daily meet. Oh, the awful contrasts in modern society! Here is a great man in the city of New York who for a single set of Charles Dickens pays easily the sum of \$155,000. There is that woman in Lenox, in the Berkshire Hills, a relative of friends of mine, who, after a life of selfishness and luxury, dies and leaves behind \$12,000,000, and not one cent for sweet charity out of all those millions. On the other hand, the average working-woman in the city of Boston, in the day of prosperity, lives on the line of starvation. There are adult women in the city of Boston, whose entire working wage is \$6.00 a week, \$5.00 a week, \$4.00 a week, \$3.00 a week, and I know of one case of an adult woman, a young girl twenty-one years of age, whose entire working wage for six days was \$2.50, and out of that she spent 60c for carfare, which left for her room, her clothing, her food, her all, \$1.90 a week. The difference between life and death, between misery or wretchedness and happiness, between the wife and the mistress, between heaven and hell, is the difference between \$6.00 a week and \$3.00. I say to you, Christian ministers, until the church of Jesus Christ comes to the correction of these abuses, until we assist in removing these abuses, your evangelistic services are

only practically a farce. Why pray? Why urge young women to give themselves to Jesus and be good, when you pay them \$4.00 a week, \$3.00 a week, and \$2.50 a week?

Brethren, I do not believe in socialism, but I do believe there is work to do. The income tax, the graduated inheritance tax, these are some expedients. We need to change the system. How? Through socialism? No. But we will find a way, and the way at last will be that One who said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: As I listened to my friend, Dr. Johnson, I asked myself whether that young girl lost her right hand on the Congo. The last address I heard from Dr. Johnson was one in which he depicted the cruelty of King Leopold and his officers cutting off the right hands of the people on the Congo. It seems that something of that kind is done in our country. My second reflection was that Dr. Johnson objects to socialism, but a rose by any other name will smell as sweet.

I have not received many cards but I am glad to say that I have received two which bear names of men whom the audience will have great pleasure in listening to. They are Professor George B. Foster, and Dr. Lemuel Paul Barnes. I will call first on Dr. Barnes.

DR. LEMUEL C. BARNES, D.D., of New York City: I do not rise to discuss this question. Perhaps in common with some others here I have been thoroughly convinced by the arguments that have been presented to us on both sides—convinced that this vastly complicated question requires of us much honest, earnest study and discussion more than it requires dogmatism. I rise not to add anything on either side, but to state a simple fact.

A few years ago I ran across a statement by a distinguished Bostonian to the effect that a large part of the real property of that city was already owned co-operatively, in a socialistic way, if you prefer that term. It was a mere sentence, no facts were given.

Living in Pittsburg, Pa., a somewhat significant city, I thought it might be worth while to find out the exact facts in that respect in our city. So the first "survey" of Pittsburg—concerning that one item—was made. Going to the official sources, in order to

find out how much of the realty was owned socially in the name of the municipality, the county, the state, and the nation, and putting all these items together, after many careful computations with the best expert advice of accountants and keen business men, the conclusion reached was that 26½ per cent. of the real estate in that city was then owned socially. I had had many fears about this sort of thing. How perilous it must be to civilization to have common ownership of land and other real property! But, in view of the enormous estate already owned, managed, and enjoyed collectively it occurred to me that since it was safe to live in a city with 26½ per cent. owned socially, it might not be ruinous if, say, 27 per cent. were to be owned that way.

THE PRESIDENT: Professor George B. Foster, of the University of Chicago.

PROFESSOR GEORGE B. FOSTER, Chicago, Ill.: *Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen:* It is not simply that it is on my conscience to earn my salt while I am here that I venture to speak for a moment or two again, although I look upon that as a very serious duty, doubtless more serious than you do from the way in which I am undertaking to earn the said salt, but that, to speak personally, my interest is increasingly turning to the problem which has received such earnest and thoughtful discussion from our brethren as one of the spiritual issues both in the world of thought and in the world of practice of our country. Philosophically, of course, it is a piece of the great problem of the one and many, or of the realities and the rights respectively of society and the individual. But into that philosophical problem which I do not believe can be speculatively but only practically solved, it is not my purpose to enter. I am concerned with the subject from a little different point of view.

Society is not an organization. It is an organism. An organization is arbitrary. An organism is natural. An organization is a product of choice and deliberation; society is as deep as the constitution of human nature and the order of the world itself. Now, society is not a figure of speech; it is a fact.

What is an organism? In an organism, and so in a social organism, no individual is mere means, but all are at the same

time ends, and the goal of humanity is an organism—shall I say—a kingdom of moral love in which no individual means but all in every respect are ends as well. That is the goal, in other words, and I understand this to be the essence of the teaching of Jesus. In other words there is the identity of all human interests in social organism. In my physical organism, if my little finger even be sick, the organism of which that finger is a part cannot be well, and so in this social organism, in the long run, and in the main, I cannot be up if my brother is down. I cannot be well if my brother is sick. I cannot be good if my brother is bad. I cannot be innocent if my brother is guilty.

Now, the first thing of importance that follows from that is the arousing of a social conviction that the individual who does the economical wrong, is not exclusively responsible for that wrong; that the social whole of which he is a part is jointly responsible, for it is the social whole that creates the ideals and circumstances which have led the man in his love of gain to be cruel to his brother.

The first duty of the hour then is not simply that the church should denounce these wrongdoers and should ask them to repent; the first duty of the hour is, so to speak, collective repentance of our sins as a whole in this matter, for we have all done the wrong deed.

There are some words that I thoroughly dislike: “merchant prince;” “railroad *magnate*,” “oil *king*,” “coal *baron*—by Divine right,” if you please. (*Laughter.*) What are we doing with princes and magnates and kings and barons in our democratic America? (*Applause.*) But the responsibility does not lie primarily at their door, but at the door of our social life, and there must be a social correction of the matter.

Now, having said that, I should like to point out the matter that gives me pause in the socialistic programme. The constant insistence is upon collective ownership of economic goods; but it seems to me that the crux of the matter is not there; by a sort of violence, perhaps, that end could be consummated. The crux of the matter is not in the collective *ownership* of the economic goods, but in the collective *production* of those goods. What is the socialistic motive that will incite men to that work which

will produce the goods that are now produced under the present motives? That is the real issue. Now, what are the motives that obtain today? The love of gain; the need of bread; the social standing and preferment; interest and business success. These, and such as these of the individualistic character are mainly, as a matter of fact, the motives which incite to the production of economic goods.

Now, if socialism provides for collective ownership, how can it provide for the collective production of these goods? Suppose tomorrow morning this city takes a socialistic régime; there is ownership in idea. By what arrangement will men be kept to their tasks which will produce goods? The milkman, will he be around at four o'clock in the morning? The street sweeper and all the rest of them with their common ownership, will they do the common work? What is the motive? One of two things: There must be an outer compulsion of force, which will keep them to their work of production, which logically would land in an absolute militarism of labor in this country, and in other countries, or there must be an inner compulsion of freedom that will keep them at this work. But do you think what kind of character that means? Do you think what it means to get this work done on the basis of collective ownership on the one hand, and on the basis of simple fidelity to vocation on the other? I mean to indicate that the kind of men that we need for the socialistic régime is not in sight yet. What an ideal for life that is: simple fidelity to vocation as the incentive that shall keep me at my work; positions and possessions assured to me! What does it mean in order that there may be socialism? We must put it briefly; we must be in possession of an inner world of truth and beauty and holiness and fidelity; but as soon as we are in possession of that world we will care comparatively little about the external ownerships of life. After all, as soon as we come to possess the character which is necessary that socialism shall be a success, we will be comparatively indifferent to the goods that socialism offers us. What we need most of all, therefore, is not money, but the moral ability to be poor. (*Applause.*)

The benediction was pronounced and the Congress adjourned.

SECOND DAY

Afternoon Session

Wednesday, November 10, 1909

3 o'clock P. M.

THE PRESIDENT: Brethren, may I invite you to come to order for the afternoon session of the Congress. The Congress desires to maintain its reputation for punctuality.

We will be led in prayer by Dr. Curtis Lee Laws, of Brooklyn.

DR. LAWS offered prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: The topic for the afternoon is one of very present as well as perennial interest: "How Is Salvation Mediated to Us through Christ?"

The first of the writers is Professor John B. Anderson, of Colgate University. (*Applause.*)

PROFESSOR ANDERSON then read as follows:

HOW IS SALVATION MEDIATED TO US THROUGH CHRIST?

This paper will not attempt to describe, much less discuss, all the ways in which Christ is the medium of our salvation, as, for example, the transforming effect of his present personal influence as he lives in personal contact with us. We shall instead fix our reverent gaze upon only one peak of the vast mountain-range of truth we are to contemplate and to some extent to explore this afternoon, its most sublime and glorious peak indeed, the Mount Holy Cross, whose foundation is in the deep immutable nature of God and whose summit pierces the blue far above the reach of human vision. Let us seek, then, to answer the question, How is salvation mediated to us through the sufferings and death of Christ? And it should be kept clearly in mind that the brevity of the paper permits only a very incomplete discussion even of this more specialized topic.

In this paper salvation will mean the deliverance by God of sinful men from sin and from certain of its consequences, namely,

evil character, lack of perfect happiness, and the estranged relation, though not unloving disposition, of God to the sinner. Salvation consists of a threefold blessing divinely bestowed: forgiveness, moral perfection together with the serviceableness to God and men necessarily bound up with it, and supreme felicity.

Let us first inquire how moral perfection and supreme felicity are mediated to us through the sufferings of Christ? The fundamental fact is that God cannot transform miserable sinners into blissful saints except by a process that includes pain for himself. This divine suffering is threefold. In the first place, all the distress and trouble that come to men in connection with their own reformation and moral progress and that are involved also in their self-sacrifice for the deliverance of other men from evil constitute a part of the consciousness of God in whom we live and move and have our being. When men suffer for righteousness' sake he suffers in them what they suffer. The torture and death of the martyrs is also the experience of the God who is closer to them than their breathing, nearer than hands and feet, the very life of their life. In all our affliction in saving others and ourselves he is afflicted. Immanence in humanity spells sorrow for Deity. In the second place, God suffers the pain arising from his perfect moral sensitiveness to human sin. The shock to a pure woman suddenly brought into close and painful contact with foul obscenity affords to our morally obtuse natures an all too inadequate suggestion of the sensitiveness and even anguish of God's holy personality living close up against the badness and the wrong of human sin. In the third place, God suffers the sorrow of ineffable love, the agony of a breaking heart as he bends in compassionate yearning over his sinning and suffering human children. He weeps over the world as Jesus over Jerusalem, and his "Spirit makes intercession for us with groanings that cannot be uttered." The earthly suffering of Christ is a part of this wider suffering of God for human betterment and blessing; and it is God's experience, not in this case because God is immanent in men and therefore in Christ, but because Christ is God, thoroughly God and thoroughly man—sublime paradox, inscrutable and glorious mystery!

If, however, we would even attempt to understand the pro-

foundest significance of the cross of Christ, our thought must pass beyond the world of merely local and temporal events and endeavor to range over the illimitable vastness of the eternity in which the omniscient, prescient God lives his life of perfect knowledge and foreknowledge. God looks over his universe and there spread out beneath his all-comprehending gaze is the complete and circumstantial panorama of its entire history. And, still more stupendous and amazing, not only the history of the universe in minutest detail, but even the infinite content of the consciousness of God, is at every moment known unto him with absolute completeness. His infinitely complex life is a unit and his consciousness is always a complete experience all at once and all together of everything that from eternity belongs to the life of God. Therefore the varied sorrows of God felt in the process of delivering men from moral evil are endured not temporarily but from that beginning which never began. And the crucifixion and death of Christ which we look back to as occupying a few terrible hours in a distant, bygone time has been for God a perpetual crucifixion. There is deep and fearful significance in the declaration that Christ is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." From all eternity God has been lifted up upon the cross of Calvary.

It is, then, only by suffering, and by suffering whose extent and intensity is utterly unimaginable by man, that God can ransom sinful men from their slavery to evil habit and character, and from present incompleteness of joy, and from the misery to which sin unchecked is sure to lead at last. God must make us good and happy through his own suffering or else leave us to sink in sin and be whelmed in woe. Unless he pays the colossal price of a self-sacrifice that has no parallel, we are irretrievably lost to goodness and fail of our proper and high destiny.

As has already been stated, the sufferings of Christ are a part of the sufferings of God involved in the process of winning men out of evil and misery into goodness and joy. This winning power of his cross finds its classical expression in the prediction of Jesus, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." But while the suffering of Christ is a part of the suffering of God for men, yet it is in a unique way the medium

of our deliverance from moral evil because it is visible to us. It visualizes on the stage of human life the eternal tragedy of Deity suffering for humanity. The visible cross has a tremendous moral influence all its own. It is one thing for God to suffer invisibly in the secret of his divine being or even to tell us of the anguish of his spirit through a Hosea or Jeremiah, or through anyone else; it is an altogether different thing in its moral influence over men for God himself personally to come forth out of his invisible heaven into this world of sin and sorrow and in a human life suffer excruciating agony for the sake of men and for the sake of men who despised and crucified him. It would seem as if in this way alone God's suffering for men and for righteousness could adequately come home to the human conscience and make a sufficiently pathetic and powerful appeal to the human heart. Our moral renewal and our entrance into fulness of joy is mediated to us, therefore, not only through the other suffering of God for us, but in an especial and indispensable way through the earthly sufferings of Christ.

Having now gained some glimpse as to how our moral perfection and supreme felicity are mediated to us through the sufferings of Christ, let us next inquire how forgiveness is mediated to us through his sufferings. All are ready not merely to admit but to affirm with solemn gratitude that the sorrowing Christ is a medium of our moral renovation and perfecting, but many demur at once at the idea that God's forgiveness requires any mediation or can possibly have any. Forgiveness, we are told, is as free as the air or as the sunshine. Yet, after all, these brethren do not really believe that forgiveness is thus free, but on the contrary proclaim to sinning men that the divine forgiveness is conditioned and rigidly conditioned. For they teach that God forgives men only upon the ethical condition of repentance. In other words, although God is a Being of infinite love, he is estranged from his impenitent child. Perhaps "estranged" is not the best word (the Bible says "wrath" and "indignation"), but whatever term may be preferable, the plain fact is that God does not forgive certain persons. This means, of course, that he is against them, not indeed opposed to their true welfare, but against them nevertheless, against them relative to their present

character, conduct, and attitude toward the moral order and highest interests of humanity. And this view that God does not forgive certain persons is quite correct. For while God is glad to change from opposition to harmony, while he is eager to forgive, yet he will not do so lightly and still less unscrupulously, but only when there exists a solid ethical foundation for forgiveness, a foundation as deep as the moral nature of God.

And there is a still larger sense in which it is true that forgiveness must rest upon an ethical foundation deep as the moral nature of God. Men, as we have seen, must meet an ethical condition of forgiveness; but it is equally true that God has ethical conditions of forgiveness which he on his side must meet.

What are these ethical conditions which God must meet in order to forgive the sinner? We remark, in the first place, that God would not be morally justified in forgiving sinful men except in connection with the most effective possible process of making them good. It is a fundamental principle that forgiveness or pardon should not be bestowed upon wrongdoers, whether children, acquaintances, or criminals, with no regard to the eradication of evil propensities and habits and to the formation of right habits and good character. Such forgiveness or pardon not only does not comport with a worthy self-respect on the part of a good father, teacher, acquaintance, or government but it is also harmful to the offender and hurtful to the family, school, social order, or state, as the case may be. Likewise God ought to maintain his self-respect. He must honor his own perfection. He must vindicate the moral law. He is morally bound to safeguard the universal social system and promote the best interests of the human race. Forgiveness is no flippant, careless, jaunty act of him who is at once responsible for the care of the moral universe and is lovingly considerate of the well-being of the individual soul. Therefore it would be unjustifiable in God to forgive the sinner except in connection with a process which is God's best endeavor for the moral transformation of humanity.

We remark, in the second place, that if God were unwilling to make the illimitable and awful sacrifice of himself which is involved in the process of making men good and happy, he would be incapacitated for forgiving the sinner, because, in that case,

as will be shown later, he would himself be imperfect. Now the point here is: Only a perfect being can in the very nature of things confer a perfect forgiveness. For indifference to moral evil disqualifies a person for the experience of forgiving in any worthy sense or measure. A coarse, lewd nature, incapable of indignation at that which is vile, cannot have a satisfactory experience of forgiving indecency. A heartless man is disqualified for the experience of forgiving cruelty. A man with but a slight sense of honor can only superficially forgive an offense against the finest honorable feelings. In all such and similar cases the man cannot properly forgive because he is not sufficiently sensitive to the evil in the case. His own experience of forgiving cannot possibly transcend his perception and feeling of the wrong. The forgiver's experience of forgiving is determined by his insight into the real character of the wrong committed and to his feeling and reaction against it. Now, perfect insight, feeling, and reaction in respect to moral evil are possibly only to a perfect being. Therefore a perfect and adequate experience of forgiving is possible only to an absolutely perfect God; and since God would be imperfect if he were unwilling for any self-sacrifice for sinners, his moral perfection as an ethical condition of forgiving practically means that his suffering for men is an ethical condition of his forgiving them.

We remark, in the third place, that it is in accordance with the eternal fitness of things that if God were a sinner he would not have the authority to forgive sin. It is true that though we men are morally blameworthy we have under certain conditions the right, duty, and privilege to forgive those who trespass against us. But our forgiveness of them is not the forgiveness of the wrong as sin, as an offense against the moral order. It would be altogether unfitting and presumptuous for us to profess to forgive a neighbor if we were viewing his action as directed against the moral order. To take an extreme illustration, imagine the devil, if one were to wrong him, assuming to pardon the action against the eternal law of righteousness. While such pardon is the prerogative of God alone, yet it would not be fitting for him to exercise that prerogative if he were himself morally defective or blameworthy. And since he would be blameworthy

if unwilling for the extreme of necessary sacrifice for the purpose of making men good, it would not be fitting that he should forgive men unless he suffered for them.

It has been assumed above that God would not be perfect if he held back from any sacrifice, even though terrible beyond all human conception, that may be necessary for the moral transformation of men, and that therefore such necessary suffering on his part is a practical ethical condition he must meet or else forfeit both his capacity and his right to forgive men. It is desirable at this point to examine more closely into the relation of God's self-sacrifice for men and his moral perfection. This examination will show more clearly that God's forgiveness of sinners depends upon his practical conformity to certain requirements of his nature. The requirements to be mentioned are not mutually exclusive, but the discussion of their mutual relations is forbidden by the brevity of this paper.

First, God is love. Uttermost self-giving is essential to the divine perfection. Moral perfection is not static; it is ever in the making. God is ever entering into the kingdom of his own perfection by continuous self-giving and self-sacrifice. And since perfection is prerequisite to the capacity and authority to forgive the sinner and since self-sacrificial love is an essential element in perfection, God in order to forgive men must undergo all the tribulation that accompanies his most effective endeavor to make men good. But the glorious truth is that God does sacrifice himself on the altar of man's need. If the making men good and happy requires God to gather into his bosom all the heart-aches, all the sorrows, all the anguish ever felt by any and every man and endure this inconceivable woe from all eternity; if it means incalculable pain to a nature infinitely sensitive to evil; if it means the agony of God's perfect sympathy with his beloved offspring going to hideous moral ruin; if it means the inexpressible yearning of a heart overflowing with tenderness and longing—whatever suffering may be involved in God's living with and in men to make them good and happy—a mother is not readier for work and weariness and pain in the endeavor to save her child from death than is God to endure with superhuman patience the measureless woe of a universe. Ah! this is love indeed. When

we remember those hours of agony on Golgotha, our hearts are filled with a tender and abounding love for him who was nailed for our advantage to the bitter cross. And our hearts burn within us as we sing:

When I survey the wondrous cross
 On which the Prince of Glory died,
 My richest gain I count but loss,
 And pour contempt on all my pride.

Forbid it, Lord! that I should boast,
 Save in the death of Christ, my God;
 All the vain things that charm me most
 I sacrifice them to his blood.

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
 That were a present far too small;
 Love so amazing, so divine,
 Demands my soul, my life, my all.

But if that was love, if we see there the divine compassion, what compassion and what love must it be that leads God to suffer Calvary in all its depth of anguish and woe, not only then and there, but through eternal ages, and thus to endure not only Calvary but also all other of his limitless sorrow? In this light the sacrifice of the divine love for sinful men is seen to be so terrific as to appear almost impossible even for an infinite God. It is an illimitable ocean of love rolling onward out of the dimness of a past eternity toward the eternity that is to be.

What a vindication of the moral law, the law of love, is this! How God honors love by perfect loving! Surely if anything can make it safe to forgive selfishness, it is the love that suffers infinite pain in order to win the sinner out of selfishness. For of all God's ways of purifying men's hearts and thereby making it safe to forgive, the way of self-sacrificial love is the most potent.

Secondly, God is righteous and thoroughly righteous. The river of a renewed moral life for men is the outflow of the divine righteousness as well as of the divine love. For a righteous God cannot be content to leave men in their unrighteousness without an effort to save them. God's holiness demands the holiest possible universe, and demands not simply

that men shall become holy but that God himself shall do all he can to win them to holiness. A good God must and will seek to make men good. Indeed, he loves righteousness so much that in order to bring men out of evil into goodness, he suffers Calvary and all the rest of his fathomless woe unceasingly throughout the ages. What a love of righteousness is this! And what a vindication of violated law, a sublime and unrivaled tribute to the worth and honor and rightful supremacy of the eternal law of righteousness! But anything less than even infinite suffering, if necessary for righteousness' sake, would be a moral defect in God. If he put forth the slightest volition not to endure such suffering, ICHABOD in black letters of doom would have to be inscribed on the great white throne, for God's glory would have departed. Lacking that glory because refusing suffering for righteousness' sake, God would have neither the power to feel nor the right to confer a perfect forgiveness upon his repentant children.

Thirdly, God would not have this power or this authority to forgive if he did not act always with perfect justice in his relation to men and their salvation. By justice is meant what is commonly meant by it, namely, the observance of rights, while injustice is the violation of rights. Either word may mean also the quality of the act or the quality of the man who performs the act. Perfect justice is the complete observance of all the rights of everyone concerned in any given case.

Now, a just character is essential to moral perfection. If God were not wholly and invariably just, just to himself and just to everyone else, he would not be perfect. He must observe all genuine rights. Real rights never clash. Sometimes they seem to do so, just as sometimes duties seem to conflict, but a wider, more comprehensive view of the situation shows that the kingdom of duties cannot be divided against itself and neither can the kingdom of rights. This vast and profound theme of the justice of God and its relation to human salvation can only be barely touched upon here as a sea-bird touches the great ocean for a moment only to fly again the next instant over the deep. Only one phase of the subject will engage our attention and, indeed, only one aspect of this one phase. What is not said is needed to supplement and balance what is said. Let me, then, suggest for

your consideration the great truth that in his relation to our salvation God must be just to himself, and that, if he were to fail of utmost necessary self-sacrifice to make men good, he would not be just to himself and therefore, being in that case morally imperfect, he would not be qualified to forgive men.

God has the right to live his constitutional life and to act out what he is. He has therefore the right to love and to promote in men the life of love, and he has no right not to love and not to promote in men the life of love. Further, he has the right to be righteous and to promote righteousness in men and he has no right not to be righteous and not to promote righteousness in men. Furthermore, he has the right to suffer all sorrow necessary in the out-reaching of his love and righteousness to increase love and righteousness in a sinful world, and he has no right to hold back from any such necessary suffering. In undergoing therefore his unimaginable travail for the new birth of humanity, God is respecting his own rights; he is being just to himself at the cost of infinite pain. And if God did not suffer all that his love for men and his responsibility for promoting righteousness demands of him, he would be trespassing upon his own inalienable rights and would be violating the divine justice. But the glorious fact is that God is just to himself although at a price that is appalling to the human imagination, and absolutely fulfils this ethical condition of his power and authority to forgive sin.

Thus the forgiveness of the sinner is conditioned upon God's fulfilment of the demands upon him of his perfect love, perfect righteousness, and perfect justice. God's love, righteousness, and justice require him to seek to make bad men good though the endeavor costs him infinite suffering. It is at least partly because God fully satisfies this demand which with uncompromising self-consistency he makes upon himself that he has the capacity and the right to confer an absolutely complete forgiveness of sin.

The love, righteousness, and justice of God, however, do not call upon him to pass through any unnecessary suffering in connection with making men good. In fact, they forbid it. For unnecessary suffering is unmitigated evil and therefore immoral. And if we hold that the suffering of Christ is a medium of God's forgiveness, we must regard his suffering as necessary. But why

was the cross necessary? It is plain that in the process of bringing men out of evil into goodness God suffers inevitably and terribly. But why was this particular experience of the cross necessary? Let us not delude ourselves with the idea that the death of Christ was a martyr's death unavoidable under the historical conditions of his career. All reformers do not die a violent death. Tyndale did, but Wyclif did not. Huss did, but Luther did not. Jeremiah may possibly have come to a violent end, but at any rate he was an outspoken, uncompromising reformer in Jerusalem itself for about forty years. And in this connection remember the career of the apostle Paul! We simply do not know what was from this standpoint inevitable in the case of Jesus. Certainly there was no physical necessity for his going to Jerusalem when he did or for his not evading arrest. It was against his principles to run recklessly into danger. "When they persecute you in one city, flee ye to another" was his own counsel to his disciples. He himself several times withdrew from the presence of menacing hostility. And we have reason to suppose that such a sagacious person could have evaded and outwitted his enemies for many years. And we might add, How could anyone without his consent kill a person who had the unique power to reanimate and raise his own dead body?

There being no physical necessity for Christ's violent death at the time and place of its occurrence or indeed at all, there must have been a moral necessity for it. And this is precisely the view that the entire New Testament presents to us. Jesus is represented as going up to that particular Passover on purpose to die. According to the Fourth Gospel he said, "I lay down my life for the sheep. . . . No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." The New Testament references to the death of Christ as a sacrifice and as in some sense a vicarious substitution imply the view that his death uniquely met some divine necessity. That it did meet such a necessity we have seen. For if God in Christ had traveled the way of the cross, he would have omitted that which has been his most effective means of transforming mankind. History proves, and our own hearts tell us, that without the cross God would not have done and suffered

his utmost for a sinful world. Because the cross possesses an unrivaled and indispensable influence over the consciences, affections, and lives of men, it is an essential part of God's self-sacrifice for sinners. Therefore if God held back from Calvary, he would be lacking in love, in righteousness, and in justice. Without the cross, then, he would have neither the capacity nor the right to forgive sin. The cross being thus essential to God's greatest moral influence upon men and therefore to his forgiveness of them, the incarnation is necessary and Christ, the God-man, is a necessary medium of all the elements of our salvation, not only of our moral perfection and supreme felicity, but of our forgiveness as well. The proposition, that is, God's satisfaction of his own ethical demands upon himself, must be made. The ransom must be forthcoming. Without the shedding of the blood which is even now being offered up in the heavenly sanctuary there can be no remission of sin.

And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he said, Behold, the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering? And Abraham said, God will provide himself the lamb for a burnt-offering, my son.

And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou . . . for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation.

And every created thing which is in the heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth and on the sea, and all things that are in them, heard I saying, Unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing, and the honor, and the glory, and the dominion, unto the ages of the ages.

THE PRESIDENT: We will now listen to a paper on the same topic by Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin, of Rochester Theological Seminary.

PROFESSOR CORNELIUS WOELFKIN, D.D., Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., then read the following paper:

HOW IS SALVATION MEDIATED TO US THROUGH CHRIST?

Words are the symbols of ideas. What is the idea behind this word, salvation? What content do we express by this term, and

how is Christ related to that process? These questions define the limits of our theme. As I understand the word, salvation means the recovery of life from the tyranny and disintegrating power of sin, and restoring it with power to achieve the ideal of its creation. Salvation is the antithesis of destruction. Destruction implies that we are morally and spiritually insolvent. We are in danger and threatened with disaster, unless some reacting power intervenes, to save us from our present condition and tendency.

Beginning with man as we find him, we discover a confused composite. Human life has multigenerous possibilities hidden within it. Its potentialities may unfold in virtues or vices. Its diverse qualities set a double stream of tendencies in motion. One disposition moves upward toward righteousness, and follows some noble, mysterious idealism. The other bias is downward, a kind of moral undertow, drifting toward perdition. Both tendencies are very real in experience. The upward tendency finds its emphasis in our noblest moods and loftiest inspirations. The downward tendency meets its sharp accent in self-centered ambitions and self-seeking activities. The lower gravitation seems politic. It promises to conserve self-interest, while it actually undermines our best potencies. The higher idealism seems extravagant in its waste of vantage, but it really gains the life eternal.

These contrary dispositions create antagonism. The animal instincts would strangle the spiritual aspirations, while the religious impulses would conquer the sensuous indulgences. There is a civil strife in the soul. Naturally these tendencies cannot remain in perfect balance. One or the other will determine the current of life. In most men the downward tide has gained the dominant force, and in all men there are times when the activities of life drift on this current. When the balance is disturbed, the winning force gains strength with cumulative power, like the force of gravitation upon a falling body.

In this condition, life is betrayed into manifold tyrannies. Yielding to the baser tempers and appetites, they begin to assert the authority of habit over us. The protest of the oversoul becomes weaker and intermittent. The higher ideal may still be formally approved, but it is dislocated from life's activities, and

its intrusion is resented as an impertinence. In retirement, the sensitiveness of the soul begins to wane. The eye of conscience becomes astigmatic; the faith faculty falls dormant; and the will is made to grind in the interests of the flesh. This surrender to, or compromise with, the lower instincts of our being, is sin. And sin includes everything, from an insincere trifling with our highest ideals, to those gross forms of indulgence, wherein men, through hardness and lust, fall below the level of the brute beast.

This retrogression is far from the noble purpose of man's creation. It vetoes the prophecy which inheres in our better self. The long reaches of biological development, ever driving upward, have endowed human life with mysterious potentialities. Man retains many links of union with the organic forms of life in the lower stages of creation. But the latencies of mind and soul which differentiate him from the animal world about him are more emphatic. However we may interpret the Genesis account of the beginnings, still "God created man in his own image." That is the continuous preface of every human life. God has planted a divinity in all men, wherefore all souls are his. But this divinity is only a virtual capacity. It must subdue the nether instincts, and bring them into subservience. When this divine capacity is denied and resisted, life is on the retreat. The spiritual capacity atrophies. The divine image, instead of transfiguring the personality, becomes eclipsed, distorted, destroyed.

Sin is the failure to realize the divine ideal. Sin is not primarily the transgression of a statute. Statutory law is an invention, a mirror revealing conditions, not creating them. To exalt the statute to a royal place, and make sin an offense against the majesty of law, will tend to subject us to mechanical systems of salvation. Sin is a violation of the constitutional law of our own highest being. We were made for partnership with God, and endowed with capacity to know him. We were fashioned with a view to understand his truth, discover his purpose, co-operate with him in service, and ultimately to share his glory. When this birthright is bartered, we sin against him and wrong our own souls.

Sin is a miscarriage of the divine purpose. Failing to adjust life to the law of progression, it falls a prey to deterioration.

With the true center gone, life becomes eccentric. The circles of thought, ambition, and activity, contract and become concentric in self. Faculties of mind and functions of body may still find exercise in art and invention, but the horizon is gone. Life is swung out of the current, and becomes an eddy on the side.

In the sinful condition, man develops morbid ideas concerning God. If the inherent retribution of sin is not too poignant and immediate, he treats God as a negligible, and laughs off responsibility in a shallow agnosticism. But when the punishment is sharp and proximate, he conceives God as his enemy. If God knows, he does not care: or if he cares, he abandons him to sorrow and pain. He is ready to curse God and die. He is afflicted with a theological insanity. As a demented man imagines his best friend a foe, mistakes love for hatred, and misconstrues a benevolent motive for a deadly purpose, so the sinful soul entertains a caricature of God in his mind, and in resentment renounces him. Sin then is an abnormality. It is a disease productive of morbid and pathological conditions. Unless it is arrested, neutralized, and counteracted, it must inevitably make for destruction.

Salvation implies that some power can intervene, and turn life from the forces of decay, and invest it with energy to achieve the lost ideal. Is this possible? Can the soul overcome the force of sin's downward momentum? Can anything break between an act and its issues, or must a cause inevitably work out its ultimate effect? These are pertinent questions. In this day when scientific inquiry seems to reveal the absolute sovereignty of law, "the problem for reason is not the punishment of sin, but its forgiveness." Yet nature is not so arbitrary as to exclude reversals within its domain. There is a system of compromises and compensations, that interlace within the natural order. The same nature which may suffer disease is stored with recuperating agencies. Stimuli and sedatives abound, and by them physical conditions and tendencies are changed and reversed. These compensations in the material realm are prophecies of analogous moral forces, which may act in the interests of salvation from sin.

We must remember that salvation has primarily to do with internal conditions, because it saves from sin which is internal.

Salvation is not immediately effected by any system of external propitiations. The very conception of having to placate God, appease his wrath, and buy his favor is fatal to the genius of salvation. The first essential in salvation is the conviction that God is love. The sacrificial systems are based upon the idea that, if God is love, his love is not free to act. It is limited by some more regal attribute in the deity. The offense against his majesty must be conciliated before his real nature can come into exercise. The sacrificial systems so constantly tend to misunderstanding and abuse, that Jesus and the prophets removed the emphasis from them altogether. One might offer a sacrifice and experience no change in his moral experience or his idea of God. That were only a temporary truce between antagonists, not a reconciliation between the Heavenly Father and his child. I would be far from saying that a true penitent does not experience the grace of salvation while offering a sacrifice. But then, salvation is effected through his penitence. On the other hand, a sacrifice may degenerate into a bribe, and a man's idea and feeling toward God and his own sinful heart be the worse for his act. It all depends upon the motive in the heart, and if the heart is right in the sight of God, saving grace is operative apart from the sacrifice. The principle and issue is no different, though that sacrifice be the cross, if the idea of the mind and the attitude of the heart be the same. If the punishment of sin were an arbitrary infliction from without, then some external mediation might be employed to ward it off. But since the punishment is inherent in the transgressor, an external propitiation will effect a moral recovery as much as a bank deposit will cure scarlet fever. When physical diseases were attributed to the affliction of evil spirits from without, incantations, rites, and noises were employed to drive the demons off. But the patient never recovered as the immediate issue of such exercises. The therapeutic value of the ceremonies lay in their suggestiveness and these were as liable to be fatal as curative. Recovery is due to some internal potency being awakened and stimulated to overcome disease. In the case of sin, which is the moral disease of the soul, the principle is the same.

How is Jesus Christ related to our salvation from sin? Dis-

tracted o'er his wife's wild raving through remorse for sin,
Macbeth appealed to his doctor asking—

Canst thou not minister to a mind diseas'd,
Pluck from the memory a rooted trouble,
Raze out the written troubles of the brain
And with some sweet oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart,
.
And purge it to a sound and pristine health?

The doctor answered—

She is troubled with thick-coming fancies,
That keep her from her rest.
Therein must the patient minister to himself.
.
What a sigh is there! The heart is sorely charged.
This disease is beyond my practice.
More needs she the divine than the physician,
God, God forgive us all.

The patient minister to himself! As well expect a man to stay his fall in mid-air. Sin has no power of self-recovery. If God should fail us, we are hopelessly undone. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, . . . and sent not the Son into the world to judge the world: but that the world should be saved through him." When Jesus entered upon this mission he said, "I am come to call sinners to repentance. . . . He that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment but hath passed out of death into life." Repentance and faith, these are his specifics. Through them he will effect forgiveness and impart his own spiritual life to men. The processes of salvation are extremely subtle and beyond our powers of complete analysis. Several elements, however, stand out with clearness.

1. Christ restores the mind with the true idea, that "God is love." Nothing is accomplished toward moral recovery until man thoroughly understands this. Despite his sin, God's interest, love, and purpose toward the man are unchanged and unbroken. The

sinner must be persuaded that God has not abandoned him. The heavenly Father has not forsaken the sinner in the pique of disappointment, nor does he abide afar off nursing an indignation against his erring, sinsick, demented children. He is ever near, yearning and grieving over them, longing for their return and restoration. This attitude of love and desire to save, Jesus reveals in his own attitude toward sinners. His consideration for those who had made shipwreck of life was an outrageous scandal to the Pharisees. They separated themselves from people caught in the sensuous vices, and were hard and overbearing toward them. Their hauteur grew out of a false notion of God. They thought of him as a colossal Pharisee, a sacred, unsympathetic separatist. Hardened in their vain hypocrisies, they deserted the needy and drove them into despair. Jesus humbled himself to give them assurance of his sympathy and love. He never raised the question of sin upon a sinner. Compassion, mercy, forgiveness, and hope were the magnets that drew sinners unto him. and when they gathered about him and felt the power of his grace and truth, they learned and knew that "God is love."

2. The love of God begets repentance. Disappointment, disgrace, suffering, and the sequences of sin may bite with remorse. But repentance can be realized only in the atmosphere of love. There and there only, is sin discovered to be a tragedy against the Father-heart of God. And yet his love survives the pain and grief, and rushes forth to cleanse the sinner of his guilt. Then godly sorrow fills the soul and makes him turn in shame and horror from his sin, and stretch forth hands toward God for help. There can be no forgiveness without repentance. That were a psychological impossibility. How can a man be loosed from that which he persistently holds fast? Repentance is the divine love and truth working in the soul, loosing it from sin.

3. The same love of God creates anew a saving faith within the soul. Jesus had faith in the power and purpose of God to redeem man. This faith in God had its corollary in faith in man. Beneath the catastrophies of sin, there is still the image of God immured within the soul. The godlike potency is smothered and dying, but it is waiting the redeeming touch of the Savior. With the love of God burning in his soul, Jesus believed that he could

touch these hidden dormant qualities into life and action. And he believed that men would respond to his saving touch. Zaccheus seemed nothing but a hopeless, grafting tax-assessor, but Jesus saw in him a lost son of Abraham. "A bruised reed will he not break." He will make him a pillar in the temple of his God. The Samaritan woman by the well seems a crass abandoned degenerate, but he saw a "pearl of great price." "A smoking flax he will not quench." He will fan it into an altar fire, burning with devotion and holy service toward God. He ever greets the penitent soul with cheering words, "Go sin no more." It is the inspiring preface of a new beginning. It is the newest edition of, "Let us make man in our own image." This greeting of grace kindles a new faith in the sinner. The past need not be a millstone about the neck. The present need not be an irresistible tyranny in life. "He holds it truth with him who sings, that we may rise on our dead selves, to higher and to nobler things." With faith in God, and a new faith in himself through God, the enfranchised sinner takes up the broken threads of life, and moves upward toward the divine ideal. God-likeness and God-fellowship shall yet be achieved. Faith is the energy of the entire self reaching out to respond to the energy of redeeming love.

4. The love of God in Christ is the power of God unto salvation. Throughout the earthly life of Jesus this love steadily shone forth. Its brightest glory however is seen against the background of the cross. The cross is a central thing in the economy of redemption, because there the divine love finds its supreme emphasis. It is necessary to evaluate the cross correctly if the love there displayed is to find its highest efficacy. If the cross is regarded as an expedient to be thrust between a sinner and an indignant judge, it will neutralize, not to say defeat, itself. It becomes a refuge and a hiding-place. But if the death of Jesus is seen to be the issue of divine love, and not the ground of it, then do we with confidence and joy meet the Heavenly Father in reconciliation. In the death of Jesus, two flood-tides met. History and experience have furnished many startling violences of sin. But instinctively we feel that the crucifixion was the highwater mark of sin. There sin became exceeding sinful. But where sin abounded, love and grace superabounded.

Where sin does its worst there love finds its brightest transfiguration. Whenever we wish to know the depth and height, the length and breadth of the divine love, we instinctively bow in the shadow of the cross. There "God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." The uplifted Savior draws us to himself, and as we realize that "He loved us and gave himself for us," the deepest darkest deadliest sins loose themselves from us, and penitent souls stand reconciled to God through the death of his Son.

5. "If we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more being reconciled shall we be saved by his life." Here is the undiscovered remainder of salvation. The forgiveness of sin is the initial step in salvation. After that, the soul must work out its own salvation with fear and trembling. Here is where the life needs to be recapitalized, that it may work out its high calling. In some unexplainable way the Christ who redeems us from sin, also makes us partakers of his divine nature. "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit" with him. We live; yet not we alone, Christ liveth in us. We abide in him and he abides in us. There is a sweet confusion in which the divine and human interpenetrate one another, and the life and service of each becomes merged in the other. The redeemed life is an organism in which Christ lives and works the will of God. Yielding ourselves to his sovereignty, we overcome sin, and daily experience a transfiguration, in which the image of God is realized in us. This process goes on in proportion as we lay hold of that for which Christ Jesus laid hold on us.

6. There is one further thought which I would suggest. Salvation is also mediated through the disciples of Christ, who are one with him in faith, and love. The gospel is not confined to the written Scriptures. It comes through the children of God, who accept the stewardship of the manifold grace of God. Wherever men have faith to penetrate the tragedies of sin, and search for the hidden image of God; wherever they with loving ministries try to touch that dormant quality into life; wherever they through self-sacrificing service win men to faith and love in God, they too became saviors. They learn to know the meaning of that scripture, "Whosoever sins ye forgive they are forgiven unto

them." This is a ministry that needs a new emphasis in our day. And if Christ dwell in us richly through faith, we too may have his spirit upon us, "to preach good tidings to the poor . . . to proclaim release to captives, recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord."

THE PRESIDENT: The Secretary has an announcement to make.

THE SECRETARY: I desire to call your attention to the fact that the General Committee of the Congress will hold its annual session after the adjournment, and request all members of that committee to retire immediately as soon as this meeting is adjourned, to the Parish house in order that there may be no waste of time waiting for absentees.

THE PRESIDENT: The first of the appointed speakers is Professor Delavan B. Reed, of Hillsdale College, Michigan. (*Applause.*) The Secretary calls our attention to the fact that our brother represents the Free Baptists among us. We very gladly welcome him. (*Applause.*)

PROFESSOR DELAVAN B. REED, Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Michigan, then said:

Mr. President: In case we allow our minds to revert to the history of dogma and the teaching of the apostolic church, we are impressed with the fact that the question before us is one that has received no little attention, from the days of Paul even unto the present.

Such being the case, it seems as though this question ought to have been definitely settled long ago.

Two reasons, however, may be urged, either of which would be a sufficient justification for the introduction of this question to the representatives of the Baptist brotherhood here assembled. First, in case the reasons for our faith in this or that particular dogma have begun to fade and grow dim in our mind, or in the mind of the Church, this in itself would constitute a sufficient justification for the reconsideration of the question. Second, in case the question before us has never been satisfactorily settled,

this fact alone must in time necessitate a reconsideration and possibly a restatement. I believe that the history of dogma will verify the assertion that no dogmatic statement with respect to the mediatorial work of Christ has ever fully satisfied the mind of either the church universal or of any ecclesiastical organization within the church universal.

The prevailing soteriological view from the days of Irenaeus to the days of Anselm, has been relegated to the museum of antiquated dogmas.

Furthermore Anselm's justly celebrated answer to the question before us, together with the modifications of Grotius and Duns Scotus, have not been found sufficient to settle once and for all the question, "How is salvation mediated to us through Christ?"

In the discussion of all great questions there is a principle which consciously or otherwise determines more or less our thought. We come to the consideration of all great questions with certain presuppositions, and these presuppositions must inevitably affect our conclusions.

This principle is in my judgment universal in its application. In the subject before us, salvation is the first word which commands our attention. It is not within the scope and aim of the present discussion to trace the word salvation with its various meanings throughout biblical literature.

Now, what do you mean by salvation—what do I—when we approach that man in the shop or in the home and endeavor to persuade him to seek salvation through Jesus Christ our Lord? Personally I expect to be saved through the mediation of Christ, from sin, both the love of it, and as far as possible from the consequences of it. All this I expect to receive through the mediation of Christ. How is this mediation effected? How are you to find out? How am I? Where shall I go, and to whom shall I appeal for an answer to this question? The apostle Paul is the first writer who ever attempted to articulate the cross in a theological system.

At the time of our Savior's advent the Jewish people held crass and materialistic views of the Messiah and his kingdom. Paul was a Jew, and it would have been difficult for him entirely to disentangle himself from the faith of his fathers.

The time, however, came when in the providence of God, Paul became fully convinced that Jesus was indeed the Christ, the long-expected Messiah.

In the city of Damascus, Paul began his notable career as a preacher, and we are not left in doubt in regard to the principal proposition which he endeavored to defend, since we read in the book of Acts, "But Paul increased the more in strength and confounded the Jews which dwelt in Damascus, proving that this is very Christ."

The Jewish people had looked for a conquering Messiah. Jesus died upon the cross, and the cross, we are told, was a stumbling-block for the Jews. Our sources do not inform us with respect to the objections urged by the Jewish opponents to the reception of Jesus as the Messiah. I do not, however, think that we shall go far astray when we assert that one of the principal objections must have been the cross.

May not that cross have been something of a mystery to Paul himself in the beginning of his work as a preacher of Christ? May not that cross have forced him into self-imposed retirement into the desert of Arabia? Would not Paul's entire training in the school of Gamaliel have necessitated that he hold fast to his faith in the conquering Messiah, notwithstanding the fact of the cross? Must not a man with the splendid dialectical powers of Paul come to an agreement with himself with respect to that cross? Must he not have so articulated the cross in a theological system that the cross itself became at last to him one of the principal evidences of the all-conquering power of the Christ?

To the solution of this problem the apostle Paul bent all the energies of his splendid intellect. To Paul as well as to all others the principle already stated is applicable. He as well as others must come to his task with certain presuppositions, by means of which his thought is determined, and his system articulated to the thought of his day and age.

What were some of the presuppositions which Paul made use of in the solution of his problem? First, there was his positive conviction of God's absolute holiness and justice. Second, law being an expression of the will of that holy and just God must by virtue of this fact be holy and the commandment holy and just

and good. Third, all penalties affixed for the transgression of this holy and just law must be paid, lest God himself be found unjust by virtue of his neglect to inflict these holy and just penalties. Fourth, the law of God had been transgressed both by Adam and all of his descendants. Fifth, the penalty affixed for the transgression of God's law upon the part of our representative, Adam, was death, both spiritual and physical; indeed, this penalty in its physical aspect extended to the entire created universe. "For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God, for the creation itself was made subject to vanity, not willingly but by reason of Him who subjected the same in hope, because the creation itself shall also be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God." Sixth, there was the Christ, absolutely sinless, bleeding, dying upon the cross. Seventh, there was the sacrificial system of the Old Testament writings. How could a just God permit the sinless Christ to bear the penalty of sin? Not on account of his individual transgressions, since he had never committed any transgressions. Not on account of inherited corruption, since Paul's system logically presupposes that corruption had not been transmitted to the Christ.

Paul finds the solution in the idea of substitution, and the tragic death of Christ upon the cross becomes the payment of penalty, by means of which the justice of God is safeguarded when he pardons sin, and the whole creation is freed from the bondage of inherited corruption. Most assuredly the Christian world will never cease to be thankful that God in his providence raised up the apostle Paul to interpret the cross to his generation and age.

Furthermore, in the Pauline system the cross becomes the symbol of the conquering Messiah, such as Judaism had never conceived. What answer, however, has the church to give to that increasing number of men and women who can no longer accept all of the presuppositions which Paul made use of in the solution of the problem of the cross? Must they be left in permanent intellectual confusion with respect to a doctrine which we all regard as the heart of the gospel? Has the life and teaching of Christ no light to throw upon the question before us? When we

turn to Jesus Christ for an answer to our question, there are certain facts to be noted. First, the Christian world is united in affirming the supremacy of Jesus. There is probably not a man on the floor of this Congress, who would dissent from these words of Principal Fairbairn. Jesus Christ is in his own order, namely, the order of the founders of religion, the transcendent person of history, and to be transcendent, he is to be transcendent everywhere, for religion is the supreme factor in the organizing and the regulating of our personal and collective life. Second, we must not forget that Christ never makes use of forensic analogies with respect to the results of his death. Third, we are all practically agreed with respect to the basis of Christ's supremacy. In Christ we find the sinless and impenitent one. In Him we have a life of consciously realized ideals, and the absolute unity of his moral self-consciousness.

In him we feel that we have revealed the heart of our heavenly Father, and the life which he lived speaks to all with authority, and validates his lordship over the children of men. Fourth, in case we throw out our thought over the reported utterances of our Lord, we shall find that the dominant note which runs throughout the teaching of Christ in relation to salvation is that salvation is mediated to us through him by means of a personal relation to himself. "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "I am the way, the truth, and the life." "All things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." "I am the vine, ye are the branches, and my Father is the husbandman." "Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life." "Then said they unto him, what shall we do that we may work works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, this is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom he hath sent." "All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."

Were we to ask who is this Christ, we shall find no better answer than that which the New Testament gives, "Christ is the Son of God, the express image of His glory, He is God manifest

in the flesh," and what is this but to say that Christ is the manifestation of God's eternal attitude toward a sinful world?

Instead of making too much of the cross, we have made too little of it. We have made it the symbol of a single event in the life of Christ, whereas, it should be made the symbol of his entire life of self-sacrificing service for the sake of suffering, sorrowing, and sinful humanity.

Furthermore, if Christ was indeed God manifest in the flesh, then the cross must become the symbol of God's eternal self-sacrificing love in behalf of his erring children. In case all this be true, we may say in the words of another,

The barrier to be removed in order to forgiveness, is on man's side, not on God's. It consists not in God's unwillingness, but in man's unreadiness; not in God's offended justice, but in man's incorrigibility. God's love impels him to forgive. He is rich in mercy and ready to forgive. Why is forgiveness ever withheld? Solely because man is not prepared to receive it. The love that gives, and the love that forgives is the same; but it is governed by different conditions. The love that gives is love unrestricted. The love that forgives often finds an obstacle in man.

How is this obstacle upon the part of man removed through the mediation of Christ? First, the self-sacrificing life and death of Christ become to us one of the strongest motives to repentance. When we behold in Jesus Christ the manifestation of God's self-sacrificing love, we begin to realize not only what sin costs us, but at the same time what it costs our heavenly Father. This revelation of what sin costs God becomes to us the clearest revelation possible of the heinousness of sin. Knowing what sin costs, and its heinousness, becomes the strongest possible motive to repentance. Indeed, these words of Sabatier with respect to this matter are none too strong, "Thus it is that the passion and death of Christ act upon the heart of sinners." His was the most powerful appeal to repentance humanity ever heard, and also the most operative and fruitful in marvelous results. We now have all that is necessary for the forgiveness of sin. The self-sacrificing love of Christ, the manifestation of the eternal self-sacrificing love of God leads to contrition, so deep and sincere that we are now ready, yea intensely desire, to co-operate with God in his

loving purpose with respect to us. In biblical literature this thought is no more clearly and powerfully set forth than in the parable of the Prodigal Son. Here we have a picture of the father whose love never abates or grows cold—a suffering father, a vicariously suffering father. His suffering is necessitated by virtue of his love. Here we have the son who voluntarily rejects his father's love, and the blessings of his father's home. Here we have at last the deeply penitent son who is now ready to make his father's will the law and end of his being. Surely this would seem to be an all-sufficient reason for the forgiveness of sin, since humanly speaking such penitence upon the part of the sinner is the strongest possible guarantee that the sinner will cease from his sin, and lovingly co-operate with God in the accomplishment of his Father's holy will with respect to him. Second, salvation is mediated to us through Christ, by means of the impartation of his own spirit whereby we are progressively freed from the love of sin. We are now dealing with a fact which is evidenced by the writings of the New Testament—observation and experience. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians writes as follows: "But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the spirit; but the word of the cross is to them that are perishing foolishness, but unto us who are being saved it is the power of God." Paul evidently regarded the members of the church at Corinth not only as men who had been saved, but as men who were being saved. They were men whose sins had been forgiven on account of their repentance and faith. They were also men who had been reconciled unto God, and consequently were giving unto God an opportunity to work out his holy will in them.

Observation is in perfect accord with these scriptural statements. The lives of the Christian men and women with whom we associate bear witness to the fact that they are being gradually freed from the love of sin by means of the spirit of Christ. The state of spiritual supremacy which characterized the life of John G. Paton at the close of his splendid career is not the state of spiritual supremacy which characterizes the babe in Christ Jesus.

Furthermore, these scriptural statements find their confirma-

tion in our own Christian experience. That was a great day when we stood before God, through the mediation of Christ, pardoned and reconciled. It was a day of rejoicing, but at the same time it was the beginning of a struggle for spiritual supremacy, which for some of us has not yet ended. We are not, however, discouraged, since by the impartation of the spirit of our Lord we are made conscious of our progressive liberation from the love of sin.

THE PRESIDENT: We regret that the bell should have brought to such sudden conclusion so admirable an address.

The second and last of the main speakers on the programme is our friend, Dr. W. G. Fennell, formerly of Newark, now of Hartford, who returns to give this address.

DR. W. G. FENNEL: *Mr. Chairman, Men and Brethren:* We sincerely sympathized with our brother, Mr. Coleman, last evening, when he spoke of the difficulty of discussing papers we have never seen, in an address already prepared before we came. I suppose we are expected to imagine what the brethren before us will say.

Perhaps we are in somewhat the same position as Goldstein, when he had already punished little Ikey. Ikey sat there sullen, bruised in spirit, and the father holding the rod over him said, "Ikey, what you dinks? you don't answer; I know what you dinks, you dinks a very bad swear word, and I whips you for that." (*Laughter.*)

I suppose we are to imagine that the brethren who go before us express some great heresy which we are to answer; but I am sure we haven't had very much of the radical here today, and so each man must go his own way.

It has come to be an almost trite expression of fact in the life of Kant, that after he had gone through all his speculative reasoning, and could not find the essentials of religious life, his own soul called for them so deeply that he returned and went over the path again, and wrote his practical reason. What was true of that great thinker in his great speculations is largely true of all of us with our smaller minds in the practical relations of life. I can never forget the experience of my seminary days when I had

studied the theories of atonement, until in sheer reaction I went back to agnosticism with no theory, and was confronted by a laboring man of intelligence, a man with a great burdened heart for his own sin. He asked me the direct question, "What shall I do to be saved?" I had to answer him. I was "up against it," as we say: I had to give him the direct word: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." The fact persists that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation. It is true that we have gone beyond some of the old views, those of the Middle Ages, those of Anselm, those of Grotius; we wonder now how such views could have been held. There are views of substitution in terms of law-court and market that now seem revolting to us, and limited atonement has become archaic. We are feeling that the emphasis of human tragedy has been carried too far, and we find our good Dr. Mabie differentiating between the tragedy and the offering through the Eternal Spirit.

But now there is the danger that we go to the other extreme; there is the danger of teaching a forgiveness that is little more than weak indulgence, and we are realizing that there are great objections to this. There is the possibility of human pride which seeks to find some justification for its own wrong attitude toward God. We know that a weak view of sin means also a weak view of goodness; there is a good that becomes the enemy of the best, and especially of blessedness. We know, too, that a weak view of atonement is ineffective, both in the way of ethics and in awakening to service. We know again, that it tends to make the human the measure of the divine; as one of the reformers of the old time said, "Your views of God are entirely too human." We think of forgiveness in terms of human thought; our forgiveness of a personal injury may have no other relation; but the forgiveness of a personal injury that involves a wrong to a whole community will involve a second element, and it is that second element which appears with God's forgiveness.

Then, again, we call our views modern, and think that they prevail today. Nearly all of us love the modern views; I love them myself, and yet sometimes I ask myself how general is this view which we call modern. When we look at the great mass of the people—the great Roman communion still deep in orthodoxy,

the communion of the Greek church, and the majority of the people in our Protestant churches, our modern view is rather the view of a comparative few. And are we sure that it is always an advanced view? When Paul preached at Athens or at Corinth, he met a people who believed they had modern views, but now we know that their views belonged to a day of intellectual senility. Let us be careful lest our advanced views go so far as to be judged a decline of truth in the years to come.

Between the views that are past and gone, and the views that tend to leniency, let us try and ask what did Jesus actually do?

Let us assume consciousness in all hearts of an unreconciled relation; everybody feels there is a great gulf between us and God; even the most modern cults have the same experience; in other words they believe there is a difference; some may call it an "error"; but there is an aspiration in our hearts to bridge the gulf that exists between us and God. We want to ask a question today, without much theory: "What has Christ actually done for us?"

First, he has revealed to us two great facts essential to reconciliation. We believe there is no change necessary in God; never has a change been necessary; his attitude toward us has always been that of eternal love; but we need to have a change with reference to two facts in our own consciousness: We need to change our conception of God's attitude toward us, and we need to change in our attitude toward God. Those two must meet. They must be brought together, and the first great fact of the mediation of Jesus Christ is to show us God's great willingness, and to make us feel the need of coming to him. On one side he has revealed God to us as Love, not vindictive, not to be placated. Text after text in the New Testament shows "the great love wherewith he loved us." And too, he has revealed to us the holiness of God, a holiness just as genuine, just as true as the Old Testament, but with a difference. When I stood by Lake Lucerne in Switzerland, on the right hand was Mount Pilatus, grand, sublime, majestic, but dark and threatening; on the other hand was Mount Rigi, probably of the same rock, with height, grandeur, and sublimity, but it was clothed with verdure and touched with sunlight. God's holiness is righteousness aglow with love. Christ has shown us

also that God has taken the initiative in man's redemption—the exact reversal of the world's thought which has ever been trying to propitiate him, trying to bring him into sympathy with us. We remember that in every reconciliation in this world, the one who is wronged must take the initiative, and must dictate the terms. Jesus revealed God as a God of love, of righteousness aglow with love, as taking the initiative, as possessing what Ritschl calls "the will of love," what Fairbairn calls "the transitive element in the immanent being of God."

On the other side is the healthful sense of guilt. Guilt is a universal fact, no matter what men may call it. They may try to soften its terms, but we find it everywhere. The great necessity is to have a healthful view of guilt. There is a guilt that leads to suicide or to wreck and ruin and wasted life. There is guilt that leads to temporary sorrow. There is a guilt that leads to selfish reaction. What we need is a sense of guilt that is deep; that is conscious of its wrong toward God; a sense of guilt that has its roots interlaced with the whole human race. The scholar counts that man his best friend who awakens him out of his lethargy and makes him hunger for scholarship. The physician is doing the best service who awakens the appetite. Jesus Christ has done the first work of mediation in showing God's willingness to come to us and in creating in us a healthful longing for God.

In the second place, Christ has objectified the Father's love and holiness, interpreting them in terms of human comprehension. We must ever keep before us the eternal purpose of God's love as primary. Fairbairn has said that Christ is but "the externalization of the eternal heart of God," and in Hebrews we read that the offering was made "through the Eternal Spirit." We believe this is the thought of the Bible. Jesus is forever trying to manifest the Father. We emphasize the Son to the neglect of the Father just when the Son is trying to lead us to the Father. He is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Paul is forever emphasizing the historical fact of the crucifixion; yet in his last days in writing to the Colossians, he goes back to the cosmic Christ, leading us to the very heart of God. And Paul says again that when at last all things are made subject to the Father, even Christ shall become "subject unto him, that God

may be all in all;" in other words, Jesus is God's heart thrown into relief that we may understand him, feel him, and know him. There are several facts, some of them modern, the synthesis of which leads us to feel the necessity of the manifestation of God in Christ. One is, we cannot live in the abstract; we must have the concrete. Note the instance of Dr. Mabie's long experience, which has been the experience of many of us, that subjectivity in religion leads to doubt and inactivity; it is the objective truth that calls forth the best that is in us. Then all religion seeks historic bases; wherever they have it not, they will find it; where they are more subjective, they will either decline, or you will find them gathering around places, individuals, or events. All the world seeks a religious deliverer; if it has them not, it has developed them—something objective by which they may come into relation with God. For the highest reaches of the soul we need an interpreter. This is true in art. You cannot learn art without a brush and a teacher; you cannot find the highest harmonies in music without a musician and an instrument of music.

Then we believe it is true that the world still thinks in terms sacrificial. When you find millions, from the age of Christ until now, carrying their sacrifices for propitiation, can you answer them better than by giving the answer in sacrificial terms? Are there not many who still think in forensic terms? If we have passed beyond that, is there not with all of us a rugged morality that must be recognized in the order of the universe? There is also a powerful appeal in the objective lesson. It is not a stage-play for effect. It is not merely emotional appeal; it is leverage we seek. In aiding the foreigner, we speak to him in his own tongue. Jesus came to us and spoke to us in a tongue that we can understand, and extended to us the very human hand of God. All this becomes a ground of assurance and a basis of faith. All this is like the geometrical figure that leads to the ideal behind it, until we say, "Yes, now I see." Christ takes our hand, places it in the Father's hand, and then we feel like singing from the depths of the heart—

Plenteous grace with Thee is found,
Grace to cover all my sin.

Once more it is through the personality, the teaching and service of Jesus that our salvation is carried on to its completeness. "Gazing upon him as in a mirror, we are changed into the same image." Here are the larger reaches of salvation beyond the mere fact of forgiveness. "Not of works, lest any man should boast," where we have the relation of salvation to the refinement and the beauty and the humility of Christian character. "He died for us that they who live should not henceforth live unto themselves," where salvation means cutting the fetters that bind us in our selfishness. "The world is crucified under me, and I unto the world," where we find mastery and achievement over all material conditions. Then again we are "purified from dead works, to serve the living God," where salvation means taking us out into the broad freedom of God's great creation, and making us live in the true orbit of our being. I believe salvation means calling men from a state like that of a wandering comet in the heavens, to find a true orbit around the very central sun, God himself.

Whenever we become disturbed with all the theories of the atonement, we may fortify ourselves with four facts. Let us give them in words of others. Denney says that "the love which can literally go out of itself and make the burden of others its own is the radical principle of all genuine and victorious morality." Simpson says: "To understand fully the atonement is to understand three things and their ultimate relation to each other: The greatest thing in God is love; the greatest thing in the universe is his law, and the darkest thing in man is sin." Then take the words of Lecky: "Three years of Jesus have done more to regenerate and soften humanity than all the disquisitions of moralists and philosophers." Last of all, I like this from the sermon of Rev. R. J. Campbell of London, eleven years ago. He said that he was called to the bedside of a woman, one who had been brought up in the refinement of life, but had given herself chiefly to the oriental cults. On her death-bed her conscience was ill at ease, and this was her plea: "Oh, that some great, strong friend would take my conscience as if it were his own, that I might find a little peace." When I realize these great facts in the practical experience of life, I feel, for one, like going on and preaching

“Christ crucified,” realizing that he is actually the power of God and the wisdom of God. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Our friend Dr. Lawson has been unable to secure cards from the friends in his pilgrimage, and Dr. Foster has gallantly consented to fill the breach and says, if we desire, he will again speak to us.

DR. GEORGE B. FOSTER: At the outset I am not quite conscious that Dr. Lawson accurately represented my attitude. I am most reluctant to speak; first, because I have had some share, however indifferent, in every session of this Congress, so far; and if my saying so did not seem to refute it, I would really urge that after all I am a modest man.

But for another reason, I am frank to say to you that the subject under consideration itself is one that gives me pause, and I am not clear in my mind either as to whether you would like to hear what I have to say about it.

A VOICE: That is what we want.

DR. FOSTER: Or whether what I think about it is a firm enough conclusion, and mature enough conviction in my own mind to warrant an expression before so representative a body as the Baptist Congress.

Instead of my speaking upon the subject, what would give me the greatest satisfaction would be to know what you thoughtful brethren are thinking about; what is the content of your consciousness now? I am wondering whether these able addresses seem to set forth that which is actual and dynamically real and useful in your own experiences today. I am also wondering whether these excellent addresses are not the expression of a waning rather than a rising conviction among us. Is it the dying wave, or is it the rising tide? Is the vitality, is the nourishment of life, actually exhibited to us in this discussion of the subject?

Now, if I could raise such a question as that without seeming in any indirect way, even, to be offering criticism upon these addresses I would be very glad. I speak out of a different experience, and if I may be permitted to say so, as a man who has suffered as keen spiritual anguish for twenty-five years as one

could well suffer, and maintain his sanity and his health, in brooding and living through these great problems, and I am wondering whether or not a great change is not coming to us. But now for the main point.

For one thing, historical and philosophical criticism now look upon the church's doctrine of the present work of Christ as an unhistorical construction and that person and doctrine have suffered disintegration and retirement by this criticism on the part of those who have engaged in it. Consequently, what was left after that was the Messiah of the Scriptures. You have there a majestic drama of a pre-existent Heavenly Being, not God—not quite God—certainly not at first—who came from heaven. Now, all this was not a figure of speech but a fact—he came to earth, entered the body of a woman, was born, lived awhile, and talked; was put to death; went down into the grave; came back again; returned to heaven; will come back from heaven again to earth and judge the world; then after the judgment and the dual issue of the judgment, will return to heaven again—or possibly stay here upon earth. That, I choose to designate now as the messianic drama. Are you sure that there is actually and distinctly such a being as the Messiah? Philosophical and historical criticism doubt that. Besides, the presupposition of science is unbroken continuity from aboriginal cosmic stuff to the perfect saint, consequently no messianic irruption into the order of the world can be allowed, from such a point of view. Then there is left for us the Jesus of history, but owing to the heterogeneity of his life and situation with our modern life and situation to the scantiness of our information concerning him, to our ignorance of his own conviction as to his death, to the vitality of the sacrificial idea being incident to blood-covered altars which are alien to our experience—owing to all these things it seems as if the time had come when we force ourselves to retain these ideas in our consciousness, rather than that they were vital sources and fountains of strength to our experiences today. We forcibly keep the ideas rather than that they keep us!

Finally, the possible advantage which I see to be gained from this mediation of Jesus—to use this phrase—the possible advantage, and it is my own position, is to see in it a supreme ex-

pression of a certain universal law, so that the value of Jesus is not in anything that is aloof and apart from humanity, but in his organic identification with us, and in our belief that he has done something which is not different from what we do, and something which is a constitutional necessity in the life of every man and of all society; that is to say, we must subsume Jesus under the head of the universal law of solidarity, and interpret him from that point of view, and also under that other universal law of dying to live. But inasmuch as these are immanent and constant processes in the life of nature and the life of man, redemptive in our experiences, we can understand what he did, what he supremely did. But that what he did is to be put in the place of our doing, is something which it would seem that our experience cannot bear out. It is rather illustrative and incentive to us that we ourselves in our place, and in our way, shall be as redemptive in our disposition and activity as he was in his degree, in his place and his way. In other words, instead of the isolation and aloofness of Jesus as the valuable point about it all, it is rather the membership of Jesus with the rest of us; it is rather that he shared experiences which is intelligible to all of us, and which is indispensable in the redemptive process of life—it is this that is the stirring thing. In case that this is true, then our modern thought of God and our modern thought of man will allow this position harmoniously to be integrated in our general view of the world and of life. But the very words that are used seem to picture an individual God here, and a man here, and some third party coming in between them. I ask you to recall how manifold and complex this ecclesiastical mediation between God and man once was, how progressive reduction has gone on for centuries, and how the immanence of God now supersedes the necessity for such kind of mediation at all.

Now, our doctrine of the immanence of God, spirit of our spirit, and processes of our processes, and suffering in our suffering, so that the Cross is the constant fact in life—our thought of that is a much more wholesome and dynamic thought than the Israelite and ancient historical fact detached and disparate from the rest of life to which we once looked back as the source of our

strength. Thus God and Christ and cross and redemption are before us as well as behind us. (*Applause.*)

REV. ALBERT G. LAWSON: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, as the reason given me why three different brethren did not send cards readily—one of the interests of our Congress, one of the interests most vital to us, is an out-and-out and frank and true volunteer discussion of all papers here presented—one of our rules is that the appointed speaker shall not use manuscript, and three men have declined to send cards, or to speak, because we have permitted the overruling of our rule. And they have said that it was unfair to give a man an opportunity to present practically a manuscript prepared beforehand when it was understood that they were appointed speakers, and then ask for men from the floor to volunteer, to think on their feet, and to discuss questions so important as these.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, for use in our future meetings, that we take a little more pains in a rightful regard for our own rules, and just legislation in regard to that feature on our programme, and I think we shall have a more lively, and more fairly distributed, and more worthful discussion of the various questions presented to us.

THE PRESIDENT: Will you take the chair for a moment?

(*Dr. Lawson took the chair.*)

DR. LEIGHTON WILLIAMS: If you will allow the chairman to become a speaker for a moment, I would like to remind you of the difficulty of the situation, and then to say a word on this important matter before us. It is exceedingly difficult for those who have been asked to prepare addresses, so called, to come here with their thoughts fixed in certain channels, and then re-adjust those thoughts to a situation that is necessarily different from that which they have imagined it to be. I think, therefore, that we must allow some discretion, especially on philosophical or theological topics; we must allow some infringement of the rule, but I do heartily agree with Dr. Lawson, that as far as it is possible, we ought to abide by the rules which we have adopted; I trust you will excuse the chair for offering these reasons why I have allowed it at all.

Now, to come to the discussion of the afternoon, I would suggest that the reason why we put one of our cherished views, the view of the atonement, up for first discussion, is this fact, that in view of the current tone of men of the day, and the influences of that, we must again consider the question whether our statement of our belief needs in any way to be modified. I would not say with Dr. Foster personally, that it seems to me that it is not historical or literary criticism that forces this so much as the inductive method of reasoning, the scientific atmosphere in which we all live, because I venture to suggest to you in the words that I used a few moments since, the question has forced itself again and again on many minds how in the orderly world, where the sequence of cause and effect is everywhere recognized, can you say that a fact that happened 1,900 years ago is one that is directly interjecting itself, so to speak, between the individual souls today and the Eternal One. Now, we may just as well meet that question, and if we do not feel that it is fully and satisfactorily met by anything that has been said, at any rate we welcome the effort to say something. That is the way I look at it. I would not feel that I had been able to feel entirely satisfied with statements that have been recently made on that, and therefore I would not feel at once that I can be in entire agreement with Dr. Foster, but I do cherish a sort of love for a man who is willing to do what seems to me a courageous thing, and what I believe to be a very necessary thing for someone to do. I believe it is exceedingly necessary that we should address ourselves to the religious and ethical consciences of the men of our time, and these men are affected very largely by these drifts of opinion about us.

Now, in all theological readjustments there must be a period of uncertainty, and it is a time of uncertainty with many minds, I myself look upon it far more hopefully than many do, and if I may venture now to give my own view, it will be something along this line, that a cataclysm has happened in this chain of cause and effect, and after this event which we call cataclysm, we find the whole chain again has started afresh, but in a somewhat altered way—it is a break, as it were, as we call it in geology. We do find again that the eternal order of things is some way or other manifesting itself continually in the temporal, and that it

manifests itself more or less in certain times, and in certain crises, and in certain persons, and beyond it is the eternal, and that therefore endures.

We do say that in the historical processes concrete stages continue for long periods, and then suddenly an individual interposes, and the individual becomes the leader of a new crisis or stage, and lastly, we do see that in personal experience of divine communion we ourselves enter into experience of divine communion in some way or other through the mediation of a symbol, and that the symbol is that which induces relation by suggesting in us the absolute, and we only get the suggestion of the absolute when we contemplate the symbol, and of all the symbols, the Christ is the one in whom we see the absolute and the divine. I know that those who cannot sympathize as I do with mysticism do not look with favor along all these lines, perhaps, but with me the great hope of the truth is summed up in the two words, "Mysticism" and "Socialism." (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: If you gentlemen have nothing to offer in the way of discussion on this subject, I will call for the benediction to be pronounced by Dr. Haywood.

The closing prayer was offered by Dr. Haywood, after which an adjournment was taken to 8 o'clock P. M.

SECOND DAY

Evening Session

November 10, 1909

8 o'clock P. M.

THE PRESIDENT: *Brethren and Sisters*, the hour has arrived for the session of the evening. Let us join in the 1056th hymn.
(*The hymn was then sung.*)

THE PRESIDENT: We will be led in prayer by Rev. Dr. Merriam, the editor of *The Watchman*.

DR. MERRIAM offered prayer.

THE PRESIDENT: The topic is, "Recent Tendencies to Change Denominational Practice: Are They Desirable?" And the first

of the readers is our honored brother, the editor of *The Examiner*, Dr. Conant. (*Applause.*)

T. O. CONANT, LL.D.: If you think you are going to get anything but straight old-fashioned orthodoxy from my paper to-night, you will be disappointed.

RECENT TENDENCIES TO CHANGE DENOMINATIONAL PRACTICE

Mr. Chairman: The first step away from the simplicity of the gospel order was taken when, very early in the history of the church, the ecclesiastical leaders, arrogating to themselves powers which did not belong to them, began to substitute their own fanciful interpretations for the plain precepts of Christ and the apostolic writers. The assumption that they were at liberty to do this lay at the bottom of all those terrible perversions of the principles of the gospel which transformed the simple brotherhood established by our Lord into a vast spiritual despotism, pretending to wield supernatural powers and to control the keys into the Kingdom of Heaven. And the most far-reaching and mischievous of these perversions was the substitution of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration for that of the baptism of believers. From that malignant root sprang the mighty Upas tree of error which still flourishes in the Greek and Roman schisms, and too largely pervades even some of the Protestant communions. The Reformation of the sixteenth century, whose spirit had already been for two hundred years in the air, was a long step backward toward the New Testament ideal; but alas! it proved a case of arrested development. For various reasons, which cannot now be specified, infant baptism was retained in the Reformed State churches, and, more than anything else, became a bar to their complete emancipation from some of the most pernicious errors of Rome. Some of these churches, and offshoots from them, still linger in the twilight of ecclesiastical reform, unable to free themselves wholly from the traditions of men; and that others have approached nearer to the New Testament standard is mainly due to the fact that, in the midst of that deplorable arrest of progress, men of courage and clear vision arose who discerned and embraced the truth, and at the cost of ostracism, imprisonment,

torture, and death, bore their testimony to the spiritual nature of Christ's church and the peril of departure from the New Testament ideal. But for their fidelity and zeal in the face of persecution, and the vital seed they planted and fertilized with their heart's blood, there might have been no truly evangelical churches in the world today. Now, the vital principle on which they stood may be summarized in the following propositions, which I present as the basis of my argument today:

I. There is but one safe guide for Christ's disciples in the organization of a Christian church—the New Testament.

II. The New Testament, by command, precept, and example, plainly indicates what a Christian church should be.

III. Any departure, for any reason, from the fundamental principles of this New Testament pattern is perilous to the spirituality of the church, and a hindrance to the spread of Christ's evangel in the world.

This is the essential spirit, if not the precise words, of our Baptist fathers' message to the men of their time—a message vital still, and worthy of earnest heed.

I. It is not many years since it would have been superfluous to argue for the truth of my first proposition in a Baptist assembly. Every Baptist held it as a sacred and irrefragable article of faith. "The New Testament our only rule of faith and practice," has been our battle-cry for generations. But we have fallen upon other and, as some profess to think, more enlightened days. There are among us those who hold the authority of the New Testament in somewhat light esteem. Oh, yes! 'tis a good book—one of the best, perhaps the best, that we have. It contains much to which we ought to give heed. But wisdom did not die with the writers of it. New truth is breaking, not only out of it, as honest John Robinson meant, but out of the air, so to speak. "They didn't know everythin' down in Judee," you know. And so they feel at liberty, like the ancient fathers, to depart from the pattern given, and follow the devices and desires of their own presumptuous hearts.

But this, I contend, is precisely what we have no right to do. Why? Because, if you please, God has been good enough to reveal a plan for church organization, we are not free to reject

or modify it to suit our own ideas. Do you say that this is begging the question? How do you know that this plan is God-given? I reply that we know it, as our fathers knew it, because it is contained in a book which bears the hall-mark of divine inspiration. I know that that is a venturesome assertion in this age of interrogation points, but I believe the facts justify the statement. The question is too large to argue here. I can only say, briefly, that he who doubts the inspiration of the New Testament is self-condemned, confessing his lack of the spiritual discernment necessary to an appreciation of the truth. To such a one it cannot be made plain. How can you describe to a blind man the beauty of the lily or the splendor of the stars? Inspiration is not clear, and cannot be made clear, to an unilluminated mind. It is a spiritual truth, spiritually discerned. Our fathers learned what it means by faith; and so must we. And looking into the Book with spirit-illuminated eyes, they received and humbly followed its teachings, and were guided to the rediscovery of truths long latent concerning Christ's church—truths that were hidden from the wise and discerning of their day—and in the light thus given were able to lay foundations which have endured the test of time and trial, and have profoundly influenced the thought and action of the entire Christian world. We shall be wise if we follow in their steps.

II. Since organization is essential to successful work, it ought not to surprise us that God should reveal the kind of organization he desired his church to have. And we find it in the New Testament. It is very simple: A company of believers in Jesus Christ, immersed in his name on confession of their faith, bound together for worship and service by their common love for him and for each other. That is all—divinely simple! But it is enough—for *it works*. It seems loose as a rope of sand; but the bond is strong as steel. Age after age it has forged ahead, a mighty and a united host. Against calumny, against persecution, against contempt, against misrepresentation, against failure to measure up to its own ideals, this loose organization has won great victories, enlarged its borders, and so wrought upon even its enemies and detractors as largely to shape their ideal to its own God-given pattern. Now you may search the New Testament from A to

Izzard and you shall find no hint or suggestion of any organization more complex than that which I have described, or than is embodied, in its essential features, in every Baptist church on the globe today. Not that the pattern extends to unessential details. As to these the New Testament is not explicit. The essentials being conformed to, there is wide liberty in details. Our social customs differ, in many ways, from those of the early disciples. The beauty of the New Testament norm is that it fits into every social order in every age—not the least proof of its divine origin. Forms of worship, modes of administration, methods of work, anything that is not in conflict with the fundamental principles of the spiritual brotherhood, may be freely adopted, if thereby the Kingdom of Christ may be advanced.

III. Since, then, the model is God-given, it is evident that any departure from its essential elements is inadmissible. We readily admit that the substitution of the idolatry of the mass for the simple meal of the Lord's Supper is unimaginable for us. Why should it be thought that a radical change in the terms of admission to the church—a change that involves a complete perversion as to the subjects and the mode of baptism—is less objectionable? Ingenious attempts have been made, of late, to show that baptism is no longer obligatory—if, in fact, it ever was—and therefore that subject and mode are of no particular consequence. But there is no foundation for such a plea. There can be no manner of doubt that every convert in the early days was required to be "buried with Christ in baptism" in token of his entrance upon the new life in Christ. It was an obligation from which none was exempt. As to its present obligation, it is incumbent upon those who deny it to show when and by whom it was abrogated. To whom has Christ made it known that his disciples need no longer be baptized? Those who presume to set aside his law are bound to give conclusive reason for their presumption. But they have no reason. The commandment stands, unrepealed, unamended.

Today we are confronted with a proposition to exempt certain disciples from compliance with this universal obligation. It is significant, however, that no argument is advanced in favor of this proposal which would not really be equally valid for exempting all believers from baptism. Possibly that is the ultimate pur-

pose. But the contention is inadmissible—unless on the ground that it is admissible to make the Word of God of no effect. For Jesus commanded it. In the same breath with which he commissioned his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel, he commanded them to baptize those whom they discipled. If the one is not binding, then is not the other—and away goes your commission for evangelizing the world! But we may venture to suppose that the apostles and their immediate converts knew the mind of their risen Lord; and they went right on making disciples and immersing them precisely as he had enjoined. What they did there is no possible excuse for our not doing. It is a plea without basis in sense or reason that asks us to subordinate our hallowed principles, drawn from the New Testament, to the mistaught consciences of some who wish to join with us, not from principle, but for sentimental reasons. If anyone wishes to join a Baptist church, let him conform to the usage of the church, not look to the church to conform its usage, received from the Lord, to his personal preference.

And so, I contend, the new proposition—new at least to this country—to receive to our membership those who have not been scripturally baptized, who have only been subjected—who have not even subjected themselves—to a rite that has not the remotest resemblance to New Testament baptism, is not unwise only, but involves positive disobedience to the law and will of Christ. This objection is fundamental, and should be controlling. But there are practical consequences which would follow its adoption which deserve mention here.

a) It would introduce an element of cleavage into our churches. There would be two classes of members, the baptized and the unbaptized. We boast of our democratic equality; but here would be a favored class, brought into the church without submitting to an ordinance required of others. Can we afford to introduce an element so likely to produce discord and division?

b) It would tend, as it has done in England, to confuse the minds of the people, especially our young people—as to the relative importance of the two forms and subjects of the ordinance; and in time the less convenient and agreeable form would be sure to be crowded into the background.

c) It would cause division in the denomination. American Baptists as a whole will never, in my judgment, tolerate a practice so subversive of their fundamental principles as the reception to membership of unbaptized persons; and the individual church that does adopt it is doing so at the risk of making trouble for itself and for its sister churches, and, so far as it can, paving the way for a split just at the time when we are trying to foster union with brethren from whom we have long been separated. We have at this very time, an illustration of what will happen in the case of a church not far from Boston.

d) It would tend to weaken the conception of our people as to the real meaning and importance of believers' baptism. I am not at all disposed to exalt a mere form. If the form were all, I should say, Let it go! But in this case the form is not all—the form is essential to the truth expressed by it. It proclaims the Lord's burial and resurrection, and the believer's burial and resurrection with him—the symbol of a fundamental and glorious fact. Surely our Lord knew when he instituted it whether or not it was needful. Are we wiser than he?

e) Finally, the history of the church from the beginning has demonstrated the peril of changing an ordinance of Christ into a rite teaching a doctrine different from that which he intended it to teach. He left but two—both relating to the solemn facts of his death and resurrection. We as Baptists profess to desire above all things to conform to the will of Christ. We base our right to be upon such conformity. Shall we now belie our profession in order to minister to a sickly sentimentalism which aims to make easy the path of disobedience in others? By such a course we may gain a few members, but we shall forfeit the respect of the world, which has hitherto accorded us—in these late years at least—praise for our consistency in adhering to principle at the sacrifice of much that is agreeable and, from a worldly point of view, desirable. But more than that, and chiefly, we should reject this new proposal because it would dishonor our divine Lord in the house of his friends. We could not do this thing without proclaiming to the world by that act that we no longer regard the command of Christ in the matter

of baptism as binding upon us. God forbid that we should ever be guilty of such folly!

But if we should be thus guilty, what then would become of our age-long protest against the error of infant baptism? This ancient rite is not simply a pretty service of dedication; it is the supplanting of a vital ordinance of Christ by a fundamental and pernicious perversion of that sacred ordinance. If now we accept it as valid baptism—as we shall do if we accept for membership those who have been thus “baptized”—we fling our protest to the winds, and no longer have any reason for being. We have committed denominational “hari-kari.”

Just a word, in conclusion, as to other matters named in the programme.

1. With regard to “open communion,” so called, allow me to say that Baptists ought never to have allowed themselves to be side-tracked from the main issue, which was, and is, believers’ baptism, to defend a matter of comparatively small *practical* moment. Our opponents were wiser in their generation than we. They attacked us at a point where divisions—mainly sentimental, but none the less powerful for that—were sure to arise in our own ranks; for us it was a tactical blunder to permit such a diversion. There our defenses were weak; on the question of baptism we were impregnable. I have long believed that we should refuse to accept the pedobaptist lead, and return to our main contention—believers’ immersion the sole New Testament baptism.

2. With regard to “private baptism” it can only be said that, inasmuch as the New Testament is silent on that point, no hard and fast rule can be laid down. The number of witnesses is immaterial, and the course to be pursued should be determined by circumstances.

3. Any member of a Baptist church in good standing, desiring to withdraw from its fellowship, is entitled by Christian courtesy to receive a certificate of Christian character, addressed to any person or body he may desire. I can see no impropriety in granting such a certificate. And it seems to me equally plain that a letter from any evangelical body should be received as evidence of Christian character and fitness for reception to membership,

after compliance with the law of Christ regarding baptism. No right-thinking person would wish to join a Baptist church on any other terms.

4. "Associated membership," like the old New England "half-way covenant," is an absurdity. What does it mean? What would it amount to? Every chance attendant at a Baptist church today is accorded nearly every privilege belonging to a member: what more is wanted? Baptism and the right to vote at church meetings alone remain, and these can be obtained by a simple compliance with the command of Christ. Must we abrogate that law to suit the taste of these fastidious "dry Baptists"?

Mr. Chairman, I stand simply for the maintenance of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. The New Testament, plainly interpreted, is our sufficient rule of faith and practice. Let us accept its guidance, loyally follow it, and we shall not go astray.

THE PRESIDENT: I am sorry that a disappointment is in store for the Congress, in that the next speaker is detained, and has sent a letter in place of his paper, which letter the Secretary will now read to us.

THE SECRETARY: Before leaving home I received a letter which I hold in my hand from Dr. Hanley, dated November 5, in which he states he expects to be with us beginning with Tuesday, and to stay throughout the Congress. I have another letter which I will read *verbatim et literatim* in accordance with the request contained in it.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH
ELIJAH A. HANLEY, PASTOR
PROVIDENCE, R. I.

November 9, 1909

To the Baptist Congress, Rev. Theodore A. K. Gessler, D.D., Secretary:

Dear Brethren: At the request of your committee, I have carefully prepared a paper on the subject assigned me, setting forth a serious situation before Baptist churches today and pointing out that change in policy which I believe to be required by fidelity to the truth and spirit of Jesus Christ and also by consistency with historic principles enunciated by our fathers.

While I firmly believe that the paper contains a vital message, I have

come to feel, on further consideration, that the time has not yet arrived when I can fully declare my views on this subject without bringing grief to many and without arousing controversy which by its emphasis on secondary things would misrepresent my real attitude and would greatly embarrass my present work.

Without the least compromise as to convictions of the truth and ideals for the Baptist church, but with recognition of the law of growth in spiritual progress, I beg to send earnest regrets, after having done my utmost to fulfil all obligations in this matter.

For the sake therefore of service in my own field, more important I believe for the progress of the denomination than anything I could now say at the Baptist Congress, and with the unwavering confidence that a larger policy in our Baptist churches must surely come, I cheerfully forego the privilege of attempting to forecast what course American Baptists must take for the future, if they are to fulfil their mission in the work of establishing the Kingdom of God.

This communication may be read or printed, provided it be used entire.

Very sincerely,

E. A. HANLEY

THE PRESIDENT: We regret the absence of Dr. Hanley, and still more the reason that he alleges for its necessity. Every man is a judge of his own position and his own acts. It is not for us to judge, but I hope and believe that any man in our denomination could fully and freely express his opinion, provided he did it in a courteous and Christian way.

The appointed speakers of the evening are now to address us. I hope that gentlemen who desire to take part in the discussion will be preparing themselves to follow immediately, and without pause, at the close of these two addresses.

The first of these speakers is our honored brother, so long pastor of the Fifth Avenue Church in this city, where he and the editor dwelt together in loving unity, and who is now the honored president of Brown University, Dr. Faunce. (*Applause.*)

W. H. P. FAUNCE, LL.D.: *Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen:* I am certainly in a difficult position. I cannot discuss Dr. Hanley's paper, because it is not here. I cannot very well discuss the paper of my warm personal friend, Dr. Conant—to be candid—I am so much on the other side.

I appreciate afresh the genial, unfailing courtesy and patience with which he listened to my preaching in those years—it now seems so long ago—when he must have hoped, Sunday after Sunday, that I would present something along the lines of his thought tonight.

Dr. Hanley's letter affords us food for thought, even if there should be no discussion whatever. It is not the paper of a coward, of a man who skilfully retreats. On the contrary, it expresses definitely and clearly his view, and any man who wants to know that view in detail can talk with him. I urged him to come here. I saw no reason why he should not come here, why any Baptist should not speak his mind at this Congress. But others urged him very strongly not to come, and as he is doing just now a magnificent spiritual work, he refuses to enter into any propaganda, or become entangled in any controversy on a subject which after all is on the circumference of Christian faith.

The Baptist denomination is today experiencing two great movements: One a movement for organic unity in work; the other a movement for greater freedom from ceremonial restriction. The movement for organic unity has amazed us by its rapidity, its determination, its imperativeness, its success. All the venerable arguments from popular exegesis, just as strong today as ever, all the precepts of our fathers and the experience of two or three hundred years have been swept away in the imperious demand for real and visible unity in advancing the Kingdom of God. The other movement is working as yet under the surface, but working steadily, and in due time will also sweep away all the arguments against it, from whatever source they may be drawn, and will achieve in some way a larger freedom, a genuine exaltation of the spirit above the letter.

I know at least a dozen Baptist ministers in churches as prominent as that of Dr. Hanley's who share his convictions and ought to be heard here tonight. They will be heard in the next ten years, either in the churches that they now serve, or in other churches that will be glad to listen.

Our Baptist churches have drifted into a position at variance with the teachings of our Baptist fathers, at variance with our fundamental principle, and which is causing today great searching

of hearts. What is that fundamental principle? It seems a work of supererogation to state it. For the sake of the contrast, however, we may attempt a statement. Our fundamental principle is the assertion of the human soul, the belief that every soul has immediate access to God, and in his presence can stand erect and fearless before all human authority. The primary Baptist position is the vindication of the individual, not only his right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, but to formulate his own faith, and to interpret Scripture and history for himself. It is to affirm what Celsus denied, when he said: "The root of Christianity is an excessive valuation of the human soul, and the absurd idea that God takes interest in man." The eternal value of the soul, the interest of God in man, and the immediate access of every man to God we steadily affirm. We hold that the Christian religion is a spiritual experience and possession; not a code of laws to be obeyed, not a set of external requirements to which we must adhere, not a series of propositions to which we must give intellectual assent, not a set of ceremonies which must be performed, but an experience "hid with Christ in God." Such expressions are almost too sacred to be used in debate; they go too deep; they touch the very roots of our being. These great affirmations and insights have generated the enthusiasm which has carried our churches into every continent and the islands of the sea. "Baptist history has been a bush aflame with the presence of God."

Now there are two corollaries from this position, both very obvious. One is that religion must be free from state control. Surely we need say nothing about that tonight. The other is that believers are free from sacramentalism of every kind. Sacramentalism means either belief in the magical efficacy of certain sacred objects, or a literal bondage to certain clauses in formulas, incantations, or documents. When sacramentalism deals with crucifixes and holy water and swinging censers it attributes magical efficacy to the material objects. When sacramentalism deals with ancient formulas or phrases in liturgy or sacred documents and declares that the essence of religious life is literal adherence and conformity to these formulas or phrases, it is

literalism. This sacramentalism is materialism on the one hand, or literalism on the other.

For instance, as we all know, the sacramentalist says: "‘Baptism doth now save us;’ is it not so written in the Scripture? How then dare you call baptism a mere symbolic act? Has not the very Word of God proclaimed that baptism is a saving rite?"

Again the sacramentalist quotes: "This is my body." We all remember how Luther brought down his fist upon the table in his argument with Zwingli again and again, and said, "Here is the Scripture: ‘this is my body.’" When Zwingli, forerunner of the Baptists, affirmed that the bread simply represented the Lord, Luther repelled the idea as dishonoring to Scripture. Again he quoted: "This is my blood," and to him anyone who affirmed it to be simply a symbol, a mere help to the spiritual memory of our Lord, was taking the heart out of this most sacred ceremony of the Christian faith.

The sacramentalist quotes again: "Through the laying-on of hands the Holy Ghost was given." "That," he says, "is the very word of God. Beware how you make it of none effect by your tradition. It means that without the laying-on of hands there is no such thing as apostolic succession or apostolic success. This is the divinely prescribed form for the conveyance of the Spirit." And that again is literalism.

But are we ourselves wholly free from this literalism? Our fathers fought for their freedom from formulas and ritual. Are we still fighting for it? Today in the opinion of the whole Christian world, outside the Baptist church, by a most unhappy misunderstanding, we are understood to lay our chief emphasis on the ritualistic element in religion. This perpetual misunderstanding is, in the phrase of Dr. John Clifford, "one of the most ghastly ironies of history."

Go out into the street here tonight and take any ten men passing this church, men of intelligence and men of Christian training, and say to those men: "What do the people inside that church tonight mainly stand for?" And out of ten men, intelligent and Christian, nine will answer: "Those people stand for a tremendous emphasis on the ceremonial element in Christianity." You say that is a sad misconstruction, and so it is. But it is miscon-

struction not only by the rank and file, but by the most intelligent men in the Christian world. I have a sentence burning in my memory tonight from the last book of George A. Gordon, *Religion and Miracle*. Dr. Gordon is one of the most sincere and intelligent and truly prophetic preachers in America today. In that latest book he says in a sentence which many of us will resent: "The Baptist cannot surrender a mere form, even for the sake of the Eternal Spirit." Do you say that is false witness? It is the judgment of one of the keenest minds and best informed men in the modern world. The triumphs we have gained in missions are too often overlooked today. What we have done in magnificent service for the separation of church and state is in the background today. The emphasis is not where our fathers put it. They fought for freedom and for liberty and for spiritual religion. Our emphasis against our will seems somehow to rest chiefly on the ritualistic element in religion.

Who then is responsible for this? Largely the popular defenders and exponents of our Baptist tradition. For when we come to these exponents and read the little tracts that they hand around in the interest of propaganda, this is what we hear them say: "Is not the fundamental virtue of the Christian life obedience? But obedience specifically requires a definite ritual. Therefore, no man is a true Christian in the fullest and deepest sense of the word until he has been through this particular phase of obedience." Obedience thus is singled out as the primal quality of the Christian life. But what do they mean by obedience? If by obedience they mean absorbing and assimilating the life of Christ, if they mean sharing his attitude toward God and toward man, if they mean absolute surrender of spirit for the great ends for which he lived, then obedience is indeed the primal virtue of the Christian life. But if they mean conformity of ritual to a few clauses in certain ancient and disputed texts, then I deny that in any genuine sense ceremonial obedience is the primary virtue of the Christian life.

Are not some of our friends familiar with modern textual criticism? Surely they are. Does biblical scholarship leave us any passage which makes it indubitably certain that Christ regarded his religion as bound up forevermore through all the

millenniums with a particular ritual? I will not answer that question. Each man must answer it for himself. Some men will doubtless always regard ceremonial obedience as the great test of discipleship, while others will make moral likeness to our Lord and possession of his spirit the final and sufficient criterion.

If I wanted to make the Baptist position—and I am a Baptist from the soles of my feet to the crown of my head—if I wanted to make the Baptist position, for which our fathers lived and died, absolutely clear to the Christian world, I would ask a hundred Baptist ministers to preach next Sunday morning from the text, "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples." And when they had done that I would ask them to preach on the following Sunday morning from the text: "I thank God I baptized none of you." In all seriousness I say it, if a hundred Baptist ministers were to preach from these two texts on successive Sundays the original Baptist position, which made personal faith the essential for admission to a regenerate church, would become obviously plain to the whole Christian world. Such preaching would not involve the surrender of any principle or any symbol, but simply put the symbol in its original and proper place. Of course, *βαπτίζω* means precisely what we have always said it means. The battle of exegesis has been fought and won. But after all, what would our Lord think of the mountainous erudition piled on the study of that one word? Would he count it vastly more important than the discussion on the length of the fringe of the Jewish garments? The battle of exegesis has been won; but the battle for spirituality remains yet to be fought and won; the battle for a life that shall place the supreme emphasis on a man's Christ-likeness, and on his faith in God the Father and his only Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Theoretically we profess to exalt the spirit above the letter; but is that the practical result?

Today the churches all around this one, in whose sanctuary we meet, are receiving Christians of every kind, if they truly believe in Jesus Christ. This church is receiving one species of Christian only, that which fully acknowledges that without the ritualistic element there is no full obedience. Yet no ritualistic requirement can ever rank with spiritual demands. Though it were blazoned on the sky, though it were spoken out of the clouds,

no ritualistic requirement can ever take rank with the command to love one's God and love his neighbor as himself. These are the supreme things in religion, and somehow we must make them seem so.

Now, as regards the details on this printed programme, I do not feel much anxiety about them. I am not here to lay out any programme or make any recommendation. I am merely diagnosing a condition. We must not shut our eyes to changes that have already occurred. "Open communion" I see on the programme as an appointed subject for discussion. But we already have that in nearly all the most influential churches of the North. In some we have more than that. I wonder what Dr. Edward Bright, the "grand old man" of thirty years ago, would say, if he knew of the present attitude of the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church of which he was a member? Would he rise from his rest and dis-fellowship the church, and dis-fellowship any of us who condone the attitude of the church? Yet with that attitude the last three pastors of the church are in cordial sympathy.

Brethren, we should be standing in another and larger way for just what those stalwart men and women stood for in the last generation—obedience to Christ. Only let our obedience be of the spirit before the letter, and make it clear that our main doctrine is not a dispute regarding the meaning of a word, but a demand for faith in the living God. The great contention of our Baptist fathers was not regarding the mode of baptism, but the subject of baptism, i. e., not regarding the outer, but the inner requirement. While the world stands the original form of baptism will doubtless endure. It is pictorial, and in it the great apostle to the gentiles saw symbols of cardinal Christian facts. It is an exact imitation of our Lord's act, as other forms are not. Through it millions have entered into the joy of absolute surrender. But we cannot conceal from ourselves that many among us are refusing longer to punish by exclusion from the Lord's table their fellow-Christians who think the outer ritual unessential to spiritual discipleship.

So today there is a great movement among our people toward a depression of insistence on ritual, and a reaffirmation of the supremacy of the spiritual. Just how this supremacy is to be

made manifest we cannot say. The little devices mentioned on our printed programme—"Associate Membership," etc.—may be wise or unwise. We cannot compel our churches to any rigid order. But we can all unitedly determine to set ourselves right before God and man by making likeness to Christ the supreme thing in the Christian life. Thus shall our churches be truly representative, not of a school of exegesis, but of the entire Kingdom of God.

But someone may say, Where then does the function of our denomination come in? What is left as our "distinctive tenet"? Just what was left to our fathers—evangelism, Christian education, the exaltation of the spirit of Christ above the letter of any law. This last week a New York clergyman in one of our sister churches—for every Christian church is a sister church—publicly said: "We believe in the salvation of souls through the sacramental system. . . . With (many) Protestants salvation is obtained through faith and conversion. Our prayer-book teaches us that we must come to God through baptism, confirmation, and holy eucharist." As long as sincere Christian men believe that, our Baptist churches will have a function divinely given, and will continue to affirm that, useful, beautiful, historical as ritual may be, men are not driven to come to the Father through eucharist or confirmation or baptism, but they come in spirit and truth.

Spirit with Spirit can meet,
Closer is he than breathing,
Nearer than hands and feet.

(*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: We gladly welcome to this platform Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith, of Brooklyn, who is the second appointed speaker on this topic.

REV. GWILYM O. GRIFFITH: *Mr. Chairman and Dear Friends:* I find myself in somewhat of the attitude equal to that which Dr. Faunce complained of, for those things that I came here prepared to affirm were in part so much better affirmed by Dr. Conant than I could possibly state them, and those things in which I came prepared to disagree with Dr. Conant (for I was not surprised or disappointed by his paper) I found answered so unanswerably by the last speaker that I am very much inclined to wish myself in

the place of Dr. Hanley, and to have written a paper and stayed away. (*Laughter.*)

However, it is impossible, of course, in a discussion such as this to treat exhaustively upon any other of the subjects we have before us within a speech limited to twenty minutes. I shall say in regard to the general theme of the possibility of contemplated change in denominational practice, that the subject is an open one, and we have not reached the point of finality. We cannot affirm that we have so perfectly wrought out our ecclesiastical or denominational systems according to the pattern shown us on the Mount, that to suggest any alteration or change would be sacrilegious. We stand as Baptists for certain principles that abide against all changes of men or methods, all mutation and fluctuation of the passing ages. These are fundamental principles of evangelical faith and practice. But how impossible it would be for us to affirm that the deductions and constructions woven around these fundamental principles are absolutely final! These things are subject to the law of change and alteration and progress that governs all things that are the emanation of the human mind (and our denominational system is the product of fallible minds). It is very easy to state, as we heard stated in the paper which was read, that there are certain fundamental facts in the Bible regarding church constitutions which are perfectly plain and which God has been good enough to make known to us, and that this settles the question once for all regarding the practices of the Baptist church. The fact is that when we pass from these fundamental facts to their interpretation, we find ourselves at once in the realm of diversity, variety, and contrariety. In these things we must absolutely repudiate any suggestion of finality. I am aware that this is perfectly platitudinous, but the pity is that we have to reiterate these platitudes, because there is in our churches an attitude, not perhaps a representative attitude, but one that is sufficiently garrulous and which would claim for these denominational practices an absolute finality that does not belong to them. Its representatives are too ready to raise the cry of sacrilege against those who advocate denominational reform, as if those who suggested the change were putting forth their hand, as the Chairman said, to steady the Ark, when all they may be

doing is putting forth their hand to overthrow the pedestal of Dagon.

Now, there is another word on this subject: We must consider all the subjects of this evening's discussion on their own merits. They must have separate discussion. I mention this because it is too glibly assumed, that in regard to those who entertain a view favoring some reform respecting one of these matters that concern our Baptist faith and order—it is too glibly assumed, I say, that they must necessarily be on the side of reform and drastic revolution regarding all these other matters that may be brought into question. For instance, if a man suggest reform in the matter of open communion (and I do not think that this matter of open communion is altogether the dead issue that has been suggested tonight; if some of my friends had been through a Baptist council here in the East that it was my pleasure, or pain, rather, to submit to a few months ago, perhaps they would temper their opinion); if a man, I say, suggest reform in this matter of communion, he is very likely to be charged forthwith with being in favor of associated membership and all the other terrible heresies which have been listed on the programme tonight.

Well, now, for my own part I am not in favor of associated membership, and I repudiate the idea that to stand for any one of these reforms means to be heretical on all the other charges. It does seem that there are some good friends who hold their opinions, their Baptist convictions, as so many pegs in a bundle of kindling wood; if one peg is knocked out, the whole bundle falls through, and these friends cannot conceive it possible for anyone to maintain a radical attitude regarding one of these subjects, without his being altogether out of sympathy with the so-called conservative view in regard to the others.

Now, our position is not of that sort. We do not hold our convictions as so much dead wood to be bound up in an orthodox knot, and useful occasionally for throwing at the head of a heretical intruder, or to throw into a heretic's bonfire. We hold our convictions rather as branches united to a living vine, and when one of these branches is dead we cast it away, but the vine of our Baptist convictions is not the loser thereby. It grows and flourishes all the more for its riddance of so much dead wood. And

then in this matter (if I may refer very briefly now in the time that is allotted me)—in this matter of open communion, I would suggest that it cannot be argued on the basis of expediency. I do deplore very deeply that argument that is reiterated so constantly in our papers and in our councils, that really it would not *pay* for us as Baptist churches to entertain this suggested reform, because (to take one instance, the case of the English churches) it has been shown so often that the English churches have lost in membership because of this change. Now, I will not controvert that statement. I believe it to be absolutely false, absolutely mistaken. But I do protest against the argument itself, as though any such argument should deter us for one instant from taking our stand for the principle of open communion, if we believe it is *right*. It is not for us to be totting up figures and asking, "Will it pay? Will it pay?" The question is not to be settled that way. The question is not, Will it mean a shrinkage in membership, or will it mean an augmentation of membership? The question is, Is it right? If it is right, then let us announce it; let us not maintain an ambiguous reticence; let us announce it. The question must be forced to this issue; all these questions that have come up before us must be brought to this issue: Are they right in principle? Are they scriptural? Are they in conformity with the Catholic spirit, with the apostolic spirit, with the Christian spirit, or are they not? That is the issue.

To refer again to the question of open communion, the question is, Is it scriptural, or is close communion merely an outworn expediency (that has served its time and served its ends, and served them well) but an outworn expediency like the brazen serpent in the wilderness that did good service in its day, amidst the fiery serpents, but which in the day when it became an idealistic conventionality was a hindrance to the spiritual progress of the people, and had to be hammered to fragments?

Here is the question, then: Is it scriptural? Is it one of those eternal fundamental principles of our evangelical faith? Or is it a changing expedient? We are quite prepared to take that stand and have it discussed on that basis.

And then all these questions must be regarded in their correlations. It is impossible to regard any of these denomina-

tional questions merely in their denominational relations. We must have a wider horizon. An artificial horizon may be of great value to an Arctic explorer, but there is a kind of artificial horizon which is sometimes the implement of the denominationalist, and which is of very doubtful value. I mean the artificial horizon which confines his vision within denominational limits so that he becomes unable to view things in their proper proportion and perspective.

No man has a right to be in denominational affairs like a cow in a clover patch, believing that the end of all things is the other side of his own denominational fence. He must take a broader outlook, and view these questions in relation to a larger perspective.

Now, it is impossible for us to escape the fact that we are now in the throes of a great movement that is making for unity and solidarity. We are certainly in the presence of arrayed and marshaled forces of evil which maintain a sinister and menacing solidarity. We ourselves as a Christian church in this world have found ourselves disorganized, badly disciplined, and cursed by ecclesiastical feudalism. And now we find ourselves, as never before, in the midst of a movement that is making for the gradual unification of the Christian forces. We have come to see that this growing solidarity, cannot be expressed in terms of intellectual uniformity; we will not perpetuate the mistake of Romanism, the terrific blunder of Romanism. We are coming to understand that when we read of our "coming into the unity of the faith and knowledge of the Son of God" we are, I say, coming to understand by that unity, a spiritual unity; by that faith, not faith as an articulated confession, not faith as a theological creed, but a repose of the heart, a personal confidence and personal trust in a personal Christ; and by that knowledge we do not mean the accumulation of any intellectual perceptions but a personal intimacy with Christ, a heart-knowledge of him. And we are looking about for the expression and the formation of that deeper unity which we believe is to come to the church of God, if the church of God is to be saved from disaster and catastrophe in our age. And I say we find that the consciousness of this unity deepens more and more as we look toward the Cross, and as we associate the idea

of the Cross in the mind of Christ and our own experiences with the sacrament, the simple ordinance, which he himself has ordained, we find this to be the great rendezvous, the great rallying-point where the hosts of God forget their ecclesiastical feuds and feudalisms, and meet and mingle and merge in Christian fellowship. There, at any rate—as we foregather in obedience to the command of Christ to all loyal and obedient-hearted disciples—as we foregather around the table of the Lord, our divisions, our controversies, our animosities must cease for that one brief hour at least where we unite not to discuss, not to dispute, and not to debate, but to worship and adore. And I say, Sir (if you will allow me this closing moment of my address), those of us who stand for close communion have a grave and awful responsibility, as we pile up our barricades around the Lord's table and draw the cords of our denominationalism around it, and stand before these vast approaching hosts and say, "Hands off! Break away! Be off! This is the Lord's table, and we Baptists are the sole custodians of it! None but Baptists need apply here!" I say that if we can stand in that position we must be able to give a reason, an overwhelming reason, to our sister denominations who inquire into the justification of such an attitude, before we can save ourselves as Baptists from the deserved censure and displeasure of the church of Christ. And when we come to inquire into that reason, what do we find but this, that it is the old played-out, exploded shibboleth of intellectual conformity that has been raised again? For why will not my close-communion brother allow his non-Baptist brother to approach the Lord's table? Why is he suspicious of him and why is he jealous of him? Why is he uneasy when he approaches? Why? Simply because on this one point of church ritual he himself is unable to conform intellectually with the Baptist brethren. Now, we would not for a moment suggest that our non-Baptist brethren are deliberately disobedient in their attitude toward the command of Christ—I know there are individual cases, I understand that—but you and I would not for a moment assert that the great non-Baptist denominations of Protestantism have been founded on a basis of antagonism to this command of Christ, and have been from the first inspired with the spirit of mutiny and disobedience. To say

that would be preposterous. What is the position? Simply that on this one point of ritual they are unable to interpret that command of the Lord and that ordinance of the Christian church in a way that conforms with the interpretation of the Baptist church. It is a matter of intellectual nonconformity only. When my close-Baptist brother sees his Arminian friend approaching the table, he does not say, "I object; I myself am a Calvinist, and you are not; you will not conform intellectually with me in this matter and I object to your communing." Nor would my close-Baptist brother, finding a man sitting next to him in a Baptist church who differs from him in regard to the inspiration of Scripture, object to pass the elements to him. Oh, no; but when he finds a man that differs from him in his interpretation of the Scriptures, not in the matter affecting the fundamental principles of our evangelical faith, but on the matter of Christian ritual, then he puts up the bar and says, "Hands off, clear away, none but Baptists need apply." I say that is deplorable; that is impossible; that is an impossible state of things. I say impossible because I don't think that such a state of things really exists, except in theory today, at least here in the East. At least you will find very few Baptist churches in the East here that are living up to their close-communion principles. But assuredly, my dear friends, the time has come for us to break the ambiguous reticence that has so long prevailed and to come out clearly and boldly in these matters and state what we believe to be true in the broadest tolerance, in the spirit of the Christ, in the spirit of the courage of the Christ.

I am sorry if I have spoken perhaps too controversially. I scarcely have touched on other matters that are of as much or more importance.

I thank you for the patience you have accorded me in listening to these words, and I would simply desire to affirm once more at the close what the speaker who preceded me affirmed, that after all the fundamentals of our Baptist position and faith are not those of ritual, but those that lie deep in the spiritualities of the Christian religion. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, I am very glad to say that we have a very prompt and interesting response to the

invitation to talk. I have been handed six cards of those who are willing to talk to us. I will first call upon our honored brother, Mr. Barnes, for many years the secretary of our state convention.

MR. H. W. BARNES: *Mr. Moderator, and Brethren of the Congress:* I shall certainly be obliged to differ very positively from some of the utterances which have been heard here this evening. I am glad, however, to believe that down deeper than appearances, which sometimes do not mean just what is in the hearts and minds, I am in very much closer agreement with them than my words, compared to theirs, would seem to indicate. In the first place I believe that there is a very positive and decided reason in Christ's purposes and in Christianity's representation of the initiatory ordinance of baptism, as positively representing and picturing the great realities or the very fundamentals of Christianity as a system, and the great realities of the experiences of Christianity; both of them are set forth in the simple act of immersion implying also resurrection. So far as I can judge, I say that there is not another possible act, within the scope of man's imagination, that can do that. Immersion represents the death and burial of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ, and these two are the fundamental doctrines in Christianity. Repentance through sin, death unto it, new life unto God by regeneration, are the fundamental facts of Christian experience, and both the fundamental doctrines and the fundamental facts are presented pictorially in baptism. The Trinity bore witness in the baptism of Jesus, by its presence, and voice, to the significance of that service of immersion. So much on the question of baptism.

A person deaf and dumb can act out in that ordinance his faith in Christ as crucified and raised again for him, and his personal experience as dying unto sin and living again unto God. And if there was no other reason for maintaining it, this is a sufficient reason for maintaining baptism unto the end of time.

Now as to another matter, it is assumed all the way through here, at least in the attitude of certain brethren, that the Lord's Supper is a communion of people with each other. I do not read my Bible that way. The very meaning of communion is an actual giving and receiving, and the Scripture declaration is that the bread that we break is the communion of the body of Christ, and

the cup which we drink is the communion of the blood of Christ. He gives and we receive. The Lord's Supper is not a communion of people with each other, but of individual members with Jesus Christ. What have I to do then with the question of another's coming or not coming? I have only to do with it by my teaching what the will of the Lord is. I am not a sheriff to arrest a person who is violating the law of Christ here or elsewhere. If I teach that the ordinances are not individually complete, but are complementary, I cannot say that our baptism is completed without the Lord's Supper to follow it, and the significance of the one runs into the other. If, therefore, baptism be the initial profession of the faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and personal piety, the profession of personal piety, is the condition of rightly partaking of the Lord's Supper, then a person does not come in that manner to the Lord's Supper if he has neglected to be baptized. This is the position which I have held and grown into in fifty-six years in the ministry, and a pretty careful study of the Scriptures and of Christian matters. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I still have six cards and less than thirty minutes. Can the brethren be trusted to limit themselves to half time? I will first call on Brother Charles R. McNally, now of New London, whom we are very glad to have with us again.

REV. CHARLES R. MCNALLY: I heard of a couple who were married and entered into an agreement that all of the girls that appeared in the family were to be named by the wife, and all of the boys were to be named by the husband. The husband was a traveling man, and he was away from home when the first arrival came. The message came that there was not one, but two, and that they were both girls. He hurried home, and with some amusement put it up to his wife that she was to name the new arrivals. She was truly troubled for a little while, but finally decided that she would name one Kate and the other Duplicate. (*Laughter.*) It happened that there was to be another arrival in that home, and at that time they were again twins, and they were boys. The wife looked to the husband to name the boys. It was his turn to be puzzled, but he finally got back at her and said,

"All right, I have the names. I will name one Pete and the other Repeat."

Now, the thing happened still a third time, and they were boys, and he was truly puzzled this time, but after pondering awhile he decided to name one Max and the other Climax, and said that would end it.

Now, what we have been saying here tonight seems to be a case of duplicate and repeat, but we have not yet got to the desired climax by any means. There seems to be a pretty general feeling that a kindly spirit in interpretation does largest justice to the spirit of the Master. The first principle of the Christ life is the manifestation of the Christ spirit. This must show itself in all our fellowship, not only with Christians of our own body, but with all Christians who are such in the evidences of their life. It is to be feared that some of us have been so over-zealous in our love of the form that we have violated this fundamental requirement, namely, the manifestation of the spirit of Christ in a kindly and generous fellowship.

It seems to me that there is possibly an aspect of the truth concerning these ordinances which has not been recognized and emphasized as I believe it ought to be. We have had insufficient emphasis placed upon the real spiritual contents of the ordinances themselves. I believe the ordinance of baptism and the ordinance of the Lord's Supper to have been distinctly appointed by Jesus Christ for definite spiritual ends. No man can see the ordinance of baptism as we perform it in our Baptist churches, and ask the question, "What are they doing?" without having Jesus Christ in his sinless beauty, him crucified, buried, and raised again, preached to him. I had a beautiful illustration of that a while ago up in New London. A young man came to me and wanted to have the service of baptism explained to him and we sat down together. He had a Bible with him, with marked passages, and as I turned to the various passages relating to baptism I found that he had them all marked, and knew of them and had studied them. I said, "You don't seem to need much instruction from me." He said, "I should like to follow the Lord in baptism. I was converted three years ago, but have never had this thing presented to me before. Ever since I saw the service of baptism

about two weeks ago in your church here, I have desired to be baptized." Now, my point is that I believe there is a spiritual content in baptism which if we emphasized more as a positive teaching, aside from all spirit of controversy, would cause the ordinance to do its own work. If we have less controversy about these questions, we can trust the spirit of the Lord to bless them to the spiritual upbuilding of those who will receive the true teaching. The same thing is true also of the Lord's Supper. I can remember one instance in connection with my ministry in Brooklyn, when one of the good deacons there looked me in the eye with rather protruding eyeballs, and told me with the utmost alarm that if I remained pastor of that church it would not remain a Baptist church. Now, as an illustration that the churches do progress in liberality in these matters, observe that my good brother Griffith whom I have never had the pleasure of meeting or seeing until tonight, has come in to carry on that work to give instruction in the matter of open-minded interpretation with even more vigor than I. It was a case surely of Max and Climax. Perhaps this is indicative of the future attitude of our churches. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Brethren, some will certainly be left out unless you limit yourselves. I next will call on Rev. Robert George Boville:

DR. BOVILLE: We enjoy tonight the unusual pleasure of criticizing ourselves, and I believe that the insertion of this discussion in the topic of the programme should be looked upon as proof that the Baptist Congress regards the Baptist church as of some value—as of so much value to America that they think its form ought to be discussed and its doctrines ought to be canvassed. I for one am heartily of those who revere the fathers, the fathers that have carried the burden and heat of the day; that have held by the old standards; that have held by the old faith, and that have battled for the kingdom of God in the midst of great adversity and when the church was in the minority. I revere them for those great services that they have done, and while I may not view matters quite as they do, I want to say as my first word that the men that founded the Baptist Missionary

Society, and the men who cut the original tracks through the hard fastnesses of this country for Baptist success are men that must always be spoken of with great reverence and regard. If the discussion of the new departures that are spoken of here tonight means that we are to have a church of anaemic quality, means that we are to have hardly enough of belief to make it worth our while to exist, I for one don't care to belong to a church of that kind. I want to belong to a church that believes enough to make it feel it is necessary, and a church that believes enough in the great fundamental truths of religion to furnish members who will contribute to home missions in a state like this one and one-quarter millions, and five millions to foreign missions in the great work of spreading the kingdom of God. And if any change of doctrine were to deter any man from writing a huge check for the progress of the kingdom of God, I for one would be against anything of this kind.

Christian men among us divide themselves into two classes which might be roughly called organization men and organic men; organization men who look at the church largely from the standpoint of simple organization, and who believe that the form of the organization is essential to its continuance, and who, because of the instinct of preservation, which is deeply founded in the human heart, originally were moved to add as a safeguard to our church, the practice of close communion.

Someone asked me recently if I believed in the closed shop of the workman. I said: "No, I do not believe in the closed shop, nor do I believe that it will survive, but it is the workman's rough bludgeon with which he is fighting the close corporation of capital, and until he fights that battle I cannot condemn him if he carries on the practice of the closed shop." And so to me close communion was nothing but the necessary result of the limitation of the denominations in their early contest, and the brethren who regard it as a matter of importance in the denomination, must admit that the time has come when the closed shop can practically be done away with. Organization men insist on regularity; to them regularity is a supreme matter; they look at the question of regularity so closely that if you don't vote the regular ticket you become disqualified and are practically thrown

out of the party; with them regularity is a man's adhesion to the details of his denomination, so that they often place more emphasis on that than on his moral character, on his moral stamina, on his moral truthfulness, and sometimes even on his moral honesty. Regularity makes them forget sometimes that the highest form of loyalty to a man's denomination is like the highest form of loyalty to a man's country, that is, to differ from it on great and important questions, and to stand for that higher loyalty, which means direct loyalty to the Head of the church.

On the other hand there are the organic men to whom the church is an organism with a divine life and definite character, but an organism which began as a germ—as the Christian germ—and because it began as the Christian germ it was bound in the growth of time to develop itself along various lines. To me it is unthinkable that there is but one church polity laid down in the New Testament, just as unthinkable as that God has ordained just one form of political government for the great varieties of the human race. This germ that God has created has grown into manifold forms, and the natural sequence is that we have today on the face of the earth great varieties of organizations who would not be satisfied by one particular form. I believe that if you run through the New Testament carefully you will find in it germs of Congregationalism, and germs of Presbyterianism, and semi-Episcopacy.

The Christian germ began with the power of adaptation and of meeting new conditions as they arise from time to time. It is like a boy who grows, and as he grows he changes his garment from the garments of a boy to the toga of a young man and the matured life. So the church has the power to change its form: not its inherent character, but its dress and its polity. Its practice is in fact but the dress which the church wears. If this be true, the quest for heresy today should be a heresy defined as a failure to carry out the purpose of God—heresy, a refusal to think squarely and honestly; heresy, a failure to practice intellectual straightforwardness; heresy, anaemic blood and unwillingness to go forward in answer to the call of the great Master himself to win the world for Christ by the teaching of the great vital doctrines of religion. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I have five cards, brethren, and but fifteen minutes; can you limit your remarks to three minutes apiece? I will now call on Rev. William Henry Bawden.

DR. BAWDEN: Mr. President, there is just one thing that brings me to my feet tonight—the phrase, “The faith once for all delivered unto the saints.” Some time ago I attempted to prepare a sermon from that text, but could not because I found the word “faith” did not mean what I thought it meant. I found it to mean a definite deposit of doctrine. But when I turned to look for that deposit of doctrine I could not find it. Without going outside our own denomination, right in this congregation tonight, are there any two people who will agree in putting down on a piece of paper what they believe to be that deposit of faith? And when we turn to the New Testament can we find it there? Peter is set over against Paul, both of them over against John, and all of them over against Christ. Instead of a deposit of doctrine may be found a spirit. The same night in which Jesus was betrayed he took bread and gave thanks. That same night in which he was betrayed he also said to his disciples: “I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; but when the Spirit of truth is come he will lead you into all the truth.” Why cling to the former, and not insist upon the latter?

Brethren, it seems to me that in relation to these questions our position as Baptists ought to be, not that of the ear to the ground, to catch the echo of what our fathers may have said, although we may reverence them highly, but rather that of the ear open toward heaven, to hear what the Spirit of God may whisper to us now, in this year of Christ, 1909. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I will now call upon Rev. Alfred H. C. Morse, of Strong Place.

REV. A. H. C. MORSE: I am sorry now that I sent my card to the desk for two reasons. One is, because no man can say what he ought to say in three minutes and there are others whose cards ought to be called for instead of mine. And a second reason for which I regret having sent my card is this; that I have always had the reputation of being progressive; but when I stand beside

some of the brethren here tonight, I find I am a long way behind them. Yet I believe we have this evening listened to a representative discussion in a Baptist Congress.

I remember when, ten or twelve years ago, I first made my acquaintance with a Baptist Congress, they were discussing another question which was kindred to this: "Is baptism essential to church membership?" and I remember the furor created in Buffalo after this discussion that came up. This reminds me of a story that is told of the time when the railroad was put over the western plains. I think of that frequently when the Baptist Congress assembles. A man on the western plains had never seen a train and knew nothing about the great swing of the train, but he saw the construction, and rails being laid, and one day he was given to understand that the train would go through; and, in common with all his town, he came to see it sweep through—this great and wonderful train. In the afternoon, when the train had gone, he was seen leaving town, and his friends said to him, "Now, Uncle Si, where are you going?" He said "I am going to leave the country, the trains are ruining it." "Oh," they said, "that was all right; didn't you see the train go through this morning?" "Yes," he said, "that was all right, but suppose she had gone through sidewise, how then?" (*Laughter.*) That is the way we feel with a Baptist Conference. When it is past we heave a sigh of relief and we say we hope she will go through endwise next time. So with this discussion.

Now, I believe, my brethren, there has been dust thrown in the air this night regarding this subject, which is by no means a dead subject; it is sufficiently alive to alarm people in certain quarters of our quiet and well-behaved country. For instance, we have had it insinuated here this evening that some of the things that we set value upon are like the fringe upon the garments of the high-priests, or the number of steps which a man may take, for instance, on the sabbath day. Now, I submit that those were not things which were given in the old Mosaic regulations. I submit that I cannot find them in the Old Testament, but they grew up with something entirely outside of religion that was given to those ancient people. They were matters of tradition. I speak of that one thing, not because I set value by the fringe on the garment

or the color of the goat's hair, or anything of that kind, but simply to say that the reference is scarcely fair. Then, to state two or three texts and say it would be a good thing if next Sunday some of our pastors could preach on this text, for instance, and then next Sunday on another text—it reminds me that I could propose texts that would stump the very best of them to be consistent. I can cut a text in two in the middle, or I can take it according to its definition. Take this text next Sunday, and preach upon it and be true—"Let him that stole steal." That also is in the Bible.

Again I am reminded, apropos of these texts, of the very good counsel that was given us at one time by one of the great leaders of our denomination in this great state. He was teaching us the great things of biblical theology, and of course he was embarrassed sometimes by the questions that awkward young men would ask, because they did not seem to fit together very well with certain of our favored passages, and he said, "Young men, I would like you to remember regarding texts of Scripture, that they are like those coupon tickets that are used upon the railroad trains for long trips: they are not good if detached." (*Applause.*) An intimation has been given to us here this evening that we are to devote ourselves to the culture of character and the sweet influences of fellowship with sister denominations. That is all very well, but I submit to you that our fathers who went before us, and who were willing to walk through the river, had characters just as quickly and rigidly developed as those congregations you and I preach to Sunday after Sunday, and their characters were not changed by the persecution to which they were subjected.

This afternoon I rode twenty miles to conduct a funeral in the town of Flushing, and there I thought of the struggles of one of our fathers, who fled from the first colony and settled in the town of Flushing, and was persecuted and driven out, not because he was a bad man, and not because he was a close communionist, and not because he simply believed in the liberty of soul by which he had access to God, but because he insisted on dipping the people. I believe that was a good thing, and I believe that Long Island today would be richer and more fruitful if there were on those desert plains of the island some more people of that same kind. (*Applause.*)

Let me state this to conclude: In the borough of Brooklyn we have been having some excitement about the signing of the contract for the new subway. We have had a subway, and our people have become accustomed to the up-and-downstairs of the subway just now, but when the subway first came to Brooklyn, in one of the longest of the flights of steps, a mere man was passing down there and before him was a woman. Unfortunately, he slipped, and as he slipped he happened to strike her, and they went down the toboggan together. When they reached the bottom, he tapped her upon the shoulder and said, "Madam, will you please take the next train, this is as far as I go." (*Laughter.*)

THE PRESIDENT: And this will be about as far as we can all go tonight, as we have arrived at the hour of ten o'clock. It seems impossible for eight brethren, each accustomed to occupy more than half an hour, to put into five minutes' time that one-half hour address, and it can't be done unless they move sidewise.

Let us close the discussion with the hymn, No. 459—two verses, if you please. I regret very much that I have three excellent names that I would like to have called on before our adjournment, but it is impossible.

After singing I will call on Dr. Gray to dismiss us with the benediction.

(*Singing.*)

The benediction was pronounced by Rev. Dr. C. D. Gray.

THIRD DAY

Morning Session

November 11, 1909

10 o'clock A. M.

THE PRESIDENT: Brethren, the hour has arrived for the morning session, and the Congress desires to preserve its record for promptness. Will you come to order? We have with us this morning Dr. George U. Wenner, who is the proposer of the plan with regard to religious instruction, and whose presence here at this session is especially fitting. Therefore, Dr. Wenner, of the Lutheran Church, will now lead us in prayer.

Prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. George U. Wenner.

THE PRESIDENT: I would now like to say, Brethren, that popular attention is in inverse ratio to the importance of the questions discussed in the Congress. Certainly the topic of the morning is one of the most important, and one of the most pressing now before the religious world: "How Can Ethics Be Taught in the Public Schools?"

I regret at once to announce a disappointment. Dr. Bryan, President of Colgate University, whose presence here we are looking forward to with especial interest, and who has but recently been installed in his high position, is unable to be present, and the Executive Committee has therefore very wisely asked President Harris to occupy his place as a reader instead of the speaker of the morning.

I have pleasure in introducing Dr. Harris, of Bucknell University. (*Applause.*)

PRESIDENT JOHN H. HARRIS, LL.D., of Bucknell University, then read the following paper:

HOW CAN ETHICS BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

It affords me pleasure to meet again with the Baptist Congress. I am glad also to find presiding over it the son of a man to whom

we all owe much, a man concerning whom Dr. McClintock, of the Methodist Episcopal church, once said, "There is William R. Williams preaching to the little church in Amity Street sermons which a conclave of archangels might listen to with rapture."

We can deduce, or at any rate define, the work of the state in teaching ethical truth in the public schools by the concept of the state itself. The object of all social institutions is the development of manhood. The fundamental social institution in our country is the family. The family is the great moral educator. Most men and women are what they are, because of the homes in which they were reared. We practice the lessons learned at our mother's knee, rather than those learned in school or church. Society in performing its function differentiates into the state and the church. Without such differentiation there can be no freedom and no progress. Spiritually considered, the state is society energizing in the sphere of justice; the state is organized justice. All those moral duties, therefore, which come under the concept of justice can and should be taught by the state. The purpose of the state is to develop the just man, and therefore all duties and obligations arising out of man's social relations to his fellow-man will furnish the subject-matter of ethical teaching by the state.

The purpose of the state is not only the development of the good man, but also the good citizen. The virtue of the good man and that of the good citizen are not identical. The voter has duties which the non-voter does not have. The duties of the office-holder are other than the duties of the private citizen. A chief function therefore of the public school is the development of enlightened patriotism. Sentimental patriotism is the constant refuge of the political scoundrel. The remedy, however, is not to replace it with a watery cosmopolitanism, like that of the man who loved all countries, even his own. He can love the whole world the best who loves his own land the best, who loves his own state and city the best, who loves his own home the best. True cosmopolitanism must begin with the home, but it must not end there. The remedy is an enlightened and rightly directed patriotism. I am persuaded that the most effective way of instructing youth in patriotic duty is by concrete example, that is,

by the reading of biography and history. Nor do I agree with some of my friends who would cut out of our histories all accounts of wars. If a war is merely a collision of blind forces, then the study of it would have morally only a negative value; but when an army as an embodied moral idea, whether of national union, or of freedom, civil or religious, meets and crushes embodied error, not without blood, then we have as sublime a moral spectacle as this world affords. Our children must not be deprived of the uplifting and enlarging power furnished by the majestic struggles of nations for truth and right. However, neither we nor our children are likely to be called on to "venture life and love and youth, for the great prize of death in battle." We are called, and our children ought to be instructed in their duty, to vote on election days, to attend and take an active part in suggestion conferences, in party caucuses and primaries. They should be taught also that it is no discredit to seek for office in order to serve the state. There are some offices of great importance but which confer no distinction and which it is therefore the special duty of educated men to covet. Such are the position of school director, road master, election judges. Horatio Seymour, governor of New York, said that there was only one office he coveted, that of road master, an office he held and the duties of which he was conscientiously discharging at the time of his death. Especially should the pupils of the public schools be taught to contribute each his part to that intangible but resistless thing, public opinion.

We do not sufficiently appreciate, our children are not taught to appreciate, our debt to society, our obligation to the past. No man can earn one-tenth of 1 per cent. of what he receives. If anyone thinks that statement too strong let him consider how long it would take him to make a common steel pen. Not if he had the genius of Edison and lived to be as old as Methuselah would he be able to do it. How many mathematicians, from before Euclid and after, toiled in obscurity and were forgotten, how many Galileos went to prison, how many Brunos to the stake, before Newton could solve the problem of the heavens and link his name forever with the stars? How many Marathons were fought out, how many Nasebys, how many Yorktowns, before

the Constitution of the United States could be ordained? That document might well be written in blood, for every syllable of it cost the lives of a thousand men, men of whom the world was not worthy. And yet there are thousands of citizens who year by year sell their birthright for a drink of whiskey; or, more culpable still, good moral men, but poor citizens, neglect to exercise their blood-bought privilege. Surely here is a field for ethical education in the schools of the state.

Now the state may educate in morals indirectly or directly. Indirectly the state may educate by furnishing a wholesome environment for the schools. When, as in one case, the state licenses nineteen saloons and permits eleven houses of ill fame on the streets facing one schoolhouse, the state can scarcely be said to fulfil its duty. So the conditions upon the school grounds and within the schoolhouses are such as to breed moral disease more deadly than the "Vampire of the South." We bear grateful testimony to the great improvement in this respect in recent years. The state educates directly by the teachers it places in the school as its agents. It is said to be the whole aim of the British constitution to get twelve honest men into the jury-box. The whole aim of our state educational system should be to get men and women of ability and character into the schoolroom. All the rest will follow. In some places there is systematic effort to have the Bible read in the schools. If the teacher believes in the Book and loves it, I should rejoice exceedingly to have it read to my children. In that way they now read it with their mother. Their mother believes in the Book and lives it. But if, as in one instance, the teacher, after reading a selection because required so to do, remarks with a sneer, "Perhaps there are people who believe that stuff," the effect will be disastrous. It will be scarcely less so if the sneer is only in the heart. It cannot be highly helpful if done in a perfunctory way. Instead then of trying to force the New Testament into the schools, I think Christians should request that it should not be used as a textbook in the secular schools but that it should be reserved as the sole and incomparable textbook of the church, where it will be lovingly studied and reverently read. That would not exclude the New Testament or the Christ of the New Testament from the public

schools. Ethical religion is the dynamic of morality; Christianity is the supreme ethical religion, and should go into every school. I mean, too, that the church as a spiritual energy should enter every school. Ecclesiastics, however, as ecclesiastics, should stay out. As citizens they may enter, the same as other citizens. This would be to the interest both of the state and church. As the state is the people energizing in the sphere of justice and objective morality, so the church is the people energizing in the sphere of piety and subjective morality. The one is concerned with the overt act, the other with the animating spirit. The one proceeds by compulsion, the other by persuasion. Whenever compulsion comes in at the door, religion flies out at the window. Both the state spiritual and the church spiritual must have organization for effectiveness within their sphere, the one as civil government, the other as ecclesiastical organization. The civil government is constantly in danger of falling into the illusion that it is the state. "I am the state," said Louis XIV. So ecclesiastics imagine that they are the church, or that they are religion, or sometimes they identify themselves with God—*Wir und Gott*. So when they are not permitted to control the schools and compel, they charge the schools with being irreligious and godless. Our public schools can be maintained only by the careful separation of the church and state functions, and in that way only can they be made truly religious and ethical. Christianity must enter the school concretely though spiritually in the person of Christian teachers.

When that Christian daughter of yours goes into the school, whether to teach mathematics or science, Christ goes into the school with her, and is present in the school in power. That is the only effectual way in which Christianity can go into the public schools, or elsewhere. Moral truth differs from mathematical truth in this that we can learn moral truth only by living it; otherwise we have not knowledge, but only theoretic dreams. So we can teach morality only as we live it; otherwise we are giving only the husks which even the swine are wise enough to reject. Moral education is dynamic. There sleeps yonder in Riverside in a sleep so deep that it is not broken by the tread of the million pilgrims who yearly visit his tomb, a man who was

of force to command a million men, who made himself felt through the great generals who stood at the head. The Sher-
mans, the Sheridans, and the Meades down to the rank and file
where I was proud to serve, felt the whole length of a battle
line stretching for twenty-five hundred miles all instinct with
life from one center and unified by one will. It was the dynamic
of a great personality. Through a like dynamic of personality
will the church as spiritual energy vivify the lessons of morality
and be examples of morality to a still mightier host, the host
of youth sixteen million strong that on this November morning
are on their way to school. From some height of vision glance
at their array. Your eyes will never behold a sight more sublime.
Let us look more closely at these eight score thousand men and
women who, each in his schoolroom, are awaiting the coming of
this host which passes beyond the power of any human mind to
comprehend. Let us mark as I have marked many and many a
time in institute and convention the great outstanding fact written
sun-clear in their faces, their moral earnestness, their conscien-
tiousness, their anxiety to learn their duty, their readiness to do it.
We will then from our mount of vision lift our eyes from that
which is before us to Him who is above us, the Father of light,
from whom comes every good and perfect gift, with a thought of
thanksgiving to Him who has called into this service the men and
women who this day are teaching the youth of America. And
yet there remains much land to be possessed.

THE PRESIDENT: The second writer on this topic is well
known among us in this city as Mr. Clarence E. Meloney, associ-
ate city superintendent of schools, New York. (*Applause.*)

DR. CLARENCE E. MELONEY: *Mr. President, Ladies and
Gentlemen:* My topic is:

HOW CAN ETHICS BE TAUGHT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

In the public schools of New York City ethics as a branch of
study is not differentiated from the subjects of the required cur-
riculum, but the syllabus explicitly prescribes that principals and
teachers should aim to make all instruction and training a means

of the development of character in every child. The underlying principles are explained and the method of dealing with the problem is carefully set forth with suggestive topics which may be used in instruction on appropriate occasions.

Ethics can be taught and is taught in all the studies and activities that constitute the "life of the school," and is fostered by the atmosphere and spirit of the classroom and the school as a whole.

From the kindergarten through all the grades of the elementary and high schools ethics constitutes an essential and positive feature of instruction. Every study, every exercise, every activity in the life of the child affords the opportunity for cultivation of the principles of right living. It is the teacher's duty to keep this aim in view at all times, but the child may be unconscious of the object sought. The success of a school is measured by the degree in which right conduct and high motives are manifested, as much as by the proficiency in knowledge and efficiency in action. Teachers and pupils alike realize this result, and in the realization grow in moral power. The elements that enter into ethical training may be briefly summarized:

1. *The spirit and atmosphere of the school as a whole.*—If the school is of a high moral tone, if the spirit is one animated by right motives, if the atmosphere is morally wholesome, if the conduct of pupils toward teachers and teachers toward pupils is mutually sympathetic, helpful, considerate, if love is the controlling principle, the moral forces are most powerful.

2. *The qualities of the principal.*—The influence and power of the principal of a school in the direction of the ethical growth of the pupils should be strong. His opportunity finds play in the development of a school spirit in all the interests and activities of the school. At the assembly he has the pupils before him for moral instruction and in his visits to the classrooms and the playground occasions arise for improving the tone and character of all the pupils. He encourages games and sports designed for healthful emulation and the increase of strength, for the social and co-operative relations of all, and for establishing ideals of conduct. When pupils are brought before him for discipline and when he meets parents in the interest of their children his influ-

ence is exerted on ethical lines. In his supervision of instruction and his conferences with teachers he is expected to direct the teaching so as to promote its ethical value. His contact with the mass is limited by numbers but his bearing, his poise, his look and gesture, his dignity, his enthusiasm have an influence reaching to the remotest pupil.

3. *The character of the teacher.*—The power of the teacher's personality cannot be overestimated. The teacher is an open book to the pupils, to be read at once, to be measured and estimated at par value. The heart of the teacher as well as the intellectual equipment is revealed to the pupil at the outset and is manifested in the voice, speech, habit of action, and attitude toward the child and to the work of the school. The teacher must exemplify all the qualities of virtue that should be realized in the pupil. The child must find in the teacher the best that he can make of himself. The teacher must be true, faithful, prompt, correct, efficient, expert, just, sympathetic, appreciative, and self-controlled.

4. *The work and routine of the school.*—It is essential that the studies and duties to be performed by the pupils should be appropriate and adapted to their ability and needs. This necessitates proper grading and classification. Every class should be homogeneous, composed of pupils as nearly as possible of equal ability and equally capable of accomplishing the tasks and duties assigned, so that all may be able to do efficiently all that may be required without unnecessary stress and without embarrassment, with a proper degree of natural emulation, but without criticism or humiliation for failure. Work should be stimulating, inviting healthy effort, but without undue pressure. Force or unnatural incentives should not be employed; temptations to be dishonest or to cover up faults should be removed. Opportunities should be as nearly equal as possible, and commendation and rewards should be measured by the standards of individual ability and effort. Success for its own sake and duties done for duty's sake should be the animating principle. Success and appreciation cultivate self-respect, and success attained honestly, even by great effort, develops strength of purpose and of character. Unfavorable conditions, unequal opportunities, misplaced confidence, unmerited praise breeds false self-appreciation and dishonesty.

The presence in the same class of pupils varying greatly in ability or in attainment affords an opportunity for discouragement on one side and overconfidence on the other; for embarrassment and conscious superiority; for self-suppression and obtrusiveness; for humiliation and self-esteem. To mitigate these evils as far as possible classes are being organized to provide similar conditions and equal opportunities for the weak and the strong, the over-aged and the younger pupils, for the slow and diffident and for the precocious children.

The relation of the pupil to the school as a whole is similar to the relations he will have to sustain to the community as a social and a civic organization. The sense of authority under which a pupil acts develops into a realization of authority in the community and the state. A free citizen is free under the law when his conduct conforms to the law; the law of society and the state must be the law of the individual. The pupil must make the law of the school the law of self-control. He must develop a consciousness of his own responsibility; he must act not by compulsion but by choice; he must take the initiative in doing right and fulfilling his obligations. He must co-operate with his companions and with his teacher, carrying on the measures necessary for the success of the administration of the school and its work.

5. *Outdoor activities.*—The recess, the plays and games of the school yard, the going to and from school, the conduct of pupils in the neighborhood afford opportunity for ethical training which should not be overlooked by principals and teachers. Here the child comes into relations requiring consideration for others when the restraint of oversight and control has been largely removed, when he is free to exercise more liberty, but under self-control. The influence of the school over the pupil must extend beyond its confines and the power of its influence is measured by the unrestrained conduct of the pupils. If passengers on a street car or train are disturbed and annoyed by pupils returning from high school or college, it is an evidence of lack of moral training and the school or college should be held responsible. If fences and buildings in the vicinity of a school are marked with chalk in

language or graphic symbols it is an evidence of lack of ethical training in the school.

The organization of playgrounds and recreation centers in which our city has taken the lead has proved to be of inestimable value in cultivating right habits of conduct, an appreciation of equal rights, subordination to authority, adaptation to social conditions, co-operation in effort, and consideration for those who need assistance. Athletic games and competitive sports which have been established as a part of our system contribute much to ethical training by stimulating enthusiasm for the school, developing self-control and efficiency, effecting co-operation and subordination, healthful emulation, appreciation of ability and power in competitors, and in promoting standards of honor and justice in conducting and managing meets and tournaments.

6. *School studies are of ethical value.*—There is no subject of the school curriculum in which there are not opportunities for ethical training, whether the subject be taught for the content or subject-matter or as an art. A brief reference to the subjects as related to ethical training should suffice.

a) Nature-study. In this subject the purpose is to open a field for investigation and the discovery of truth. Observation must be exact, the records and inferences must be correct, and the expression must be true. Science is essentially ethical. The pupil is made to feel that truth is at the foundation of it. Nature appeals to a pupil as a big question mark. It says, "Find out, think, tell what is true."

b) Literature. This is of ethical value. It presents the highest ideals of life. It cultivates the best motives and stimulates the richest emotions. It furnishes the best types of character. The best literature is placed in the hands of the pupils as soon as they can make out words; in fact, the teaching of reading even in the first stage is accomplished by the use of the choicest literature. It is not a question of how to read but what to read. The pleasure and satisfaction of reading what is worth while, the consciousness of power to read intelligently, added to the ethical ideas derived from the subject, make reading one of the most valuable subjects of instruction. Every fable, myth, fairy tale,

every story or poem that carries a moral or a principle of ethical value is a text for moral instruction.

c) History. This subject presents in concrete form the lives and the deeds of the human race. Examples that characterize noble actions, self-sacrifice, persistent endeavor, love of country, undying patriotism, are held up for reverence and emulation. Moral judgments are exercised in the study of events and enactments that mark the progress of civilization. Nor is it necessary to confine to the pages of history the study of examples of moral value for we have in the acts and the events of every day life object lessons that point the moral, inspire the imagination, and stimulate the pupil to right conduct.

d) Civics. This subject occupies an important place in the curriculum. It is designed to teach the duties of the citizen to the citizen, and to the institutions of the community, the city, the state, and the nation. It is presented concretely and is studied as far as possible by observation. The everyday life of the child in his relation to home, school, society, and to organized government in its various departments is studied with the purpose of teaching the pupils their place and their duty. The syllabus in civics prescribed by the Board of Superintendents is introduced by the following note:

Pupils should be taught in all grades, as far as they may be made to understand, their responsibilities and privileges as members of society, and that as such they owe duties to the school, to the family, to the neighborhood, to the city, the state, and the nation. In this way they may be led to comprehend the principles of government and their individual duties in connection with it. The necessity for obedience to authority should be dwelt upon, as also the moral obligation of working with the various departments of the government and not against them. Wherever possible, the reasons for conduct should be explained. If the child knows the reason for any law, he will obey that law more readily.

In all grades there should be frequent discussions under these headings: Obedience to law; Why laws are made; Who makes the laws? Who enforces the laws? Why are law breakers punished?

Principles and teachers are urged to lose no opportunity to impress upon pupils the importance of city ordinances that are specially applicable to local conditions. Pupils should be led to see that even slight departures from the standard of order and good administration become

very serious matters when many persons engage in them, and that, therefore, each individual should be careful to avoid acts, such as throwing paper and fruit skins into the streets, which, though trifling in themselves, would, if they became general, tend to impair the cleanliness and health of the city. In teaching the "duties of citizens and public officials," special attention should be directed to the work of the departments that come under the immediate observation of pupils.

e) Mathematics. The content of arithmetic presents subjects closely related to the life of the child requiring truth, exactness, honesty. Problems involve the dealings of people in financial matters, commercial and industrial activities, in which values, measurements, and accounts are studied. Transactions of such a nature are based upon an ethical foundation. The work from the lowest to the highest grade deals with the fundamentals of business. It affords an opportunity to inculcate principles of honor, fair dealing, and business integrity. The commercial and financial world is the field where honesty and mutual confidence should be the guiding motives. In the school pupils can be taught these fundamental principles and arithmetic offers the largest opportunity. We attempt to teach exact values as well as practical and honest methods and to train pupils to obtain exact results. Figures should not lie and the attempt to make them lie by manipulation cannot be attributed to the school.

f) Art and industrial training. This feature of school work also contributes in large measure to ethical training of the pupils. Here again the powers of seeing perfectly, judging accurately, and reproducing truthfully are cultivated. The work begins in the kindergarten and continues throughout the course. In every grade emphasis is placed upon truth, utility, and beauty: the highest ideals to be inculcated in the child mind. Here more than in any other branch of teaching, the eye, the mind, and the hand are in unity and co-operation. Whether in the sewing-lesson or the cooking-room, in the drafting-room or the shop, the girl and the boy learn that thoroughness and exactness are the only standards of success. The seam must be straight and true; the proof of the pudding is in the eating; the drawing must tell the truth and the frame must be tried by the square; any deviation shows imperfection and failure. The model is the ideal and the product must be

measured by the model. Unthinking people characterize this branch of school work as a fad. If it is a fad to teach a child to do a piece of work correctly and by a standard that will not permit of cheating, to persevere by hard work if necessary until truth has been expressed, to overcome difficulties by patience, repetition, and determination, until the consciousness of power is acquired and the joy of mastery has been experienced, then let us have more fads.

g) Writing. The art of penmanship and of composition leads to the same ethical goal. An art requires study and patient practice. The pupil must teach himself to write, the teacher cannot do it for him. He is thrown upon his individual effort and must work persistently to attain correctness and facility. The child grows by his own activity, whether in body or mind. Self-reliance and self-mastery are essentially moral. The greatest weakness of a school is revealed when a teacher does for a pupil what he can do for himself and thus prevents the pupil's growth. Persistence in such misguided assistance produces stagnation of growth and paralysis of the will.

To enable a pupil to master the art of composition let the teacher hand back a set of papers without indicating the errors and demand that the errors be discovered and corrected and that the composition be rewritten. Let this process be repeated time and time again until correctness may be acquired and until the pupil realizes that nothing short of a correct product will be accepted. The child must be forced back upon himself until he acquires mastery. He may have help and suggestion to enable him to help himself. The degree of help depends upon the progress and strength of the child, but the teacher must draw himself from under the child and lead him on. This is moral, rational, educational.

Aside from the development of ethical ideals and ethical methods in the teaching of every subject of the prescribed curriculum, formal ethical lessons may be given when the occasion arises for pointing a moral. I take the liberty of quoting from the syllabus prepared by the Board of Superintendents and placed in the hands of every teacher, as it is proper that you should know authoritatively what our teachers are instructed to do:

The following list of topics affords subjects for many practical lessons in morals and manners:

a) Duties to parents, brothers, sisters, and playmates; to servants and other employees; to employers and all in authority; to the aged, the poor, and the unfortunate.

b) Conduct at home, at the table, at school, on the street, in public assemblies, and in public conveyances.

c) The common virtues, such as regularity, punctuality, self-control, cheerfulness, neatness, purity, temperance, honesty, truthfulness, obedience, industry, and patriotism.

In all such moral instruction and guidance the following principles should be observed:

a) The course of moral training is a development, in which the child is first led to act rightly and afterward to work from principle; he proceeds from obedience on faith to obedience on principle; from regularity to faithfulness. The child also develops from egoism to altruism. His impulse toward self interest normally develops earlier than his impulse to put himself in another's place. Upon the full development of the former stage depends the full development of the latter.

b) The culture of the imagination is a powerful aid in moral instruction; first, as the power vividly to picture consequences—to put yourself in your own place later on (foresight); secondly, as the power to "put yourself in his place" (social imagination, sympathy).

c) In using literature and similar material for purposes of moral education, the teacher should not violate the law of self-activity. The child may resent having a moral drawn for him which he can draw for himself. He is the more likely to follow the principle which he himself discovers or formulates because it is his own.

d) The most effective method in moral education is positive rather than negative. A mind filled with worthy interests, high ideals, and helpful activities has no room for evil. Approbation more than censure leads to well-doing. Love is a stronger and a better motive than fear.

e) At every stage of school life pupils should be taught that they live under inexorable laws which they cannot violate with impunity—both physical laws and moral laws. Obedience is not optional: it is compulsory. Penalty follows law-breaking as surely as night follows day, though the penalty is not always immediate.

To summarize and to answer briefly the question, "How Can Ethics Be Taught in the Public Schools?" let me say in closing:

The teaching of ethics involves the acquisition of knowledge

of what is truth and what is falsehood; the obligations to oneself and to others, duty; the keeping of a promise, keeping an engagement, being on time, completing a task; of what constitutes respect for parents and elders, obedience to authority, co-operation for the general welfare, support of important interests, institutions, and the state; the right to property, honesty.

Teaching ethics involves the awakening of the sensibilities: interest, enthusiasm, desire to know and investigate, sympathy, co-operation, responsibility.

It involves judgment, contemplation, weighing of values, appreciation of motives.

It involves the cultivation of the will, courage and fearlessness to do right, perseverance and determination to do right and to perform duty.

As I have shown, this can be done efficiently if the child is surrounded by conditions that favor education of a high standard, is placed under the direction of teachers of positive moral character, and submits to a comprehensive course of instruction and training conducted upon true principles and methods of teaching.

THE PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first of the appointed speakers, I would like to announce to the audience that this discussion, I hope, will be participated in by many, and Dr. Lawson has kindly consented to traverse the aisles and take the cards of those who may desire to participate. As you know, already Dr. Harris' part has been given as one of the written papers. I now call on Mr. John L. Alger, president of the Rhode Island State Normal School, of Providence, R. I.

MR. JOHN ALGER delivered his address as follows:

Mr. President: While our subject deals with the teaching of *ethics* as distinct from *morals*, it is impossible to limit the discussion in this way. The scientific study of ethics must be limited to the few in college grades who are really ready for it, and very little formal teaching of the subject has any place in the public schools. Child life must be spontaneous, happy, care-free. His goodness must not be a studied and calculated goodness, but one that grows into right habits of action, with his own sense of justice and right as guide and interpreter. One of the most difficult

things in the teaching of children is to make what is taught from books appear real to them. There is a sort of idealization of the printed page which makes the child seem to be living in a different world from the plain, everyday affairs of the real things around him. He would readily accept principles in a blind way, and would stick to them in this second self; but they would not touch his real self, and he would have only the distorted view of them that he has obtained from his half-appreciation of what the teacher is trying to inculcate. With him conscious study will almost surely distort. We must give him habits, and must train his impulses and his passions, until these bear fruit in a real and wholesome and happy life.

It is true that the French schools are seeking to deal with the subject in their usual thorough manner. This week they will study one virtue, and next week another, until all have been covered. The system surely appeals to one's sense of the fitness of things, but it is not merely intellectual men that we want. The vilest criminal may know most about ethics and about theology as well. I am even inclined to think that much early study of these subjects would seriously tend to make a child wish to try the wrong course to see what would result, like the case of the small boy who omitted to say his prayers, and when nothing dreadful happened felt that there was no longer any use in them.

The ethical culture schools are performing a real service in their study of what may be done, and of how far instruction may go along these lines. A former teacher in these schools when asked his opinion of the work there, now that he looks back upon it, writes as follows:

As to the value of direct teaching of ethics, I believe in it; but I believe more in the value of the teaching that Dewey formulates in *Moral Principles in Education*. And I also believe that the "moral lessons" that are taught direct will be most fruitful when taught in close connection with the other phases of school life. Even at the Ethical Culture School the direct teaching was, at times, too much instruction *brought in* from the outside.

Fortunately direct teaching and the view set forth by Dr. Dewey are not mutually exclusive. As I think of it now, the best conditions for moral growth are those in which the teacher "recognizes that moral

forces are real in the same sense in which the other forces are real, that they are inherent in community life and in the working structure of the individual," and in which the teacher draws on the ethical poses of the material being—reconstructed as the needs manifest themselves.

It must be borne in mind that this teacher is speaking of the ethical training in a particular school, especially planned and with teachers especially selected for this work. I doubt if he would go so far in outlining a course for the ordinary public school, where we must deal with the average teacher.

If we may turn at once to the more vital question of how we may teach morals in the public schools, consider the training of an ideal bank clerk, who can handle uncounted millions of money without fear of dishonesty. It is not to be supposed that a character built up by precept would endure the strain. One may believe without having power to act consistently and continually in his belief. The training must come by habits, built up a little at a time, until the belief is fully established, largely as a result of habits. Finally, with repugnance for dishonesty and with a clear conception of values in life, come a stability and a confidence that will prevent the possibility of failure. The great value of the precept is as a maxim or concise statement which helps to clarify the ideal. Something of this can come into the early training, but it cannot be made the foundation of training. Someone has said: "To make 'I believe' the basis of 'I do' for boys and girls is an attempt to make the river of God's life flow up hill."

There *are* teachers in the public schools who can teach ethics, but there *are* also teachers in many *Sunday* schools who do *not* teach ethics or even good morals.

Much of the value of the public-school teaching lies in its training to habits of accuracy, to love and respect for good work, to an admiration for the truth and a desire to find it. These all have a direct and vital bearing on the formation of the character. Much of the *Sunday-school* teaching leads to confusion, to disorder, to superficiality, and the tolerance of it in ethics; habits which are destructive to morals and which must seriously retard the best development of character. It is to be hoped that the introduction of the graded lessons may bring with it more of the

spirit of real work and more of a desire for accomplishment of substantial results.

Mark Hopkins on a log with a student means a vital and a personal element that enters his life, not by what the teacher says to the boy, but by what he is, and by the love which the boy feels and knows his teacher has for him. One of the greatest helps that can be given a boy is the feeling that you have confidence in him and in what he can and will do.

We see the folly of textbook teaching of morals in much of the teaching of temperance. In many places this was carried on in such a way as to destroy rather than to help. The success of the temperance work in the country seems to me to be due rather to the general advance in civic righteousness than to the forced teaching of the subject in the schools.

It will be impossible to deal justly with ethics in the schools until we can have teachers trained to a right handling of the subject. One of our new western states, in an attempt to introduce the teaching of agriculture in the schools, decreed that the subject must be taught, with the result that teachers who knew nothing about it in any scientific way made it and themselves ridiculous before their pupils. It was impossible to secure teachers who could do justice to it, and the whole cause was unnecessarily delayed. We shall be unable to make any large requirements of our teachers in the way of teaching ethics until they are more nearly ready for it. The present idea of the goody-goody boy, and the boy's own exalted opinion of himself, are only too easily produced by the namby-pamby methods so prevalent in moral instruction.

It seems to me that our best work at this particular time in forwarding the cause of really saving and reforming boys and girls will be that of promoting manual and industrial training in the grades. When it is so conclusively proved that many may be made useful and happy and virtuous citizens by being given something to do with their hands instead of always with their heads, we are neglecting our duty seriously if we are not helping to bring about the good time coming when our education shall be more rational as it is applied to those who show no taste for book-learning. President Eliot calls it the new gospel of education

which says, "Find something for the child to do which he can do, and help him to do it." It is said that the greatest task for the teacher of the feeble minded is that of finding something for each child to do that he can do with credit. This might almost be said with equal truth of the teacher in the regular grades. We like to do what we can do well. Children grow into self-respecting, capable men and women if they can grow in confidence in their own ability and in their power to please those whom they love and whose love they know they have in return.

There are still other ways in which we may teach good morals. We are coming to know something of our power over our own bodies, and how we may make ourselves cheerful or sad at will. We can preach the gospel of the cheerful, sunny life, and of how it may be attained. I heard recently of a club in this vicinity where the password is a smile, and where, when a member appears with a frown, his mates say, "Don't you belong this morning, John?" It seems to me that we as church members need also to emphasize more fully one other point in our talks with young people. In the Rhode Island Normal School there is a bust of Henry Bernard on which are inscribed these words: "For one, I mean to enjoy the satisfaction of the labor, let who will enter into the harvest." We are less and less concerned about the happiness of our future state, and our young people are even more unconcerned than the adults. What we need is the enjoyment of the labor of the present time, and this means as much to the boy and girl as to us. One of our greatest problems will be solved when we can find some helpful thing that each one may do, for the church as well as for the school.

Can we not also make of greater value the story hour, and must we always feel that children love to hear sermons? Stories form one of the teacher's best resources in the teaching of morals. They should convey a definite and clear ideal; the teaching must be positive, not negative, the ideals must be practicable; they must be adapted to the development of the child; they must convey their own moral; and they must appeal to the child's sense of right and justice. If it is true, as stated by James Rhoades in *The Training of the Imagination*, that: "There is no other entrance to the realm of knowledge, but through the folding gates of

pleasure and of wonder," may we not ask if on this basis we do not need to revise, not only our teaching of the regular school subjects but most of all our teaching of those things which are to lead to the formation of the characters we wish to secure?

THE PRESIDENT: The Chair has permitted the reading of papers by those known as speakers for the reason discussed somewhat in the meeting of the General Committee yesterday, that they had been requested to furnish for the printed report the substance of their remarks, and coming thus with a draft in their pockets, they naturally did not desire to give something that might be of an entirely different character as an *ex-tempore* address. For this reason the Chair has not held strictly to this rule.

Only two cards have reached the platform of those desiring to participate in the discussion. The Chair would like very much to call on some who are present, but that liberty is not given. Particularly, I should like to call on Dr. Wenner, who is well known to so many of us as an author of a plan for religious instruction in public schools. But Dr. Wenner feels that that was not included, as I understand, in the theme of the morning, and I have no permission to call upon him in the absence of his desire to speak. I call, therefore, on Rev. R. G. Boville.

DR. R. G. BOVILLE: *Mr. Chairman:* However much we might wish to see the Christian religion and the Bible introduced in the public schools and taught to every child in America, yet there are reasons, both practical and theoretical, why that is impossible: Practical, because the bulk of the population is entirely divided in religious thinking, and they could not justly be forced according to our views, to accept any definite religious training that they did not agree with. Further, it would result in complications, such as the union of the church and state in the schools; this union of church and state in the school would imperil the safety of that principle that has been reached after long centuries of conflict, and which is essential to the well-being of spiritual religion in the world today.

But while the teaching of the Bible cannot be introduced in the public school, that is no reason why Christianity should not

be introduced, and in that sense I understand the statement made by Dr. Harris this morning, and in that sense alone. In other words, Christianity can be introduced in the public schools in the person of Christian teachers, and through the influence, the unconscious influence of these, an open door awaits the recognition of all the forces of denominations of religion today. In this way can the church bring the power of religion to bear on the children of the community, through the Christian spirit of the teachers who have charge of them in the schools. And for this reason it seems to me that it is most important that the church and the boards of education should today center their thoughts and interest on the system of normal schools, for it is in the normal schools that the secret of education lies, and that the battle of education is fought.

We all of us regard the profession of teaching with the highest respect. To us the teachers are the priests and priestesses of knowledge. They should be called with the divine call, and they should be ordained with the divine ordaining, and if that thought is to enter into our public schools, and if we are to regard our public schools as great temples—beautiful temples, thank God, in New York, and beautiful even in the small country schools, where some of us may have gone—if we are to have this thought assimilated, and divine service introduced into the education of today, it must be in making it certain that when the normal schools are open, the young people that enter those schools shall have been selected with regard to their habits, their intellectual development, their type, their moral purpose, and that no person shall be allowed to enter upon the career of education without having given sufficient guarantee for their moral honesty, just as no person should be admitted into a theological seminary, without having proven that he has a divine call to the ministry. In this way, therefore, the church can influence religious education in the schools by assisting in the training of teachers for the schools, and by the elimination of the purely professional point of view in the schools, and by emphasizing in the curriculum of the normal school the great moral purpose of education, the great ethical purpose, the production of character, so that citizens may be pro-

duced that will build up the moral strength and force of this country.

But while we take that point of view, it must be obvious that ethical education, as imparted in our schools today, whether pursued by the indirect method of the American schools, or the formal and direct method of the English and French schools, does fail in giving to us the type of citizen that we should have, unless it is reinforced by other forces. Ethical education in the school will prove abortive, and to some extent, has proved abortive, unless society, as a whole, will come into the field with its co-operating force—and by this I mean that education of children in our great cities where the social conditions are such outside the school as to be destructive of ethics—you cannot have an ethical education in the true sense of the word.

I talked a year ago with the principal of one of the great Jewish schools in the east side of London that had over 2,000 boys and girls, and he said to me, "My problem is not here in the school from nine o'clock in the morning until three in the afternoon, but it is after these children go out to the slums of East London and live in contact with degrading conditions that despoil character, and counteract the influence of the school."

Now, if that is true in the east end of London, it is true in the great city of New York, and other great cities in this country where millions of children are exposed to the unethical conditions of society that counteract the influence of the school.

How would it be possible, how would it be conceivable otherwise, that 12,000 children, boys and girls, under sixteen years of age were arraigned in the children's courts of New York last year for a list of crimes that pretty nearly exhaust all conceivable phases of human depravity. It is the fact that our social conditions, our tenement conditions, our civic conditions, our civic corporations, our civic graft and landlord graft and capital graft make the existence of tenements possible, and you will never have ethical education in New York that will make the children's courts unnecessary, until you abolish the tenement house, and society as a whole must do that.

It seems to me, too, that ethical education in the schools will prove abortive, unless you have the co-operating influence of the

Christian religion as it is incarnated in the Christian church of America today. It does seem to me that a society in which the idea of God is eliminated, a society in which there is no Christian spirit, which is not molded by the benign influence of Jesus Christ, which has nothing of his shaping hand left upon it, that a society of this kind cannot enable a child to grow up under conditions that promise well for a future prosperous America, but rather promise an America of assassinated presidents and of criminal conditions that almost pass the bounds of possibility. Perhaps we are not aware that in the cities of this country the anarchistic societies and the socialistic societies have organized Sunday schools and Saturday schools in which they treat their system, and in which their system is positively opposed to Christian and ethical education, and based on atheistic principles. So when we talk about socialism as being the hope of society, some of us should be pretty careful about indicating exactly what we mean. Socialism which is teaching boys and girls down on Rivington Street, and down on Canal Street, positive atheistic principles, will inevitably produce an America of assassinations.

Last summer in Chicago, a boy of eleven years of age, of violent temper, ungovernable in every sense of the word, on the opening day of one of our vacation Bible schools, in the Methodist Institutional Church in that city, arose and created a violent scene in the first session of the school, because God's name was mentioned in that assembly. Can you have efficient ethical education which is not reinforced by the idea of God; which is not influenced and motived by the presence of the Christian religion? Can you have it, and if you cannot have it, then it is the great duty of the church throughout the world, throughout the week, in the afternoons and on Sunday, and during the 62 days of the summer when you have millions of children playing at your church door and unemployed; it is the duty of every Christian church to open its doors and make its best ministers and its finest products the teachers of the children of America. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I invite next to the platform Dr. Edmund F. Merriam, the editor of *The Watchman*. (*Applause.*)

DR. EDMUND FRANKLIN MERRIAM: *Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* Some of the things that I had intended to say have already been said and I will not attempt to repeat them. I agree with Dr. Boville that the teaching of ethics will be of small effect unless reinforced by religion, by Christianity. The example of Japan has been exceedingly suggestive in this particular. Japan now entering upon new life, and in adopting appliances of western civilization, found herself deficient in the ethics, in the moral character of her people. Take the Shuntu religion and it has practically no ethical teaching connected with it in the old religion of Japan. It was first attempted to adopt the ethics of Confucianism, but after instructing the children in the schools with these ethics they were found unsatisfactory. Finally the ablest men in Japan were requested to draw up a code of ethics in accordance with the Christian religion, and while it was not desired to adopt Christianity as the religion of the country, Japan had adopted the ethics of Christianity, and they are now being taught in the schools of Japan. This has produced a certain effect and is satisfactory to some degree, but is not fully satisfactory; and the Japanese are coming to the same conclusion as expressed by Dr. Boville that the teaching of ethics needs, in order to produce satisfactory results, to be reinforced by the sanctions and motives of the religion which is behind the ethics. I think this is the conclusion of Dr. Wenner, who is a great authority on the subject and from whom I hope we shall hear and who has given very careful attention to the teaching of ethics in the public schools.

We have listened to the papers of Dr. Meleney and Dr. Alger with great interest, and they have given us the best possible idea of the present state of teaching of ethics of public schools in the United States. And in that respect we have been fully informed, but I believe it is a matter of common observation what with all the care of the teaching of ethics in the public schools in the country, results are far from satisfactory. And the reason is simply this, that it has been without reference to the fact that this teaching of ethics is, as has been pointed out by Mr. Alger, mechanical, formal, and perfunctory. I don't mean to say, however, that the teaching is of that character, but the reception of

these teachings by the pupils is simply formal and perfunctory and without proper motives. Therefore while the teaching itself is admirable, that is, the teaching of ethics, the moral effect upon the children is not strong and pervading. And as Mr. Boville has pointed out, it does not keep them in the life away from school out of the temptations which they encounter outside of the school.

Now, what I have to say this morning is just this: You have heard from Mr. Boville why Christianity cannot be taught in the public schools—it is because Christians are so much divided; it is because we cannot agree upon what kind of Christianity shall be taught in the public schools. This is just the trouble in England today, and the reason that Great Britain is having so much trouble over her educational bill and educational system is because the Church of England desires to control the teaching of religion in the public schools and the nonconformists are not willing that it should. And the effect is likely to be that the schools of Great Britain will be wholly secularized as our schools are in this country. In England, if the nonconformist Christians all could get together, then all the children in Great Britain could be taught Christianity; and in this country if our denominations—our Christian denominations of all sorts—could get together, then the small proportion of people outside would have so little effect that we could have a teaching of real religion with its sanction and motives behind the teaching of ethics in our public schools.

Now, this subject is one of the greatest importance; when we remember that the world of the future is to be the world of the children of today, I believe, as the President has already said, that there has been no subject before us of so large an importance as this one which is now before this Congress. The greatest arguments for Christian unity today come from the missionary peoples. The missionaries wish to present a united front, to teach the same thing to the pagan world; and the same sort of an argument ought to go to the Christian peoples of today of different denominations. Our duty, our duty, my friends, to the children of today and to the world of tomorrow requires that these divisions among the bodies of Christian peoples should disappear; that we should unite under the banner of Christ and

be able not only to be a united people as followers of Christ, but united to carry his gospel into the public schools, into public life, into every phase of society and life of the future.

And so, this is just what I wish to say, that our duty to the future requires that every effort should be made to unify the Christian people in a single effective body, a powerful body, a conquering body. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Dear friends, you will be glad to learn that I hold in my hand the card of George U. Wenner; I know we shall all rejoice to hear Dr. Wenner. (*Applause.*)

DR. GEORGE U. WENNER: *Mr. President:* I think it is John Stuart Mill who says all progress is dependent upon the contiguity of opposing ideas. All that is true, and I fear we shall make very little progress because I think we are all pretty well agreed with the sentiments that have been expressed here this morning, and I felt myself very much at home in listening to these papers and thoughts that have been expressed. At the same time I did feel that President Harris' magnificent paper was better suited to Pennsylvania than to New York, because we have entirely different conditions here, where we have nearly a million Jews, and where even the Christians are not altogether agreed on precisely the kind of religion that ought to be taught in the schools, so that there is very little to be expected in the way of truth, Christian truth, in the schools—although we are all agreed that the personality of the teacher is everything in the matter of teaching either ethics or religion. But the great thing that I gathered from the very admirable paper of Superintendent Meleney is the question of authority in the matter of ethics. Has ethics any basic authority? I was talking with a leading lawyer just a few days ago in this city and he tried to convince me—I was exceedingly shocked at the attitude that he took—he tried to convince me that in the matter of law, in the matter of obedience to law, the trouble was not so much in the matter of breaking the law—that was not wrong—but it was being caught at it; that law itself was only a sequence of events; that the general conception of the present day was that there was no such thing as a principle underlying it, but it was simply a statement of some person who

assumed to have authority, and that that person really hadn't any more right to lay down the law than he or I had; and therefore the only thing that there was in all the laws that were imposed upon us was that we must try not to be caught at it when we violated them. That is, I fear, the sentiment of the people—many of the people—just as much as it is of this distinguished lawyer; for I find, in spite of all these splendid things that Superintendent Meleney has said, that the ethical results of our public schools are not such as we would like to see them. The children's courts tell the story, and, as Dr. Boville has said, it is not very agreeable. But when we see the children that come from our splendid schools in this city, we see also that the views that they have and their conduct are not what we ought to expect from them. I met a man just day before yesterday who went into the theater—I think it was some theater in the neighborhood of forty-second Street and Lexington Avenue—on a Sunday afternoon—not particularly a churchman—he took his boy in there on a Sunday afternoon and he said he was exceedingly shocked by the conduct of hundreds of boys and girls gathered there, the language they used—being children from thirteen to sixteen and seventeen years of age—that the language and conduct that was used there in the course of progress of the theatrical representation, shocked him exceedingly, although he was a man who was not very easily shocked. So I am very glad to notice that the discussion is veering around, swinging around to the fact that there is something else we must have, a basis or authority in ethics, and that is religion. But what is the use of worrying and bothering about this question of teaching ethics in the public schools? It is religion that we want. We believe in God and we believe in our Christian religion, and the great question is how can we teach that; and I am in heartiest agreement in all that has been said today. I am a thorough Baptist on all questions of relations of church and state, for we really have no place in the public schools for our religion; the churches are strong enough to take care of it; all we want is time enough to do it. And if you will pardon me for a little egotism in the matter I would say that for the last fifteen or twenty years I have been trying to do that in the weekday afternoons for the children of my congregation,

and I believe that is the solution of it. We won't stop there, but all we ask of the state is for them to give us enough time and we will do it properly.

When I go away from this meeting I shall go to my own church, and as soon as school hours are closed there I shall meet a splendid lot of boys and girls, and the little ones I meet twice a week and the older ones once a week regularly for nine months of the year, and teach the children the Bible story where we have all the elements of wonder and interest. Then leading up to the special training in church matters in our church services, we have our children bring in the sermons of the preceding Sunday, so that in that way, by regular daily training and teaching of the Bible and the Bible story, and having it constantly throughout every week of the year—or at least throughout nine months of the year—it is brought daily together—this family of little children—and they are taught daily the Bible story, and in that way we find the solution of all these questions. We simply acquire the ethical training, whether in public school or anywhere else, so long as there is an underlying basis or authority. God is our guide and Christ is our brother, and this being a part of the daily life I think we shall make progress. But the churches have the entire thing in their control. They can do this work—they are capable of doing it—but they must not be satisfied with the enjoyment of any systematic instruction that is given on Sunday, but it must be an instruction for every day and every week. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I still have two names. I will call first upon Dr. Albert G. Lawson.

DR. ALBERT G. LAWSON: *Mr. Chairman:* My principal interest was awakened by a suggestion made by President Harris, which brought to my mind the history, as given to me, of the famous Girard School. You know on account of the will of Mr. Girard, ministers, if they are known to be ministers to the gatekeeper, are not allowed even to go on the ground. It has been commonly supposed by a great many that it was because Mr. Girard had a deep prejudice against religion. That is not true. He did have deep prejudice against the priesthood, and he had

seen the overruling, and almost, in the overruling, the destruction, of what he believed to be noble for citizenship on the part of certain priests, and that led him to make his prescription. Now, the reaction from that is somewhat extraordinary. Some of the brightest and best ministers that we have in and about Philadelphia are graduates of the Girard School, and got all their academic training there.

There is a kind of intellectual and actual revolt in a large way, all unconscious, and all without distinctive premeditation, that has come out largely from that prescription, and it leads those who are in the management to be decidedly more careful than the ordinary academy or the ordinary public school about enforcing the inner spirit and life of what we denominate broadly as ethics.

It emphasizes from another side Dr. Harris' suggestion. Truth becomes of little worth until truth is incarnate in life. It is impossible for the Christian personality, in teaching mathematics, to make sweet and lasting effect upon those about them. Many of you know the name of our revered brother who went on to his joy and reward a year ago, Dr. James L. Hodge, of Brooklyn. His daughter was a teacher in one of the higher classes in the grammar school right near to the church where I had the joy of serving for eighteen years. Of course, it was impossible for Miss Hodge to talk directly from the desk, or in handling her book in some particular application of ethics—certainly in Christian doctrine—and yet there was no term at which that young woman had the privilege of meeting her class, that she did not have from one to three of those bright young men and women come to her and say, "Give me an opportunity to go home with you, or in some way to talk more about that deeper thing than moral ethics." I had the privilege of receiving into the Greenwood Baptist Church some eighteen persons whose direct bringing to Jesus Christ came from the sweet and consistent and continuous revealing of the supreme and precious Christian character of that sainted woman as she stood there in her place as a public-school teacher.

Now, the time may never come, in view of our ideas on the subject of the suffrage in this country, when we shall have an opportunity to put into the school, whatever aspect we may call it,

of Christianity as such, and the time may never come when we can broadly decide as an ethical product upon that in which we may have such concurrence and fixed agreement as to make anything like a system, but we may constantly do just what President Harris suggested.

Now, I think in another respect, while none of us wish to make any ecclesiastical attacks, we ought not to be mealy-mouthed about what we know as facts, and when we know that the great Roman church permits its priests to make constant assaults upon our public-school system at this very point, and yet everywhere through our country is planning to secure on boards of education a sufficient majority of members to checkmate anything we may try to do, I think we ought to meet that fact squarely, and we ought not to make believe we do not know it. And so we shall come sufficiently into unity at last to make our effort there, and make it in such a way as to be permanent and effective. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: The next card I have on the list is Dr. H. W. Barnes. (*Applause.*)

DR. H. W. BARNES, of Binghamton, N. Y.: *Brother Moderator*: I know that any address of mine will be trenching upon the time which is allotted for this morning's session, and I shall not attempt to make an address, but simply to call up one fact which has decidedly impressed me, in two large gatherings where the question of religious education was considered—one of them, which I myself attended, at Philadelphia, and the other, which was reported to me from England—namely, this matter of confounding or confusing religion with theology. What is religion? There is but one religion; theology relates to it, creeds relate to it, have something to say about it, but you never can put religion into a book. It is realigiance; the binding of the soul and the life back again to God, which sin has separated from him, and a binding of men together in all proper relationships to each other. Now, ethics we *can* teach; we cannot teach doctrinal matters concerning religion—I mean denominational matters in our schools—but may we not gather up the great central facts, growing out of our eternal relation to God as creator, and our relation

to each other as individuals, and all that concerns the principal attitude and action of men toward each other, and embody them in a book which shall be put in the public schools as arithmetic, geology, grammar, or anything else that is put into a book. We cannot teach theology there; but may we not teach the great verities on which all our Christianity is founded? The only legitimate purpose of any business whatever in this world, and the most significant results of any business whatever, is not what it accomplishes outside, but what the effect of accomplishing it is upon the man who lives within, and does the work, or is reacted upon.

Mr. John D. Rockefeller and I were schoolmates together in the academy. I have said again and again that the most important result from Mr. John D. Rockefeller's life and work is, not what is outside of him, but the influence upon him of doing his work as he has done it. The building of character in the likeness of God or of Christ is the *one great purpose*. It is God's special purpose, it is my special purpose if I am a Christian, and it must be the permanent, the central purpose of humanity, if the Kingdom of God is ever to be realized in this world. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I should like very much myself to have spoken this morning. This topic is one that, it seems to me, has a present importance perhaps beyond almost any one of the topics which we have had on the programme. Perhaps you will permit me to say in line with what has been said by other brethren, that if we could have some book of common worship in our schools on which there could be general agreement by Jews as well as Christians, it would seem to me that we would have taken a practical step in this direction. It was long ago remarked by my father in one of his most beautiful sentences, that ethics apart from religion is but like cut flowers; they may maintain their perfume, but their life and vigor are gone, and they are but dying things. You must have a base of authority behind ethics. The lawyer who was quoted was in some respects justified. Law without sanction is but good advice. It has no weight whatever. You must have authority behind teaching to make it important.

I would like to contribute this thought of my own. Can we not at least bring this principle into the public-school system of

our country, that it shall represent not the minimum, but the maximum of general agreement? We are eliminating from the curricula in our schools anything that any considerable minority objects to, but can we not in some way or other bring about such a conciliation and understanding that the best opinion of every denomination shall be represented, and that the maximum of opinion shall control what is presented in the public schools?

THE PRESIDENT: I should like to invite you to join in a Hymn, No. 239:

Break Thou the bread of life,
Dear Lord, to me.

After the singing of the hymn REV. MR. CRAIG pronounced the benediction.

The Congress then adjourned until 3 o'clock P. M.

THIRD DAY

Afternoon Session

3 o'clock P. M.

THE PRESIDENT: *Ladies and Gentlemen and Brethren of the Congress*: The hour has arrived for the session. Let us join in the hymn very congenial to the thought of the Congress, No. 851.

The hymn was sung and prayer was then offered by REV. ARTHUR S. COLE, of Manasquan.

THE PRESIDENT: As is probably known to most of those present already, it is the custom to have the subject or topic at the closing session of a somewhat different character from those of the preceding sessions of each annual meeting. We assembled primarily for the purpose of discussion, and as discussion is best when emphasized most clearly and concisely by the expression of opinions held by those who have a distinct diversity of views, we have devoted our earlier sessions to this end. But our closing session is not for discussion. It is to emphasize anew the great spiritualities in which we are in agreement, and therefore, always, some theme of this character is taken for the closing session.

For this year the topic selected is, "Realizing the Presence of God." And the first of the speakers is Rev. G. G. Johnson, D.D., pastor of the Prospect Avenue Baptist Church, of Buffalo.

REV. G. G. JOHNSON, D.D.: *Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen:* I have been asked to write upon this great theme, and I thank God for the opportunity of presenting it before you at this time. I feel like Wendell Phillips, when he addressed himself to the newspaper reporters, and said, "At least through you I speak to our millions of people." One may feel that this closing message through the printed report may go even farther.

REALIZING THE PRESENCE OF GOD

"He that dwelleth in the secret place of the Most High shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." "God is a very present help in trouble." The Real Presence is a far-stretching theme, and I suppose I am expected to play the part either of critic or of mystic. I shall do neither. I shall take it for granted that what is wanted, and what is needed even more than it can be wanted by any one of us, is the definite, practical answering of the question implied in the subject assigned: *How may we see His face?*

A card has recently been rather widely circulated in Buffalo bearing this prayer-motto, "Enable me to understand and live the life of Christ." This prayer draws him who offers it to the feet of the One who alone fulfilled our theme. If we understand and live the life of Christ we shall constantly be realizing the presence of God. The very atmosphere of Jesus' life was the Father's presence. In that presence he lived and moved and had his being. In a way that Enoch never did, or could, *he* "walked with God." His consciousness of his own being was not more real than his consciousness of his father's attending love. Here, then, we must find our pattern, the One to show us into the "secret place of the Most High." We must humbly say,

My dear Redeemer and my Lord,
I read my duty in thy word;
But in thy life the law appears
Drawn out in living characters.

Such was thy truth and such thy zeal,
 Such deference to thy Father's will,
 Such love, and meekness so divine,
 I would transcribe and make them mine.

And yet for us all Jesus is, and must needs be, more than the "Way-Shower," as certain ones nowadays so glibly call him; he must be *the Way-Opener* to the Father. I know this is in many quarters now denied. Even Dr. Clarke in his weighty book, *The Christian Doctrine of God*, a very reservoir of truth, crystal clear, while setting forth Jesus as the revealer of the Father, yet says, "No authority or hint of Jesus limits us to learning about God from him alone," and yet a little farther on he says, "Concerning his own acquaintance with God, Jesus uttered the profound saying, 'Neither knoweth any one the Father, save the Son and he to whom the Son wills to reveal him'" (Luke 10:22).¹

Surely to none of us here today can it be without decisive authority that Jesus also said, "I am the Way (not the Way-Shower), the Truth, and the Life; *no man cometh unto the Father but by me.*"

We do not now deal with the question whether there is not a possible revealing of the Father by the Son to one who never heard of Jesus, but who honestly seeks for light. We are, for the most part, concerned with men who do know of Christ and might, if they would, come to him that they might have life—"and this is life eternal that they should know Thee, the only real God, and Him whom Thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (John 17:3).

It is useless then, at the outset, to talk of realizing God's presence to people who cannot know him because they refuse to walk the only way to him, by humble obedient faith in his Son—faith not only in Jesus' character, but also in his cross, because "Christ also suffered, the righteous for the unrighteous, *that He might bring us to God*" (I Peter 3:18). Not for naught was this way opened at such fearful cost, and not to give a choice of ways, but verily because there *could be no other way* into the

¹ W. N. Clarke, D.D., *The Christian Doctrine of God*, pp. 7, 26,

holiest than the one opened by the flesh and sprinkled by the blood of Jesus Christ (Heb. 10:19).

Even as Paul wrote, "Ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:13), and, we have "peace through the blood of his cross" (Col. 1:20). Apart from this peace no experience of the Presence! Vainly do men talk of knowing God by self-consciousness. Pathetically false is it to say, as a recent writer does, that "religion does not consist in having a God, but in having a god-making capacity" (Foster). Hopeless is it to look for a God of our own making or a way of our own devising. The "secret of his presence" is found by no one who has left the *via crucis*.

Again, as useless is it to hope to dwell consciously with the One whom Jesus addressed as "Holy Father, righteous Father" (John 17) without the aid of the Holy Spirit by whom alone can anyone call Jesus "Lord" (I Cor. 12:3) or look up with satisfying love and say, "Abba, Father" (Rom. 8:15). Now the Spirit is given to those that obey God (Acts 5:32), those who leave all to follow him who, "though he was Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb. 5:8). And this obedience to the Lord carries with it obedience to his Word. One who rejects or neglects the Scriptures as the full and final message of the Father to his children cannot by any peradventure find and follow the walk with God.

Of these things I speak at the opening, not to be controversial, but to be clear *and to be true*. As well encourage an ignorant or disobedient child to rejoice in his father's smile as to expect one to realize the presence of God who does not ascertain or accept the will of God as revealed in his Word.

And now what does the "presence of God" mean? The Scriptures indicate three meanings or phases of the one great fact of his presence. The first is the celestial; the second, the universal; and the third, the local. Of the first, the celestial, we need not speak save to quote Heb. 9:24: "Christ entered into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us."

On the second meaning, the universal, it would be delightful and profitable to speak at length, but a few words must suffice. It is the theme of the 139th Psalm—"whither shall I flee from

thy presence?" In heaven or in Sheol, in earth or sea, "*thou art there.*" This thought glorifies Nature and beautifies Life. Thus viewed,

The meanest flower that blows can give
Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears;

and human history, with all its turmoil and tangle, becomes after all in truth "His story;" and the human family, with all its perversions and its shame, becomes the family of the Most High and the constant object of divine concern. Well, therefore, do we sing:

There's not a plant or flower below,
But makes thy glories known;
And clouds arise and tempests blow
By order from thy throne.
Creatures that borrow life from thee
Are subject to thy care;
There's not a place where we can flee,
But God is present there.

This view, moreover, does not glorify and deify man, but glorifies and magnifies God. Timelier and stronger words have not been recently written than these by Principal Forsyth:

What we are developing at the moment is an anthrop-centric Christianity. God and Christ are practically treated as the means to an end that is nearer to our enthusiasm than anything else—the consummation and perfecting of humanity. The chief value of religion, then, is not its value to God, but its value for the completing and crowning of life, whether the great life of the race or the personal life of the individual. Love Christ, we are urged, if you would draw out all that it is in you to be. Our eye is kept first upon our self-culture, our sanctification, in some form, by realizing a divine presence or indwelling, with but a secondary reference to the divine purpose. God is drawn into the circle of our spiritual interests, the interests of man's spiritual culture, as its mightiest ally and helper. We have many kinds of effort—some genial, some ascetic—for the development and deepening of the soul's life, in some of which the spiritual man is thought to be a stage higher than the Gospel man. Whereas, if we forgot our spiritual life after a wise and godly sort, and lived more to God, His finished Gospel, and that purpose of a kingdom for which Christ died, he would take better care of our spiritual life than all our forced culture of it. In a subtle way

this tendency is less Christo-centric than ego-centric. It is monastic. It is not theo-centric. For in any theo-centric faith man lives for the worship and glory of God and for the obedience to His revelation of Himself; which is not in man, and not in spirituality, but in Christ, in the historic, superhistoric, Christ. Christ is not the revelation of man, but of God's will for man; not of the God always in us, but of the God once and for all for us. Christ did not come in the first instance to satisfy the needs and instincts of our diviner self, but to honor the claim of a holy God upon us, crush our guilt into repentant faith, and create us anew in the act. He did not come in the first instance to consecrate human nature, but to hallow God's name in it. He came to fulfil God's will in the first place and to fulfil human destiny only in the second place and by consequence.²

Far from "pragmatic pantheism" is the true teaching of the universal presence of the Blessed God!

We come now to speak of the local (I should like to say, personal) presence of our God. It is particularly this that concerns us here: *his presence in our hearts and lives*. We are to realize *him*, for, as the Scriptures often speak of him, he alone is the "real God" (*ἀληθινός*: "We know him that is real," I John 5:20). Then, surely, he is realizable! How? That is the question.

First, let us say we are to realize, make real to ourselves, the presence of God strictly *by the psychological law of attention*, the simple and familiar law that what we fixedly set our minds upon becomes real to us. Our mental part is like a camera. It requires, as a rule, "time-exposure" in order to print clearly upon its film some object rather dimly seen. We know this is true regarding other objects of our mental vision. Why do we not understand that it is equally true of our vision of God? Paul saw it and urged plentiful prayer and much meditation—"in everything by prayer," "think on these things" (Phil. 4:6, 8), and he urged that our whole process of transformation was closely connected with doing our part by attention, "be ye transformed, *by the renewing of your mind*" (Rom. 12:2). Therefore, the prayer-life and much time with the Word, these which are one and indivisible, are indeed indispensable. If the Master

² Rev. Principal Forsyth, D.D., "Theological Reaction," *British Weekly*.

must needs take dawn-anticipating hours for the cultivation of this fellowship, who are we that we should think to snatch or catch a hurried vision of God's face, and then rush on and be conscious of his presence?

The second law governing this life, of which we are so unworthy to speak, is that of *practice*. There must be a proper commingling of waiting and of working, or we shall miss the boon and blessing. The vision may be rare and rapturous, but

This is what the Vision said,
"Hads't thou *stayed*, I must have fled!"

So, when the time of actual service has come, we are to go, confident of his promise made first to Moses, "My presence shall go with thee." Hence we find the great apostle in the thick of the fray, as well as in the place of quiet prayer, and in both conscious that "the Lord stood by him" (Acts 23:11). So we find the Lord himself serenely confident in the hour and power of darkness surrounded by his foes, and saying, "He that sent me *is with me; he hath not left me alone; for I do always the things that are pleasing to him*" (John 8:29). Truly here is given to us hallowed light upon the way into "the secret place of his presence"! It is doing always the things that are pleasing to him. Moreover, it is doing these things in the consciousness of his love. It is "walking in the light as he is in the light." It is obeying the blessed command, "*Keep yourselves in the love of God.*" As patients on a sanitarium piazza move round from side to side of the building to keep all day in the sun, so we, if we are to realize his presence, must keep ourselves, by attention and action, by thought and deed, by constant prayer and painstaking practice, in the warm and glowing radiance of his everlasting love. It is just here we most often miss the blessing, do we not? We think our first duty is *to do*, while really it is *to be*, and the foremost duty and privilege of Christian being is *to be happy in the love of God*.³ Truly the joy of the Lord is our strength!

Now one of the most precious agencies whereby we are

³ But in no forced way. "Christianity," says President King in his helpful book, *The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life*, "sets aside all strained, and sham, and passive emotions."

brought into this deep well-spring of joy is the tribulation which worketh steadfastness, which worketh approvedness, which worketh hope, "and hope putteth not to shame because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who was given unto us" (Rom. 5:3-5). Remembering that "whom he loveth he chasteneth," we learn as in no other way to know and joyously realize the Father's tender, constant love, and whisper,

Still by my woes to be
Nearer my God to thee;

while we are jubilant to discover that neither tribulation nor anguish can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

But all this, particularly in the humdrum of daily duty, without the excitation of pain, we must learn by constant practice, so that, actually, realizing the presence of God comes in a very true sense to mean *practicing the presence of God*, and here as everywhere it is practice that makes perfect.

Admittedly, apart from the Bible, there is one book supremely helpful upon this subject, a book well known, I assume, to many of us, a book to be accepted as the classic on our topic, the little book entitled, *Practicing the Presence of God*. Brother Lawrence, the monk of three hundred years ago, may well be now our teacher. His experience he thus sums up:

If I dare use the expression, I should choose to call this state the bosom of God, for the inexpressible sweetness which I taste and experience there. . . . The time of business [he says again] does not with me differ from the time of prayer; and in the noise and clutter of my kitchen [he was cook in the monastery], while several persons are at the same time calling for different things, I possess God in as great tranquillity as if I were upon my knees at the blessed sacrament. . . . [He held] that we ought to give ourselves up to God, with regard both to things temporal and spiritual, and seek our satisfaction only in the fulfilling of his will, whether he lead us by suffering or by consolation, for all would be equal to a soul truly resigned. . . . [His testimony is] that in order to form a habit of conversing with God continually, and referring all we do to him, we must at first apply to him with some diligence; but that, after a little care, we should find His love inwardly excite us to it without any difficulty. . . . [His secret of peace was]

that when he had failed in his duty, he confessed his fault, saying to God, *I shall never do otherwise if you leave me to myself; it is you who must hinder my falling, and mend what is amiss.*

After this he gave himself no further uneasiness about it. It was his opinion

that useless thoughts spoil all; that the mischief began there; but that we ought to reject them as soon as we perceived their impertinence to the matter in hand, or our salvation, and return to our communion with God.

His controlling principle was

that all consists *in one hearty renunciation* of everything we are sensible does not lead to God. . . . That our sanctification did not depend upon *changing* our works, but in doing that for God's sake which we commonly do for our own. . . . In fine [he wrote in a letter] by often repeating these acts, they become *habitual*, and the presence of God rendered as it were *natural* to us. . . . Hold yourself in prayer before God like a dumb or paralytic beggar at a rich man's gate. Let it be your business to keep your mind in the presence of the Lord. . . . I make it my ordinary business to abide in the Presence of God with the humility of a useless, though a faithful, servant.

And, finally, let me quote this suggestive paragraph:

We cannot escape the dangers which abound in life without the actual and *continual* help of God. Let us, then, pray to him for it *continually*. How can we pray to him without being with him? How can we be with him but in thinking of him often? And how can we often think of him but by a holy habit which we should form of it? We must know him before we can love. In order to *know* God we must often *think* of him; and when we come to *love* him we shall then also think of him often, for our heart will be with our treasure. This is an argument which well deserves your consideration.

My brothers, is it not so? Has our new psychology brought us beyond this principle? Is it not the same which we find so richly expressed in Andrew Rykman's "Prayer"?

Let me find in Thy employ
Peace that dearer is than joy;
Out of self to love be led
And to heaven acclimated,
Until all things sweet and good
Seem my natural habitude.

And now, lest Brother Lawrence and his principle and practice seem distant and monastic, let me refer you to a present-day example of the realized presence of God in a most wholesome and happy combination of the contemplative and the active, the mystical and the practical. I have in mind Dr. Grenfell. In an editorial of the *Outlook* of recent date on "The Path to God," the writer says:

We long for a great and final vision of God. At the beginning of the journey we want the enlargement, liberation, and certainty which can be found only at the end. We forget the significance of the divine commendation, "Well done, good and faithful servant!" We change it to read, "Well thought," or, "Well felt, good and faithful servant." We want to feel the presence of God. We want to be able to think our way to him in perfect clearness. We want peace, but we are not willing to set our lives in order. This gospel of education by doing, of gaining the vision and learning the truth by doing the will of the Father from day to day, is being preached by Dr. Grenfell, not only to Labrador, but to Canada, to America, and to England. Here is a man who, day by day, with childlike simplicity, without theories either of theology or ecclesiasticism, does the work of Christ with modern tools, and preaches his gospel in modern speech; and no man who hears him or comes in contact with him fails to take away from his presence a wonderful sense of his faith in the invisible God and his sense of the presence of the unseen Christ. *Dr. Grenfell always speaks of Christ as if he were in the next room.*

Inspiring words these! But I ween there lies back of this rare personality and unique activity more persistent practice of the Presence, by means of prayer and the Word and habitual thought, than is hinted at by the above writer.

For all—the Master himself, the great apostle, Brother Lawrence, Dr. Grenfell, and for us—the one law holds true; we are to realize the presence of our gracious God by steady practice. We are to keep ourselves in his love, and learn by humble obedience and patient perseverance to say, "In thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore." Thus, and thus only, shall life be fitly lived, and we shall dwell in his presence, both here and there.

THE PRESIDENT: The last address of the announced pro-

gramme, and of the Congress, is to be given by our honored brother, Dr. J. F. Elder, who for so many years has been a leader among us, especially in this portion of this country. (*Applause.*)

REV. J. F. ELDER, D.D., of New York, then read as follows:

REALIZING THE PRESENCE OF GOD

We are always in the presence of God, whether we realize it or not. In him we live and move and have our being. The question of the Hebrew psalmist still grips us—"Whither shall I flee from thy presence?" Heaven is his abode. Hell cannot shake him off. The wings of the morning cannot bear us beyond his outstretched hand. We flee into the outer darkness to escape him, only to find that the night shineth as the day—darkness and light are one to God. God is not merely transcendent but immanent. He does not press a button, as the President in Washington may, in order to set in motion the machinery of some distant fair; but he is present among all the whirring forces—the life of their life—to which is due the order, the beauty, and the bounty of Nature. He not only gave the initial impulse that set in motion the stars of heaven but, night after night, the celestial shepherd brings out these hosts by number. He calls them all by name—not one is lacking. The great mountains proclaim the stability and the unsearchableness of his judgments as he walks among the children of men. Every such mount is a holy mount. Coleridge's rapture over the vision of Mt. Blanc is but the emotion of every normal soul in its presence:

O dread and silent Mount, I gazed upon thee
 Till thou, still present to the bodily sense,
 Didst vanish from my thought; entranced in prayer
 I worshiped the invisible alone.
 Yet, like some sweet, beguiling melody,
 So sweet we know not we are listening to it,
 Thou the meanwhile wast blending with my thoughts,
 Yea, with my life, and life's own secret joy,
 Till the dilating soul, enrapt, transfused,
 Into the mighty vision passing, there
 As in her natural form swelled vast to heaven.

If "the undevout astronomer is mad," even more so is the undevout husbandman. In this realm the presence of God is palpable. In the varied phenomena of life, alike in the vegetable and the animal world, is found unfailing help toward realizing the presence of God. *Life* is the light of men. Its mystery is unfathomable, no mortal has ever originated it. It is the monopoly of the living God. Its manifestations proclaim his presence. When Israel in the days of Hosea averred that her lovers, the false gods of the Baal worship, gave her the fruitful seasons, God smote her with famine. But in view of her repentance he comforts her with the promise that he "will answer the heavens, and they shall answer the earth, and the earth shall answer the grain and the new wine and the oil and they shall answer Jezrael"—tracing by unbroken links the bounty of their fields to the open hand of God.

Let us not belittle natural religion. It has been said that it is all the religion the vast portion of mankind have to depend on—the more shame to those who hold idly in their hands Christ's great commission till it is almost moldy from neglect. Nor are we who have the supreme revelation of God in Christ blameless for not making more of this primitive and compelling evidence of the divine presence in Nature. To a Christian above all others the contemplation of Nature should bring a closer fellowship with his pre-existent Lord; for all things were made through him and without him was not anything made that hath been made. One of my most conspicuous memories of the comforting power of Nature was when, under the stress of fear of impending trouble, I lifted up my eyes, as I sat by the open window at midnight, and called on the Lord of those heavenly hosts for his succor; and he heard my cry. My appeal was inspired by the power that was manifest through those marshaled hosts.

But if the heavens and the earth declare the glory and the presence of God, much more does He who came forth from God and dwelt among us full of grace and truth. As Dr. Van Dyke has put it, "His was the human life of God;" and through him we enter into a fellowship and communion with God that is human in its reality and in its essence divine. He offers himself as our Friend who reveals to us the secret thoughts of God. He

promises to abide in us. He declares that he knows us and we may know him even as God knows him and he knows the Father. He promises another Paraclete who will explain his person and work. One of his apostles, who had a vision of his risen glory that the noonday sun could not dim, entered into fellowship with him so close and vital that he could say "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." Another declares that though now we see him not, yet believing we rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Truly here is a goodly basis for a most profound and rational and abiding realization of the presence of God in Christ through the ministration of the Holy Spirit. And in all ages have been found saints of the most high God, both men and women, who have entered into such devout and personal fellowship with him that they have closely approximated the fulness of Christ in his love and his joy in God. Nor may anyone say how intimate and complete this fellowship may become. There are no limits to its fulness that we may define. God and man are of one nature essentially, and may become one in a spiritual union so real and true, that deeps in the one call to deeps in the other and are answered with pulsating tides of joy in both man and God. The joy of the marriage feast is only a faint, if scriptural, symbol of the resultant bliss. Of course there will sometimes be extravagances of language in describing these ecstatic experiences and some of them may indeed be indescribable. Those who are caught up to the third heaven, until they know not whether they are in the body or out of the body, may be excused for lack of human language that will adequately describe their experiences. Such heavenly emotions call for a divine vocabulary.

And yet in attempting such rapturous realization of the presence of God there is a peril both real and grave. Icarus rushing into the face of the sun on wings of wax is but a feeble illustration of the folly and peril of many who have sought to achieve such an experience without due regard to sane and scriptural conditions. The stream of mysticism which, under different names, runs through Christian history and on which so many of these presumptuous souls have embarked is strewn with many a wreck on its shoals or beneath its cataracts. To

many of these daring speculators God might have said, as to the wicked man whom he rebukes in the fiftieth Psalm, "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself." In many respects we have a right to think of God as one who is such as we are. We have the same affectional nature enabling us to appreciate the love of God and to love him in return. We have a correspondent intelligence so that we can comprehend his instructions and his purpose and can search out the secrets of his universe. We have from him a moral nature that leads us to accuse or excuse one another and approve his own moral judgments. We have a will which he respects and which we can submit or oppose to his own sovereign will. His Spirit has an affinity for our spirit, as the acid for the copper plate, and can bite into our natures with indelible results. So there is ground and hope for our realizing his presence in intimate communion, as real as our most familiar fellowship with one another. But while there is so much in common we are not to forget that we are not *altogether* such a one as he is. He is infinite and we are finite. He is holy and we are sinful. He only has immortality; we return to the dust. He can enter into our estate and under our limitations of finiteness and temptation live a normal and perfect human life. But it does not follow that we can equally enter into and appropriate his perfect divine nature. But some of these philosophical dreamers, ignoring all rational and scriptural tests and conditions for realizing the presence of God, claim that by direct intuition they enter into union with the divine; and sometimes in such pantheistic fashion as to come perilously near to the extinction of the human personality. Mme. Guyon says:

The essential union is the spiritual marriage, where there is a communication of substance, when God takes the soul for his spouse, unites it to himself, not personally, nor by any act or means, but immediately reducing all to a unity. The soul ought not, nor can, any more make any distinction between God and itself. God is the soul and the soul is god.

When the drop has slipped into the ocean, we might ask, what becomes of the drop? Some have gone so far in this inward contemplation that it has become a sort of self-hypnotism and

differs but little in its outcome from the Buddhist Nirvana. The peril arises from the divorce of the contemplative and the practical, the intuitive and the intellectual, the speculative and the scriptural. As John Wesley says of Mme. Guyon, while acknowledging her as a pattern of true holiness: "The grand source of all her mistakes was this—the not being guided by the written Word. And in truth, any attempt to realize the presence of God apart from the conditions laid down in the Scriptures will be futile and disastrous. Christ's language, as to the revelation of God through him alone, is too explicit to be neglected by any man who wishes to draw nearer to God. "No man knows the Father save the Son and he to whom the Son wills to reveal him." "He who hath seen me hath seen the Father." If we are to find perfected life in the realization of the presence of God, we must not ignore the teaching of Christ as to his mediatorship of that perfect life to men. What we need is not to turn the eyes within in a complete self-absorption, whose fruit may be self-delusion, but to look away to Jesus and contemplate him who "was made unto us Wisdom from God and Righteousness and Sanctification and Redemption." "I am the Way and the Truth and the Life: no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." The Holy Spirit was sent that he might take of the things of Christ and reveal them unto us. And he will not go contrary to his mission by helping to bring men unto God or into God through intuition and speculation, apart from the truth as it is in Jesus. The contemplation of Jesus Christ in his person and works and especially the self-surrender of our lives to him in loving and self-sacrificing service is the true path to fellowship with God. The experiences that come to us through some form of ecstatic reverie, apart from the intelligent recognition of Christ as the path to peace, will be likely to end in a frothy joy that has little depth or staying power. One can but wonder how permanent was the ecstasy of the good Methodist sister who, when under the influence of the "power," declared that she felt "like a barrel in mid-ocean with both heads stove in and the surges of God's everlasting love rolling through her soul."

But Christ by his life as well as his teachings should be our guide in this matter. He had the Spirit without measure and

his fellowship with God was profound, complete, and uninterrupted, save for three hours on the cross. And yet how sane his spiritual experiences were. How absolutely free from anything that savored of the hysterical or rhapsodical. Nowhere is there evidence of any abnormal experience of the divine fellowship, differing from that which any child of God might have who would fulfil the same tests of loyalty to truth and duty. What oneness of affection and will in that confession at the grave of Lazarus, "I know that thou hearest me always." How completely welded with God he became in the white heat of Gethsemane's furnace. How calmly he looked down through the fathomless but crystal depths of eternity as he prayed, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." His oneness with God manifested itself rather in silent streams of joy than in geysers of ecstasy.

And for him the immediate path to this peace and fellowship with God was simple loyalty to present duty. His wish "to fulfil all righteousness" in his baptism was followed by the fulness of the Spirit, as typified in descent of the dove upon him as he came up from the waters of consecration. At the Pentecost the Holy Spirit came down in divided tongues of fire, one on each. But Jesus' enduement of the Spirit was represented by the descent of a dove, a distinct bodily organism, as if the wholeness of the spirit was to be his from that hour. The approving voice from heaven, "I am well pleased," was but the outcome and the echo of: "I do always the things that please him." And every loyal soul who can truly say, "Lo, I come: I delight to do thy will, O God," flies straight into the outstretched and welcoming arms of everlasting love. There is no mystery in Christ's formulary for enjoying the presence of God. "If a man love me he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." This involves no fusion of personalities or confusion of consciousness, but rather the emphasizing of the human personality by bringing it to a wider and truer self-consciousness as its powers are disclosed and energized by the divine fellowship it enjoys. As Griffith John naïvely put it to a party of friends, in detail—his experience in

coming into a fuller and abiding consciousness of Christ, "There are always two of us now."

I believe that grace, like nature, abhors a vacuum. And just as the ocean rolls into every bay that is open to its tides and seeks every crevice and pool along the shore, so God seeks a place in every willing soul who truly longs for him as the hart pants for the water-brooks. He seeketh such to worship him; and when one is found he fills him, after his measure, up to all the fulness of God. He craves souls that are *en rapport* with himself, that share his love of truth, that are interested in his kingdom and his righteousness more than in any form of self-aggrandizement whatever, that reflect his spirit and purpose in their own lives; and such he makes his closest friends and gives them his fullest confidence. It was in recognition of Abraham as his friend that he said: "Shall I hide from Abraham that which I do?" But the destruction of Sodom were a small matter in which to give Abraham his confidence. God had a secret locked in his bosom from eternity and had found no created being with whom he could share it. But when Abraham had so far surrendered his will to God as virtually to sacrifice his only son, then God found a human soul that could understand his own eternal and heart-breaking purpose to give up his only-begotten and well-beloved son that all the families of the earth might be blessed in him. You can almost detect the choking in the voice of Jehovah as he says to Abraham: "Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest, and offer him for a burnt offering." How vividly it anticipates the "only-begotten and well-beloved son" of John's gospel. And if ever there was one particular hour when Abraham rejoiced to see Christ's day, and did see it and was glad, why may it not have been the very hour when he showed himself so thoroughly *en rapport* with God that God took him into his confidence as regards the offering-up of his own beloved Son, when there would be no higher voice to stay the sacrificial blow? The gladness of Abraham was the gladness of a soul that has entered into the very recesses of the divine. It was not by foresight into Christ's earthly career but by insight through perfect sympathy into the heart of the eternal that he was able to see Christ's day and

rejoice in it. And is it not, when, in some act of self-surrender or self-sacrifice, we enter into the spirit which dominates Christ's life, that we most naturally and forcefully draw him into our lives with fulness of blessing. What did not that rich young ruler miss when he turned away from Jesus, very sorrowful because very rich. The conditions seemed hard, but Christ was not merely imposing a test but offering an opportunity, an opportunity to do precisely what he himself had done when, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might become rich. It would have made him a kindred spirit with Christ and the passing love which Jesus felt for him for his sincerity would have deepened into a divine and eternal fellowship.

It is said that we live in a busy, rushing age with few opportunities or inducements to cultivate the meditative spirit or to realize the presence of God. Doubtless we need devotional helps, such as mediation and prayer and study of the word, but may we not graft our busy lives into the divine after the Pauline fashion of doing all our business to the glory of God? Is Kline's method of getting "in tune with the Infinite" any more rational or effective than to come into such hearty sympathy with the idea of giving the gospel of Christ to the world in this generation that it shall become an absorbing passion and we consecrate all that we are and have to bringing the kingdom of God to pass? May there not be as grand possibilities and incentives for realizing the presence of God in the cordial support of the Layman's Missionary Movement as in a week's retreat for meditation and prayer? Perhaps this hustling age may yet develop a spiritual side by devoting its energies to practical methods for securing the doing of the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven. Let St. Siméon Stylites come down from his ridiculous perch and devote himself to the needs of suffering humanity around the base of his pillar. Let the anchorite come in from the desert and breathe the fetid air of the tenement house till he is moved to cry aloud in the streets for better conditions for the poor. Here he will oftenest touch the hand of him who went about doing good and who gives his warmest smiles to those who follow closest in his steps. He himself hastened from the celestial intercourse of

the Mount of Transfiguration to answer the cry of suffering that rolled up from its base. Profound spiritual experiences are not necessarily to be divorced from the plain duties of everyday life.

Without limiting, then, the power or the freedom of the Holy Spirit in leading men into the realization of the presence of God by his direct influence on the soul, through meditation and prayer, I wish also to submit whether just as direct a path to this fellowship and peace may not be found, under the influence of the same spirit, in yielding ourselves to the divine will in the ordinary calls of daily duty and in the doing of the commandments of God in love for his holy name. Surely the one method of realizing the presence of God will be ineffective unless it is supplemented by the other; for the latter contains "the core of Christ's moral philosophy": "Whosoever loseth his life for my sake, the same shall find it."

THE PRESIDENT: I take pleasure at this time in reading a telegram received by Dr. Rivington Lord, member of the Executive Committee:

Explaining to the President of the Baptist Congress, that my absence is unavoidable. Have written Dr. Lord.

JOSEPH W. MAUCK

President of the General Conference of Free Baptists

We welcome very cordially this brotherly word from the president of our Free Baptist friends, and I will ask Dr. Lord to make a suitable reply to the writer.

You will notice on the programme that "Closing Words" are to follow the addresses of the afternoon, and these are to be given in four brief addresses of which the President is instructed to give the first.

The words then, that I shall address to you, dear brothers, will be with especial reference to what I understand to be the functions that our Baptist Congress should seek to subserve in our denominational life. And in tone with the devotional character of the afternoon, without directly taking a text, I will seek to follow the theme that has been so beautifully brought before you.

In the first place, I am reminded, by the address of Dr. Elder,

of an address given many years since by my honored father, entitled "Puritan and Mystic," in which he dwells lovingly and appreciatively on both these ideals developed in Christian history, and while, with Dr. Elder, he rather inclines to the Puritan ideal, he realizes that both are worthy expressions of the Christian life, and neither is actually exclusive of the other, but rather are they supplemental one of the other.

I thought as I listened to the address of Dr. Johnson, of the text quoted in his remarks: "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life." There our Lord presents himself distinctly as the channel of salvation, and not in one, but three terms, the way, the truth, and the life, and it has occurred to me many times—it is no new thought to me—that in the development of Christian theology and life, the emphasis has passed gradually, but certainly, from the first to the second, and in our time, rather from the second to the third of those terms; that during the early Christian centuries the emphasis was distinctly on the "way," and the church presented itself as the expression of the way, and that this churchly sacramental notion was only very gradually displaced by the recognition that behind all symbols the great thing for which the symbol had worthiness was the truth it embodied and expressed, and that of all symbols the Bible expresses that truth the most clearly, and that it is most easy of comprehension. Therefore, the Protestant Reformation, particularly, lifted up the Scriptures as the great expression of Christ in the world, and thus we had, as it were, a loss of emphasis on the churchly idea, and a supersession of it by the scriptural idea, which still so largely obtains. The question would then naturally suggest itself, whether this is the ultimate, and whether in the will of the Master this was to be the ultimate of religion, and since the days of John Wesley, this question finds not a hopeless, but a very hopeful answer, in the evident conscious possession of life, spiritual life, by the recipient of the truth, and of the work of the spirit. And so truth no longer is so objectively thought of or exclusively objectified, it becomes more and more distinctly a conscious, subjective possession, and we therefore, find it easy, comparatively easy, for us, who are evangelical, to realize that while we share

in the Protestant protest against former errors, for us the substantive of our belief is, still more, this conscious experience.

Now, then, we have life. We can then, I believe, boldly say the very contrary of what was said by a distinguished Presbyterian minister who, in an address some years ago, said: "If I were asked to choose between the formula, 'Christianity is a dogma,' or 'Christianity is a life,' I would regret the necessity of choice, but I should say unhesitatingly 'Christianity is a dogma.'" As unhesitatingly I would venture to say if I had to choose, "Christianity is a life," and I would suggest to my Presbyterian friend, could he read such a text as, "I am come that they may have life," and paraphrase it, "I am come that they may have dogma," or "In him was dogma, and the dogma was the light of day." Any such statement of the idea suggests its incongruity.

Now, then, to apply this directly to the thoughts and the attitude of our Baptist Congress: We believe that in our Baptist Congress we serve a very useful purpose to our denomination, by bringing up views that are under present discussion, for the very purpose of discussion. We do not believe that it is the purpose of the Congress simply to take, for instance, such a theme as "The Attributes of God," and give us a careful summary of the positions of some admirable theologian like, I will say, Dr. Hodge, of Princeton. Those who desire to be well informed on those doctrines and positions of our faith find them in the proper treatises, but we believe our purpose is here to treat of topics under present discussion with reference to our faith, and practice, and in a way which will bring out the error or the truth which may be in them. We believe that both the position of the conservative and the liberal, or radical, are very necessary in a living church. There is a heritage from the past that must be conserved in every life, and there is a new growth that must be carefully watched and cultivated. These two sets of truths will not be equally seen, and in their full balance, by each individual. A certain individual, or a certain group of individuals, will realize the preciousness of the heritage to them of conservative opinions as natural and congenial; others of them will realize the power and energy and vigor of the new life, and to them

radical views are most congenial. Both these are valuable; both are necessary in the Baptist Congress. We can see that it is well to call these groups together in order that thus we may have, as it were, the pruning of the living vine, the consideration of whether the new view that presents itself is error or truth, or the mingling that is there of both truth and error, and out of the discussion of both truth and error we may be better able to discriminate between the two.

We do not, as Baptists, hold, as the Roman Catholics do, to the idea of a *deposit of faith* to be carefully handed on to a future generation. We look rather, as I have already suggested in this text, on the Christian position as the conscious possession of an inner life, and as that inner life develops, it necessarily, and perfectly normally, ought to increase in self-conscienceness, and with the increase of self-conscienceness there ought to be an increasing clearness of spiritual vision. Thus what the Fathers held was true, will still be deemed to be true, but perhaps something more than the Fathers saw will also be deemed to be true, so the discrimination, as I say, will become clearer. Now, this will not imply at all the loss of authority. It may seem to imply sometimes a carelessness with regard to certain standards of authority, but that will rather be because the transference of authority has been or is being effected to the common source of authority. And so further, just as an illustration: In the latter part of the eighteenth century, the French physicists realized that the standards of length and weight were not, after all, scientifically accurate, and they therefore proposed the metric system, which has since been progressively extending its way among all European people. Now, their movement was not intended to discredit the old ideas of length and weight; it was not a carelessness of accuracy in those respects. It was an increased discrimination with regard to real accuracy that led them to feel that the old English system of pounds and ounces was not sufficiently accurate; that the old method of miles and leagues was not sufficiently accurate; that we must have the meter and the kilometer, and the decimal system, founded on the earth, and its qualities and measurements. So I would suggest, my friends, that the attitude of suspicion that sometimes and in some quarters

has prevailed with regard to such discussions as these is an unworthy attitude. I recognize that it has to be, and therefore, I never do feel any irritable feeling toward it, but I distinctly feel that it is an unworthy attitude of Christian people, and that it is one they ought to learn to yield up. It never has been the attitude of the best leaders of our denomination. It can never be the attitude of those who look hopefully forward toward the future.

I remember a young lawyer once speaking to me regarding some matters in his own profession, and making this remark which lingered in my memory with regard to young men. He said: "I have noticed that older men will forgive rashness in younger men, but they will never forgive their lack of courage." I have noticed the same thing in the ministry: that rashness is forgiven in a young minister, but lack of courage is never forgiven. Perhaps it will not be definitely and sensibly realized, but the man who has lacked courage in his ministry will certainly more or less distinctly fall out of the ranks as life advances, while the man who has been rash will sometimes overcome his rashness, and become one of the safest and most widely accepted of leaders.

I may perhaps close with this anecdote: One of the leading conservative theologians of the country, one of the most honored of the retired professors of theology connected with any of our Baptist institutions, told me that he was very much in the habit of haunting my father's study, and it was said to him by some elderly men of that day: "Mr. So-and-So," as he was then, "be careful how you receive the instructions of William R. Williams. He is a good man and a spiritual man, but he is not sound." Now, I would not tell that story were it not for the fact that he did accept the advice of William R. Williams until he came to feel himself the exponent of those views, and thinks himself today the exponent of those views more than any other man, and is himself regarded as the very pillar and standard of orthodoxy. What has happened? Evidently the conception of orthodoxy has moved on in our denomination, and what has once happened may happen again and must happen in every growing institution.

Now, those who feel the fear of such discussions as these, of what are they really afraid? They are afraid, of course, of error and heresy; but let them realize that what really they may be

hindering is the very tendency that is the life and development of things. Against all that the Baptist Congress has stood, all these years, not itself undertaking in any way to express views, or say what is the proper view, or what is the false view, but simply affording a forum where these views could be discussed, and their merits thus tested. Now, my friends, it was said by the late Dr. Elias H. Johnson, that we find in our conferences that conservative men are not always readily induced to take their positions here, and that, he used to say, was the reason why sometimes it seemed as if the Congress definitely stood for radical or heterodox opinion. Dr. Elias H. Johnson was called the father of our Baptist Congress. The position that he took was felt to be the position of the Congress. His own life was an illustration of these tendencies. He died a most honored man among us. He had come to be respected as a man who was safe, who was loving, who was true. I trust and believe that the Congress has achieved the same reputation, and will worthily maintain it.

These closing words from your Chairman, I hope, will be admitted in the spirit with which they are given.

I will now call on the pastor of the church, Dr. Eaton, to speak for the local committee.

REV. CHARLES A. EATON: *Mr. President and Friends:* I am at a disadvantage in being asked to speak for the local committee since there is no local committee.

Dr. Gessler requested me to say a few words at the closing hour, and suggested that I say what I thought of the conference or Congress. I cannot say that I have been passionately in love with the Congress as it has gone along, nor had I become wildly enthusiastic over it. This is my first privilege of enjoying the discussions of this body. I have learned a great deal. I have understood some things that I have heard, and sometimes I thought the speakers understood what they were talking about! (*Laughter.*) Sometimes I must confess—well, I won't make that confession.

THE PRESIDENT: Why not?

REV. EATON: Well, that they did not exactly just know

where they were going to come out when they went in, and when the speech was through they were still in.

I think one of the most delightful things we have had today, or any day of this Congress, is the address of our honored President, to which we have just listened. Personally, sir—you will forgive me if I say it in your presence—I was charmed with it. I think it sets forth ideally the conception of a gathering like this. I am glad on behalf of this church that this Congress did us the honor to meet with us in this place. I was glad to see standing in this pulpit this afternoon our honored brother, Dr. Elder, so long a pastor here, a true man of God.

Brethren, we younger men—because while I am gray-headed, I am not very old—we younger men rejoice in the conflict of opinions, when back of this conflict there stand loyal, loving, faithful hearts. The only way that we can discover truth is for each side to express itself fully and frankly, not with personal animosities, or harsh criticisms, but with utmost manhood and frankness, and have every man say his say, in the fear and love of God, and in the love, but not the fear, of his fellows.

I have rejoiced in that spirit here, and I feel under deep obligations to some of the brethren, for whose personalities I have the deepest affection and admiration, and for whose opinion I have not the slightest regard in the world. I have enjoyed hearing them speak at this Congress.

And, now, in closing, permit me to say that I feel that the Baptist denomination, and the other Christian bodies, are under a profound obligation in this modern age. If we fail to send forth a clear and easily understood message, if we fail to hold aloft the lamp of divine truth, if men cannot find God through the way which the churches of Jesus open in their presence, then dark indeed is the outlook for the future. The truth, sir, is more than any man's creed, or any man's opinion; it is more than the dogma of any church. Truth is God; truth is a universe, and the spirit of man is more than the reasoning power; it is a universe like the universe from which he has come. So that the man who is in advance in his thought, and the man who is conservative, the man who loves, the man who feels, the man who is optimistic, and the man who reasons, these are all needed, and after we have

all said our say, and fought our fight, and made our contribution, we have only touched the outer fringe of the great universe of God's self-revelation through the darkened spirit of his lost children. By and by we shall know as we are known, but here we know in part, and for that reason I welcome with a deep sympathy and joy the opinions of any man, provided he is honest and good, whether I can understand them or agree with him or not. I rejoice to hear him say his say, and undertaking to kindle as far as he can a light to guide the footsteps of men home to their Father. I welcome you once more to this place, and when the Congress is over we would be glad to welcome you personally. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: I am sure that we feel a heartfelt response to the brotherly words of the pastor of this church, by whose hospitality we are meeting here, but a more fitting word is to be spoken for the General Committee, first, by Dr. Addison Moore. (*Applause.*)

REV. ADDISON MOORE, of Jersey City, N. J.: *Mr. President:* On behalf of the General Committee, it gives me great pleasure to express to you, Sir, our appreciation of your very graceful and courteous and dignified conduct in all the sessions of this Congress, and also, on behalf of the General Committee, it affords me great pleasure to extend to the members of the Executive Committee, through their officer, our presiding secretary, our appreciation of the efforts that have been put forth to make the programme on this occasion such an interesting, inspiring, and instructive programme as we have received.

We have come to believe in the Baptist Congress as the force among us that makes possible the broadening of our denominational views; and we appreciate the opportunity that the meeting of the Congress affords us to become better acquainted with one another.

We feel as members of the General Committee that some of the statements made from this platform have been of such tremendous import, and have had such seriousness in their trend, that if they were thrown out on the sea of life, they might readily be expected to sink in that sea. We also feel that some of the

things that have been said from this platform have been said so carefully, have been phrased so wisely, that they will float on any sea. And we have in both of these statements, the corks that float on the top of the net, and the leads that drag the net down, while both together, corks and leads, make the net so comprehensive that with it we can become efficient fishers of men.

It is interesting to know that during the last five years there has been a gain of 40 per cent. in the membership of the Congress. We have 173 members of the General Committee; we have 175 annual subscribers; we have 348 contributing members of this Baptist Congress. And this marks the prosperity of this organization as an institution among us; and we do well to remind ourselves of the value of the fellowships that we find here; fellowships in the search for truth certainly bringing us into the closest sort of relationship.

In the church in New Haven of which I had the pleasure of being pastor for a few years, it was thought best to change the communion service from the old form of the two or three cups, to the individual communion service. The first time that we used the individual cups I noticed the widow of one who had been an honored deacon in that church, who sat glaring at me through that service, and at its close, she came forward without any hesitation, and she said, "Well, I have sat under close communion, but this is the closest communion under which I have ever sat." I think somehow in this Congress of ours we get into the closest sort of fellowship, because it is the fellowship in which we seek to relate ourselves to the truth of God, who is the Truth.

After all then, it is a matter of relationship, and nobody can tell us unto what that relationship shall eventually lead. We know what some sorts of relationship do for us. If I am related to the sons of Italy, it gives me the olive complexion, eyes like the midnight, and raven black hair. I know that if I am related to the Anglo-Saxon, it gives me eyes the color of the blue sky, and a skin that is fair in hue, and hair that is golden in its color. I know that if I am related to the sons of Africa, it gives me the complexion of ebony, and kinky hair; and if I am related to God, nobody can really tell what that means; a prophet of old failed utterly when he tried to tell it; only we know that ears

have not heard, nor eyes seen, neither has there entered into the heart of man, the things that God himself, the Truth, has prepared for them who love Him. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: The anecdote relating to the communion service, that Brother Moore has given us, recalls one in my experience that came to my mind during the discussion yesterday evening. I was called to officiate at a communion service in a Baptist church in the country, of which a friend of mine, whose views are more conservative than mine, had been pastor for many years. The old man had died, and I was asked to conduct the communion service there. I invited his widow, a Presbyterian, down to commune with us. She did so, and after the communion—she loved her husband dearly—with trembling lips she said, “This is the first communion I have ever been able to take in this church, and it has been a privilege inexpressibly dear.” We now have a word from a representative of the Executive Committee, my dear friend, Dr. Rufus P. Johnston. It is to be explained that Dr. Sanders, the chairman of that committee, is in enforced absence, due to the funeral of a relative.

REV. RUFUS P. JOHNSTON, D.D., of New York City: This session of the Baptist Congress, like all earthly fellowships, must have its formal close, and I am to speak in behalf of the Executive Committee the closing words.

I should like to remind you that while the session closes in one sense, it does not end. For messages have been uttered, convictions have been expressed, visions have been caught, fellowships have been enjoyed, which constitute an influence that shall continue to be operative in our individual lives, as well as in the larger life of the denomination, when you and I are forgotten. “Their echoes roll from soul to soul, and live forever and forever.” Some of us can never be the same as we were before. There have come into our minds and hearts forces which shall make us more valiant and resolute and effective in our life and work.

Dr. Williams has set forth something of the purpose of the Baptist Congress. I agree with him entirely, and it only shows how different minds view the same thing from different angles,

when I say that, in my opinion, the purpose of the Baptist Congress is most beautifully and accurately set forth in the phrasing of the last subject of the session: "The Realization of the Presence of God," realizing his presence that we may attain unto his vision, that we may achieve his purpose. This, I am convinced, has been the throbbing aspiration and the yearning prayer of every member of this Congress, that we may know him, and be conformed unto his image, and achieve his purpose in our own lives, and in the work that he has given us to do. I have come to feel that there are many avenues leading to the heart of God. Thebes had a hundred gates through which the tides of commerce and of travel poured into that ancient city, and I think there are more than a hundred portals through which we may come unto his presence.

We have been emphasizing in this Congress the importance of the truth, because we believe that truth is of God, and that God is truth. In our intellectual efforts to grasp the truth, and to state it, we have been seeking for the realization of the presence of God. And not through our intellects only, but through our affections, through our yearnings, and our aspirations; for the utterances of this Congress have not been the product of merely cold intellectual processes, they have been the products of the processes of the entire man. And while they have been stated in intellectual terms, they embody the prayer and the yearning and the struggle and the aspiration, not of the mind, but of the heart and of the will and of the soul. We believe, therefore, that in striving to find the truth, we are striving to find God. In constituting us as he did, our Father flung us out into the universe and said, "Find the truth; it is to be sought; it is to be realized; it is to be achieved; it is to be experienced." And we are trying, in God's world, to come into fuller fellowship with him, by discovering and putting ourselves into harmony with the processes of his eternal being. Truth in one sense is the mode of divine activity. And when we discover it we may say with the old astronomer, "O God, we are thinking thy thoughts after thee."

You remember the word of Lessing, that if there were offered to him the alternatives of truth perfectly revealed and perfectly formulated on the one hand, and the privilege of seeking for

truth on the other, that he would say, "Give me the privilege of seeking and finding the truth." And that is what we are trying to do in our discussions, in our thoughts, in our yearnings, in our aspirations. This Congress stands for the freedom of search for truth, and also, for the freedom to express the results of that search. It has been said—I think I have been guilty of saying it myself—that sometimes one is impressed that the Baptist denomination stands for freedom of thought, but not for freedom of conclusion. The Congress aims to give a platform from which a man may have the freedom of stating his conclusions—not that the Congress endorses his conclusions, but it does endorse his right to think and to reach conclusions.

There is something of the spirit of Lowell's "Man" in the spirit of this Congress.

All honor the man who is willing to sink
 Half his worldly repute, for the freedom to think;
 And then having thought, be his cause strong or weak,
 Will sink t'other half for the freedom to speak.

In my opinion, one of the results of this Congress has been a broader spirit of freedom within the fold of the denomination. If the Congress has done nothing else, it has contributed a little to a broader standing-ground, and to wider freedom of thought and utterance, within the limits of the denomination. I do not care to be specific in details, but I dare say that if some of the utterances which have been made at this Congress had been made ten or fifteen years ago, there would have followed a great deal stronger protest from various parts of the country than is likely to result at this time.

Now, it is not that the brethren have come to the conclusion that we are freaks, and that freaks are not responsible; but it is due to a larger realization of the fact that we are all searchers after truth, that all truth has not yet been apprehended and expressed in any creed or formula, that new truth is constantly breaking, not only out of God's world, but out of human experience, and out of the understanding of Nature, and that we are but learners after all in God's great world.

Behold, we know not anything,
And yet we trust that somehow good will fall,
At last, far off, at last to all,
And every winter turn to spring.

and we are turning our faces toward the balmy air of that happier day.

Before I close, and I am not sure that I have performed the orthodox function of the representative of the Executive Committee in these remarks—the censor censorum sits to my right; he has been here since the days of Abraham, and I fancy he has never heard such a speech as this by the representative of the Executive Committee—before I close, I am to say, in behalf of the Executive Committee, that it has been a great pleasure to present to the Congress such a programme of subjects, modern, vital, practical, devotional. The Committee would want me to express their thanks to all who have participated in the programme, to all who have attended the sessions of the Congress, and to all who, in any way, have contributed to its success. I am sure that I voice, not only the sentiment of the committee, but the sentiment of all who have attended the Congress, in expressing our appreciation to this noble church, and its honored pastor, for the cordial welcome they have given us to their beautiful church home. We were strangers and they took us in, and thus fulfilled one of the most beautiful injunctions of our Master.

I am sure also that the Executive Committee, that the General Committee, and all the friends of the Congress are praying that out of this rubbing of mind against mind, out of this fellowship of spirit with spirit, out of the sessions of brethren thinking and praying together may come a more vivid realization of the presence of God, a higher and sweeter consciousness of his fellowship, and larger and richer results from our ministries as we go out into the world of active work and of service again. May God's blessing abide with you, and bring forth rich fruit in your ministry and in your lives. (*Applause.*)

THE PRESIDENT: Now, Brethren, we are going to sing and pray together as we close, in which we will all have a part. You remember Father Ted says that there is a trinity on earth; Christ,

one's self, one's brother. In that spirit of brotherliness, let us sing the hymn of our good Baptist, John Fawcett, No. 1,003, the first two verses and the last two. You know the story, that the good man had decided to go to London, and leave his Yorkshire parish, and so great was the lamentation, that he, with his good-bye and friends congregated to bid him adieu, recanted his resolve, remained with his people, and wrote this hymn. I think the larger usefulness proved to be the producing of this hymn.

The hymn was sung as announced.

THE PRESIDENT: I will ask Dr. Farnum to offer the closing prayer and the benediction.

REV. DR. E. P. FARNUM: O Thou divine Master, and Teacher of us all, we desire to be very grateful in Thy presence this moment for Thine own confession of the purpose of Thy coming, that to this end wast Thou born, and for this cause didst Thou come into the world, that Thou mightest bear witness unto the truth. O, Thou great Revealer of truth, we pray that we may be Thy willing disciples, that we may be teachable in the presence of our Master, and that we may also be willing fellow-helpers to the truth among men. We beseech Thee, fill us with the love of the truth, and with hunger for it, and with fearlessness in its presence, and so we will dare to ask that the fellowship and the inspiration and the resolves and the visions of these hours may gird us all for better service, and for nobler doings in the days that lie before us.

And now, unto Him who is able to do for us exceeding abundantly, beyond all that we may ask, or think, according to His mighty power, that dwelleth in us, unto Him be praise in the church in Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. *Amen.*

THE PRESIDENT: The Congress stands adjourned.

MEETINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

DATE	PLACE	PRESIDENT
1882.....	Brooklyn.....	George Dana Boardman, D.D.
1883.....	Boston.....	Alvah Hovey, D.D.
1884.....	Philadelphia.....	Henry G. Weston, D.D.
1885.....	New York.....	Thomas Armitage, D.D.
1886.....	Baltimore.....	William E. Hatcher, D.D.
1887.....	Indianapolis.....	Hon. William S. Holman, Jr.
1888.....	Richmond.....	Hon. J. L. M. Curry, LL.D.
1889.....	Toronto.....	Hon. David Mills, M.P.
1890.....	New Haven.....	Hon. Francis Wayland, LL.D.
1892.....	Philadelphia.....	Colonel Charles H. Banes
1893.....	Augusta.....	Governor William J. Northen
1894.....	Detroit.....	President A. G. Slocum, LL.D.
1895.....	Providence.....	President E. B. Andrews, LL.D.
1896.....	Nashville.....	President J. T. Henderson, A.M.
1897.....	Chicago.....	Adin A. Kendrick, D.D.
1898.....	Buffalo.....	Mr. H. P. Emerson
1899.....	Pittsburg.....	D. B. Purington, LL.D.
1900.....	Richmond.....	A. P. Montague, LL.D.
1901.....	New York.....	Professor A. S. Bickmore, Ph.D.
1902.....	Boston.....	President D. W. Abercrombie, LL.D.
1903.....	Philadelphia.....	Russell H. Conwell, D.D., LL.D.
1904.....	Louisville.....	Jos. Benson Marvin, M.D., LL.D.
1905.....	Cincinnati.....	Gershon M. Peters, A.M.
1906.....	St. Louis.....	R. H. Jesse, LL.D.
1907.....	Baltimore.....	Mr. Eugene Levering
1908.....	Chicago.....	John L. Jackson, D.D.
1909.....	New York.....	Rev. Leighton Williams, D.D.

NOTE.—The fall session of 1891 was transferred to the spring of 1892. This left the year 1891 without any report.



3 2044 052 686 607

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BAPTIST CONGRESS

FOR 1907

TOPICS:

The Virgin Birth
The Church and the Wage Earner
The Organic Union of Baptists, Free Baptists, and
Disciples of Christ
The Ethics of Present-Day Fiction
Fear in Religion

Price 57 cents, postpaid

FOR 1908

TOPICS:

Does the New Testament Contemplate the Church
as an Institution?
What Are the Legitimate Limits of Free Speech in
a Republic?
The Doctrine of Atonement in Terms of Modern
Thought
What Definite Steps should Be Immediately Taken
Toward the Organic Union of Baptists, Free
Baptists, and Disciples of Christ?
Is Psycho-Therapeutics a Function of the Church?
Christ's Prayer for Unity

Price 59 cents, postpaid

Address Orders to the Publishing Agent

The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois