Vol. II, No. 1
November, 1918

nion Theological Seminary Bulletin

The Inauguration of

PROFESSOR FLEMING
PROFESSOR WARD
And
PROFESSOR LYMAN

Published by the Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York

3041 BROADWAY
NEW YORK

Entered as second-class matter November 9, 1917, at the
post-office at New York, N. Y., under the
Act of August 24, 1912

Published five times a year, in November,
January, March, May, and July

The Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York

Exercises Connected with the Inauguration of

The Rev. Daniel Johnson Fleming, Ph.D.
Professor of Missions

The Rev. Harry Frederick Ward, M.A.
Professor of Christian Ethics

The Rev. Eugene William Lyman, D.D.
Professor of the Philosophy of Religion

At the Opening Service of the Eighty-Third
Academic Year of the Seminary
September Twenty-Sixth
Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen

Together with an Address
Given at the Eighty-Second Commencement
May Fourteenth, Nineteen Hundred and Eighteen
By The Rev. Henry Preserved Smith, D.D.
Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages

MCMXVIII

CONTENTS

I

THE ORDER OF SERVICE

1. Organ Prelude
2. Processional Hymn 304:
   "The Church's One Foundation"
3. The Lord's Prayer
4. Hymn 665:
   "America"
5. Scripture Lesson
6. Statement — *William M. Kingsley, M.A.*, President of the Board of Directors
7. Reading of the Preamble to the Constitution: Declaration by the Professors-Elect
8. Declaration — *The President of the Board of Directors*
9. Prayer — *The Rev. Joseph Dunn Burrell, D.D.*
10. Charge — *The Rev. Anson P. Atterbury, D.D.*, On behalf of the Board of Directors
11. Inaugural Addresses:
    "Christianizing a World" — *Professor Fleming*
    "The Present Task of Christian Ethics" — *Professor Ward*
    "The Religion of Democracy" — *Professor Lyman*
12. Hymn 306:
    "Lord of our Life, and God of our Salvation"
13. Prayer and Benediction
14. Recessional Hymn 594:
    "Forward! Be our Watchword"
15. Organ Postlude

II

THE INAUGURATION EXERCISES

The inauguration of the Rev. Daniel Johnson Fleming, Ph.D., as Professor of Missions, of the Rev. Harry Frederick Ward, M.A., as Professor of Christian Ethics, and of the Rev. Eugene William Lyman, D.D., as Professor of the Philosophy of Religion, took place on Thursday, September 26, 1918, at four o'clock, in the Chapel of the Seminary, at the Opening Service of the Eighty-third Academic Year.

After devotional exercises the President of the Board of Directors, Mr. William M. Kingsley, made the following statement:

"On the twelfth of March of the present year the Board of Directors of Union Theological Seminary appointed three new professors, whom we are now to induct into office. The Rev. DANIEL JOHNSON FLEMING, Ph.D., since 1915 Director of the Department of Foreign Service in this Seminary, is to be inducted into a new Professorship of Missions; the Rev. HARRY FREDERICK WARD, M.A., into the vacant Professorship of Christian Ethics, and the Rev. EUGENE WILLIAM LYMAN, D.D., into the Marcellus Hartley Professorship of the Philosophy of Religion, formerly the Marcellus Hartley Professorship of the Philosophy and History of Religion and Missions. The latter Professorship has been held since 1914 by Professor Hume, who has been transferred, at his own desire, to the new Charles Butler Professorship of the History of Religions.

The organic law of the Seminary requires each member of the Faculty when entering upon his office to make a certain Declaration, after the reading of the Preamble to the Constitution of the Seminary. I will now ask President McGiffert to read the Preamble to the Constitution and the relevant portion of the Charter."

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION

That the design of the Founders of this Institution may be fully known to all to whom it may concern, and be sacredly regarded by the Directors, Professors and Students, it is judged proper to make the following preliminary statement:

1. A number of Christians, clergymen and laymen, in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, deeply impressed with the claims of the world upon the Church of Christ to furnish a competent supply of well-educated and pious ministers of correct principles to preach the gospel to every creature; impressed also with the inadequacy of all existing means for this purpose; and believing that large cities furnish many peculiar facilities and advantages for conducting theological education; after several meetings for consultation and prayer,

RESOLVED unanimously, in humble dependence on the grace of God, to attempt the establishment of a Theological Seminary in the City of New York.

2. This Institution (while it will receive others to the advantages it may furnish) is principally designed for such young men in the cities of New York and Brooklyn as are, or may be, desirous of pursuing a course of theological study, and whose circumstances render it inconvenient for them to go from home for this purpose.

3. It is the design of the Founders to furnish the means of a full and thorough education, in all the subjects taught in the best Theological Seminaries in the United States, and also to embrace therewith a thorough knowledge of the standards of faith and discipline of the Presbyterian Church.

4. Being fully persuaded that vital godliness well proved, a thorough education, and a wholesome practical training in works of benevolence and pastoral labors, are all essentially necessary to meet the wants and promote the best interests of the kingdom of Christ, the Founders of this Seminary design that its Students, living and acting under pastoral influence, and performing the important duties of church members in the several churches to which they belong, or with which they worship, in prayer-meetings, in the instruction of Sabbath-schools and Bible-classes, and being conversant with all the social benevolent efforts in this important location, shall have the opportunity of adding to solid learning and true piety, enlightened experience.

5. By the foregoing advantages, the Founders hope and expect, with the blessing of God, to call forth from these two flourishing cities, and to enlist in the service of Christ and in the work of the ministry, genius, talent, enlightened piety and

missionary zeal; and to qualify many for the labors and management of the various religious institutions, seminaries of learning and enterprises of benevolence, which characterize the present times.

6. Finally, it is the design of the Founders to provide a Theological Seminary in the midst of the greatest and most growing community in America, around which all men of moderate views and feelings, who desire to live free from party strife, and to stand aloof from all the extremes of doctrinal speculation, practical radicalism and ecclesiastical domination, may cordially and affectionately rally.

FROM THE CHARTER OF THE SEMINARY

Paragraph 5: Equal privileges of admission and instruction, with all the advantages of the Institution, shall be allowed to students of every denomination of Christians.

Mr. Kingsley then propounded the following question:

"Do you promise to maintain the principles and purposes of this institution, as set forth in the Preamble adopted by the Founders on the 18th day of January, 1836, and in the Charter granted by the Legislature of the State of New York on the 27th of March, 1839, and adopted by the Board of Directors on the 20th day of December, 1839?"

After answers in the affirmative, Mr. Kingsley said:

"The Rev. DANIEL JOHNSON FLEMING, the Rev. HARRY FREDERICK WARD and the Rev. EUGENE WILLIAM LYMAN, having been chosen, by the Board of Directors, Professors in this institution, and having made in this public manner the required declaration, I now declare them duly inaugurated Professors in Union Theological Seminary, and as such entitled to discharge all the duties and to enjoy all the rights and privileges of their Professorships."

The Prayer of Installation was offered by the Rev. Joseph Dunn Burrell, D.D., of the Board of Directors, the Charge to the three professors was given by the Rev. Anson P. Atterbury, Ph.D., D.D., on behalf of the Board of Directors, and the professors then delivered their Inaugural Addresses.

III

THE CHARGE

on behalf of the Board of Directors

By

THE REVEREND ANSON P. ATTERBURY, PH.D., D.D.

Professors Fleming, Ward and Lyman:

Three professors at one time and of such size and weight!—a gargantuan feast for the Seminary. We congratulate ourselves upon this splendid accession to its forces intellectual and spiritual. Our extremely orthodox friends may set their souls at rest. Here are three men of orthodoxy, yet liberality of thought. This addition of so much real intellectuality and spirituality to the already large stock accumulated by the older members of the faculty is welcomed by the Directors and all the friends of this great institution. We have much, but we need more.

This business of making men out of boys, leaders out of the common run of humanity, officers out of privates, ministers out of youth—it is not at all easy, and it is all-important. Nature does something towards this, but art as incorporated in the Seminary does more. That is why you are inaugurated into your various professorships today—to take hold of this more or less crude soul material that comes to this institution in successive years, and mould it into shape of spiritual beauty, and breathe into it the Spirit Divine.

Of course, your sphere of activity and influence will be larger than that contained within this quadrangle. It is one of the glories of an institution like this that the members of its faculty write books that illumine, and sometimes amaze the world at large. The Directors look on, and sometimes read, with more or less of appreciation and satisfaction. But may I be permitted to say that your real business is something other than this writing of books—important as that by-product may be? It is for you to deal with these young men in your classes in such way that they shall become yourselves, but

better; themselves in their largest possibilities; God's self, incorporated, in this war-world of human life.

If this be your supreme thought, it will give the tone, the "motif," to the sweet music of your seminary life and work. You will seek to put something of your own purely aspiring personalities into each of your students. It is not so much ideas, as yourself, that you are to give to them. As Lowell reminds us, you know, "the gift without the giver is bare." Present to them the great thoughts of the ages past, the great problems to be faced in the years to come, all possible of solution for the vexed questions of life here and hereafter, vision into the mind of God—yes! do all of this that you can. But force them to think of you personally as an inspiring ideal for their lives. "How then did religion spread from its living source in the Teacher to multitudes?" asks William Barry in his study of Cardinal Newman. "The answer was, by personal influence, which offered a pattern of it, and took hold of others as a charm."

The ideas that you will be expected to impart to these young men will be—some of them true, some of them, perhaps, to be proved later more or less untrue, many of them absolutely essential for "the man of God, thoroughly furnished unto every good work." Some few of these ideas you may in small part originate; most of them you will have gathered from others but made your own, and vivified for your classes. When I was a student in this Seminary it was said of one of the professors, honored and loved, that he would go to Germany every summer to pick up new ideas, and would return to dilute and retail them for American consumption. The American theological digestion was not as vigorous then as now.

But your real impartation to these students will be yourself. Hence the imperative need of persistent spiritual culture of your own souls. The theological professor needs, above all men, spiritual culture—to pray, attend public worship, study God's word devotionally, develop the inner life of holiness, guard the inner self from world-stain, practise with Brother Lawrence the "Presence of God," with Thomas a Kempis the "Imitation of Christ."

Perhaps some neglect this. It is strange—but theological professors are not always exemplars of the higher spiritual life.

Some of the most spiritually inspiring personalities that I have known have been in these chairs. But in retired clergymen and seminary professors we do meet with some in whom the lamp of God is burning somewhat dimly in the temple of the Lord—and with a few "Ichabod" is written on the brow.

Do not make this Seminary a graveyard for the higher spiritual possibilities of your own souls. If you do, you will bury with yourself some of these young men.

In order thus to inspire your students, intellectually and spiritually, it will be necessary for you to enter to some extent into the inner personal life of at least some of them. You cannot do it with all; but every one of these young men should have, as close and trusted personal friend, some one, or more, of this faculty. Make yourselves the makers, under Divine inspiration, of these young men. But you can do this only by giving something more than mere ideas; you must give direct personal influence, you must give yourselves.

This great war is upon us. Our hearts are filled with high and holy aspiration—to make the world safe for a democracy which shall mean righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. But a far greater struggle is before us, in the years to come—to make democracy safe for the world. The antithesis is not mine, as you know. But the thought presses upon us irresistibly at this time. Great social, world-wide problems are already forcing themselves upon us. Leadership in the Divine solution of these questions lies with you now, and will lie more largely with some of these young men whom you will have the chance to "make" in this institution. What a responsibility! What a glory of service, if at the end you hear the Master say to you, "Well done!"

Our armies will disband soon, after having fulfilled, and grandly, their part of the struggle in these years of tensest effort. But the greater warfare will go on, through the centuries. And in this your undying personalities, incorporated in the thoughts and deeds of successive generations through the youth into whom you will have put yourselves, will have large part in that struggle of the good against the evil, which shall end only beyond the possibility of present human thought. At some time, we know, the full victory will be reached: "He shall reign whose right it is to reign."

We think with gratitude and affection, especially in such a service as is this, of those whose munificent gifts have made possible, through these material structures, this great sphere of spiritual possibility. Their names are written in these stones, the faces of some of them look down upon us from the walls of the Directors' room. They have transmuted money into spirit—creating the material foundation for the grandeur and usefulness of this institution. And there is need and opportunity for more of such gifts. But you professors have something to give that is even more important. You can give yourselves. This gift of self is really the gift of the Christ within yourselves. And perhaps the most effective work that you will do will be in the hours outside of the class-rooms, in the sacred privacy of personal Christian friendship.

So, at the end of this charge, let me phrase the thought that has been in my mind, and that I have attempted to give to you. *Self and the Seminary.* The gift of yourselves to these young men. But that inner self must be worth the giving. It is because we are sure that it is thus worthy that we welcome you today.

IV

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

By

PROFESSOR FLEMING

CHRISTIANIZING A WORLD

In these days we are witnessing the birth pangs of a new world order. Humanity, having been stirred to its depths, is awakening to an inter-racial consciousness. Mankind can comprehend, therefore, as never before, a common objective for endeavor. Such a common cause must be sufficiently definite, sane and appealing to arouse a mighty community of interest and loyalty. Far surpassing any other purpose that could unify a world is that one involved in the internationalism implicit in Christianity. It confidently asks humanity to rise to the comprehensiveness of Jesus' love, and to take as its common cause no less an object than the Christianization of a world. Six conditions make this confidence especially reasonable in our day.

In the first place, modern consciousness includes *awareness of the solidarity of the human family.* The nineteenth century bequeathed to the twentieth an almost staggering problem of world-embracing inter-relationships. But the great war has vastly deepened mankind's appreciation of mutuality in international privilege and responsibility. It has graphically manifested the implications of monotheism. That we are members one of another was yesterday a mere phrase. Today, through mutual service and sacrifice, it has become a vivid reality to young and old in every home, and may be placed amongst the assets of mankind. The time, therefore, has forever passed for living unto oneself alone. Ever more widespread becomes the conviction that humanity is a living, vital, interpenetrating organism, and that the life of one God flows through all. Henceforth, therefore, any great objective must take into consideration the whole world.

Furthermore, there has arisen *a new conception of human need*. And response to need has ever been one of the mainsprings of Christianity's outreach. Men used to dwell on the fate of lost souls in a world to come. The necessity of the world's salvation was stated in abstract, *a priori* and speculative terms. But in modern times the significant discovery became operative that man's life is socially conditioned. With the rise of the ethico-social movement men began to demand a salvation for the world that is. Missionary methods and objectives are being revised to square with the fact that man is a psycho-physical organism and that environment and social heritage have vital bearings on highest life. It is the concrete fact and the practical situation that now calls forth response. Information is so accessible that we can grasp the world's need, not only extensively as it exists in China, Japan, India, South America, Africa, the Near East and the so-called Christian nations; but even more intensively—the need for the Christianization of every sphere of human activity. We see that the Gospel is not merely for the whole world, but for the whole of life. Missionaries seek to bring Christ to bear not only upon new continents, but upon each untouched aspect of life within those continents.

Furthermore sociology has enabled us to comprehend man's total need and to analyze it as sevenfold: hygienic, economic, educational, social, aesthetic, moral and religious. To make health the possible attainment for every people; to abolish the world around, all necessity for existence below the poverty line; to enable each human being through education to enter as far as possible into his heritage; to discover and to eradicate all causes of social maladjustment; to develop capacities of response to beauty in every form; to pierce down with discrimination into what is right, and to have the will to do it; to know our Father and the One whom he has sent—for all these ends we see that we are to be co-workers with God. Ministry to each of these aspects of world-need is seen to be a real part in the establishment of the reign of God on earth.

And yet while all this sevenfold need must be met in God's ideal democracy, experience shows that we dare not evaluate the various aspects of man's deficiency as being equally important. There is a need which, if it remains unmet, it profiteth a

man nothing to have gained the whole world of other values. Mankind's greatest need is still for that inward renewal which cometh from above. Henceforth, therefore, the Christian objective will take into consideration every form of human need, but will, with even clearer conviction, place foremost reconstruction from within.

Another distinctly modern stimulus to the Christianization of our world comes from researches in anthropology, ethnology and comparative religion. These fields of study have laid the basis of *a fundamental respect for the capacities and attainments of other peoples.* Emphasis can now be placed not primarily on man's lack, but upon his latent possibilities. It is becoming evident that no limit can be set to any race for its growth in knowledge, in power, in character and in a wondrous, progressive sharing of the life of God. A growing confidence is being established that each people can make to the world a unique contribution without which humanity would be the poorer. Since there is a light that lighteth every man coming into the world, and since amongst no nation hath he left himself without witness, builders of a new world order expect to find in each land tokens of the spirit's work. Christian missionaries enthusiastically recognize variety of endowment and faculty amongst all the peoples of God's great family, and they strive to fire the imagination of mankind with the glorious vision of a democracy of God into which shall have been brought the life and thought and talents of every section of the human race as transformed by Jesus Christ. In this expectancy of reciprocity in service all patronizing condescension is removed. Rather is there the conviction that we shall never apprehend all that Christ is until we see him bodied forth in every nation through gifts which have been transfigured through his influence.

Furthermore, the last four years have given us *a new conception of human resources.* We knew that readiness to pay the cost was one of the characteristics in the case of the ideal missionary; but who had had faith to believe that such boundless reservoirs of sacrificial life-investment existed in the average man? We knew that the church had never even glimpsed the extent of financial support needed for her world enterprise; but who had ever dreamed that such astounding material re-

sources could be available for an unselfish venture? In the achievement of union movements the foreign field has led a backward church; but the war has set absolutely new standards in the thorough-going mobilization of cooperative effort, and is shattering the isolation of the church's older individualism. We have bemoaned a church whose apathy to the missionary enterprise and whose apparent lack of all leadership in the war have made some wonder whether its day had passed. But the war has shown how essential is organization; and Christian leaders realize that in the church, if thoroughly reconstructed for new tasks and conditions, they have an international organization of unrivaled potentiality. We have struggled along with the problem of missionary education; but unparalleled attainments in publicity in connection with the war make the effort seem not impossible to educate a world to understand and to undertake the missionary enterprise. Thus absolutely untapped springs of power in human nature stimulate us to a world task.

But no great missionary movement ever became dynamic apart from a spiritual awakening. In the last analysis the measure of our Christian outreach to the world is the measure of *our valuation of Jesus Christ.* Has the modern world any fresh conviction as to the priceless treasure that it has in Christ? Powerful modern tendencies such as the scientific method and evolution, the new psychology and the historic method, the new social emphasis and the comparative study of religions have, within recent years, completely changed the face of theology. And yet these very influences have deepened the sure conviction that Jesus Christ is the most significant personality in all history. The year nineteen hundred and fourteen witnessed a most collossal repudiation of the spirit of Christ. Yet the world is turning to him as never before for what is divine. Men find in him the way, the truth, the light, the life. In him we get the promise of a perfected humanity, and in him we find the only hopeful solution of the relationship of man to man. To him can be traced the greatest forces making for the betterment of civilization. Mankind is by nature capable of becoming what we call Christian, and Jesus Christ has been the stimulus which pre-eminently elicits this kind of life. The prize we want to share with others is this unique

stimulus, *i. e.*, the person of Christ. We tell others about our experience, and share with them the explanations of our experience in order that they may be reasonably induced to subject themselves to his influence, to put themselves continuously, receptively and obediently in his presence, to let his life play upon theirs, transforming, infilling, regenerating.

The sixth and most fundamental stimulus to the Christianization of our world comes from *a fresh interpretation of the significance of life upon this planet.* We begin to see that God, who is pre-eminently characterized by forth-giving, self-sacrificing, resourceful, constructive love, is perpetually endeavoring to incarnate himself in humanity; that his greatest concern is the creation of personalities like his own; that God has set earth's few continents and few peoples amongst the myriad stars as man's kindergarten for eternity.

Still further we see that God's purpose goes far beyond the perfecting of isolated units. His purpose is social. He has set us within a potential democracy of God in order that, through discipline, we and it may attain together. His interest is not merely in the individual but in the great unit—the human family. In suffering, fruitage, growth and salvation we are bound up inextricably with the Father's other children.

But God's purpose does not end even here. Still more wonderful is it to realize that he wants us to be one with him in this ideal democracy, that he seeks our fellowship, that divine re-inforcement is within us for a great world task, that God calls us to cooperative creativity in the Christianization of a world.

In this faith as to the character and purpose and sufficiency of our God is found Christianity's greatest contribution to our day. In it we find the ultimate foundation for a faith large enough to reconstruct a world. The faith Jesus had in the God he knew is the only faith big enough for these great tasks. If we hold our Lord's convictions as to the character of God there can be nothing impossible in the building of a world into a glorious democracy of God.

With the conjunction of such conditions as have been outlined, there should be possible in our time the greatest missionary movement of all history. The initial impulse to the task came nineteen hundred years ago when, in Jesus Christ,

the face of God was uniquely revealed to men and they beheld his glory. Within three centuries the early Christians made their message known throughout the Mediterranean area. After some two centuries more of assimilation a second era of expansion sent Christianity through northern Europe. By the end of the Middle Ages, with the opening of the great ocean routes and voyages of discovery, we began to know our world a little better, and a third great expansive era of Christianity began with Xavier for the Catholics, and with Carey for the Protestants. Consecrated spirits in those days yearned to spread their good news in every land, but their world was still vague, hard to visualize even in its physical features and resources, and almost unknown in its cultural aspects.

Now, however, through the patient researches of innumerable students, through travel, wire, film and press, our whole world stands revealed. Men are acquiring a consciousness of humanity; they are passing from parochial to world thought; they are seeing that the modern mind and heart and conscience can be limited by no frontiers. Furthermore, nothing less than an unprecedented exhibition of the Christ spirit can offset the unrighteous influences issuing from many phases of so-called Christendom. Surely this generation is called to inaugurate a fourth great missionary era for the Christianization of a world.

II

Towards this end, however, if the sacrifice, the devotion and the loyalty of mankind are to be enlisted, *practical measures must be taken.*

It is evident that *the home church must be educated and aroused to this task.* To her condition can be traced Christianity's greatest failures abroad. But if the church is to sound a rallying call for a great adventure, her seminaries must burn with the fires of a world enthusiasm. Ministers to home churches must be sent forth to do their work against a world background. They must attain their local objectives as their part toward a world task. In that sense for them and for their congregations there should be but one field, and that field should be the world. They should be led to realize that to be Christian, without at the same time being missionary, is

a contradiction in terms; that the missionary spirit is just the normal Christian attitude toward the world and its needs.

As a still further practical measure, *very much more careful preparation must be given to the church's ambassadors* who are to go abroad.

They must get a thorough grasp of what Christianity is. And very few realize what patient, steady, continued work this requires. It is so easy to go forth with only a partial aspect of our religion as one's gospel. But Christianity, thus restricted, is deservedly rejected or produces only ænemic followers, simply because Christianity in all its rich, full, universal, satisfying power was not known or appreciated by the messenger. Part of this understanding of Christianity will be to see the points in which it differs most fundamentally from other religions; how the Christian message may be most winsomely and convincingly stated for a particular people, and how their characteristic objections may be most satisfactorily met. There is the psychological and educational problem of understanding the minds to whom the message is to be addressed; for, if Christianity is to seem any more than an alien cult, the message must come from a mind that is appreciative of the religious thought, national aspirations and social conditions of those to whom it is given. With unanimity Christian statesmen declare that these and other technical and professional qualifications must be imparted to the missionaries of the church. The passing of the day of individualism and pioneering in missions, the growing complexity of the work, a new understanding of the inherent difficulties in the task, a developing science of missions as the result of the comparative study of the missionary enterprise in different centuries as well as in different lands—such new factors demand an entirely new emphasis on missionary preparation.

To these two needs, concerning the home church and concerning the preparation of her ambassadors abroad, *Union Theological Seminary has responded.* Its traditions of scholarship, reverent yet fearless; its spirit at once inclusive, progressive and free; its catholicity of temper; its university connections; its metropolitan location—these facts should enable this seminary to send forth for the Christianization of a world, whether the service be geographically home or foreign,

men with accurate understanding, broadened sympathies, and stirred by the highest loyalties.

World service, however, is no new conception to this institution. The Founders, in the Preamble adopted on the 18th day of January, 1836, expressed the hope and expectation of calling forth missionary zeal. One of the earliest actions of the Faculty after its organization was to approve of a request made by the students for the formation of a Society of Inquiry respecting Missions—a society that has had a continuous existence for eighty-one years. One out of every twelve ordained alumni have entered mission service. Four Professors have held chairs whose very titles recognize the place of missions in their work, *viz.*, George Lewis Prentice who, in 1873, for the first time in this country, introduced lectures on missions into the regular curriculum of theological study; Charles Cuthbert Hall whose winsome love, expressing itself in sympathetic appreciation of individual and people and alien faith, was coupled with intense loyalty and enthusiasm for the unique satisfactions in Jesus Christ; George William Knox whose fascinating lectures full of penetrating insight set indelibly before us standards of scholarship and statesmanship in the Kingdom of God; and Robert Ernest Hume whose Christian comradeship, both as fellow student and now as colleague has been one of the great inspirations of my life. Further, it is significant that in the very year that the war broke out, a Department of Foreign Service was established; and now a full chair of Missions has been founded.

III

Directors, Faculty, Students and Friends of Union Theological Seminary: We have been reviewing certain favorable conditions for an unprecedented expansion of Christianity and certain practical measures that must be taken. Such considerations make me contemplate the significant potentialities of the chair of missions in this seminary with a deep and humbling sense of responsibility. Each fresh view of the vastness of the opportunity impels a prayer for divine empowerment, and also elicits a joyful renewal of utmost consecration. Moreover, in yielding myself to this work, a very real joy comes from the way in which the Faculty as a whole have

shown their interest in world service. For surely no mere addition of a chair nor enlargement of the curriculum by a few missionary courses, will enable a seminary to produce a world Christian. Each subject must be taught from a world background. It is because a missionary consciousness pervades our whole institution that, in spite of the limitations of which I am all too aware, I am filled with aspiration and hope for what this Seminary can do through its Department of Foreign Service.

Just twenty years ago this month I went, fresh from college, for three years' residence to India. There, with life still uncommitted but in closest participation in mission work, I came as never before to see the incomparable riches that are in Jesus Christ, the greatness and the urgency and the possibility of the missionary enterprise. It was there I heard God's call to commit my life to a world task. At the end of this period, having encountered in my class-room the keen minds of Muhammadan, Hindu, Parsee and Sikh, and deeply impressed with the baffling difficulties of missionary work, I came to study at Union Theological Seminary. I love and honor this Seminary with the affectionate loyalty of a son, since within her walls I found the spirit, the message, the apologetic which made it my joy to return as a witness to the Orient. The experience and the lessons of twelve years of missionary life I gladly place at your disposal. As your Professor of Missions I pledge loyal service to an enterprise which aims to give Jesus Christ his full opportunity with every human being and every aspect of organized society. For myself and for my students my highest longing is for intelligent, zealous, effective cooperation with the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Christianization of a world.

V

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

By

PROFESSOR WARD

THE PRESENT TASK OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS

To no section of Christian teaching does present circumstance bring a sharper challenge than to its Ethics. In this domain vital positions are now under assault. In the aggressive pursuit of self-interest, a large and powerful section of mankind has been led to discard and denounce some of the hard-won moral gains of the race, and to silence those among them who see and would serve the common need of humanity. Other sections of mankind, hard pressed and weakened in defense of the common interest, are subtly tempted to abate their allegiance to ideals in which, by word and deed, they have vigorously reaffirmed their faith. Among them also, the forces of self-interest await the day of weariness to reassert their power. In such a time Christian ethical teaching finds its pressing business to be the upholding of those common moral standards which have been largely developed under its own tutelage, and which constitute the higher and more permanent interests of the race. These standards must be maintained alike against the foe without and the enemy within. No inch of ground can be yielded to either, no matter what the cost of holding it. For without its slowly acquired ethical possessions the race cannot live.

In a desperate military situation, oftentimes the only possible defense is a vigorous offensive. This is now the case with the ethical teaching and practice of Christianity. We cannot merely hold the ground gained in twenty centuries of development. If we do not advance, then we retreat. The larger issue of the present conflict is whether humanity shall take a long step forward in its associated development, or shall turn back upon the path that led away from the brutes, like them to perish. And that issue yet hangs in the balance, even though

more of the people of the earth than ever before in its history have fixed their faith and pledged their all to secure a higher order of life. Even though the dynamic forces of civilization are seething and surging in the endeavor to cut new channels for human progress, it is yet to be seen whether they can overcome the resistance before them. In such a situation Christianity is manifestly called upon to approve itself by some clear teaching concerning human conduct that shall bring light and leading to mankind. Against the desperate attack of an ethical philosophy whose core is self-interest, it must oppose the counter-offensive of an ethical philosophy and practice whose heart is mutual service.

The first step in this moral offensive is the further application of existing standards of conduct. In certain regions of life these are fairly well defined, for Christianity is an ethical religion. It is not content alone to secure intellectual allegiance to an interpretation of life and of the universe. Its central appeal is to the will. Its test is "the fruits," in character and conduct. In its historical development it has so far modified the moral standards and the actions of humanity, that there is now a type of conduct which is commonly known as Christian. The man in the street has a somewhat sharp idea of what constitutes a Christian man. He is getting also a concept of what a Christian nation would be. Not the least of the factors in the present world situation is a Christian conscience in distinction from that generated by other religions. So much we may register as the Christian contribution to civilization without arrogance or conceit and with no disparagement of the ethical factors in other faiths.

Yet it must be recognized that even these commonly accepted Christian ethical standards flourish more vigorously in the realm of the ideal than in the sphere of conduct. The Socialist workingman who criticizes the church-member employer and investor, is measuring them by a scale with which Christianity has provided him and which he himself does not live up to. There are, however, constant gains. The Christian of Fiji is a more valuable citizen of the world than his cannibal grandfather. The average church-member of England or the United States in the twentieth century is a higher ethical type than his forbear of the eighteenth. Yet a large part of our

ethical standards are more honored in the breach than in the observance. How different would the world be today if even a majority of professed Christians had embodied in every sphere of their conduct those standards to which they profess allegiance? One of the signs of promise is that so many people are now determined to move in this direction; for example, to insist that obligations that bind individuals shall also hold nations.

But to secure an ethical advance in the common life there must needs be an extension of ethical standards to unoccupied domains in the lives of individuals. The regions of conduct wherein the authority of the Christian ideal is not fully recognized are in matters of sex and questions of property. Here Christianity won its earliest ethical triumphs. It called its adherents apart from the uncleanness of a decadent Roman civilization. It developed a teaching and practice of the use of property for the common need. Some of these ethical gains have been capitalized in our modern social development, but neither the community life, nor the organized church is today drawing full interest from them. How many people, even among the membership of the church, order their sex life and their property relationships in a conscious attempt to apply the Christian ideal? A religious worker at the front reports a group of men as exhibiting their religious and ethical ideal in terms of the soldierly virtues—loyalty, courage, service and sacrifice. When asked concerning wine and women they replied with a laugh that those were personal matters that did not count. That way lies the disaster that always follows an unethical type of religion. Christian teaching cannot let men be content even with having fought together a good fight for the common cause. It has learned by bitter lessons that there are no purely personal virtues. It knows that the new world, for which these men have greatly suffered, can never exist except it be builded of the joined lives of men and women whose characters and dispositions, when associated, will produce a new order of living.

When the attempt is made to personally apply the Christian ideal in the relationships of sex and property, it is discovered on the one hand that the individual has plunged into the center of the social question, and on the other hand that the Christian

ideal is an ideal of community living. By the relationships of sex, society is perpetuated; through the relationships of property it is maintained. In these relationships center the vital ethical issues of the after-war period. How are the nations to recuperate their depleted populations? How are they jointly to order their economic life that there may be sufficient goods for all? With these questions Christian ethical teaching must deal if it is to apply itself further in the sex life and property relationships of the individual. This undertaking is also the necessity of its own nature, for Christianity is a social religion. Its ideal is a God-filled, fraternal community. In the recent period of Christian history, there has been an ethical emphasis which has defined a Christian man. It remains for us to define a Christian community. This cannot be done alone upon stone or parchment or paper, but the Word must needs become flesh.

It is a task of creation that awaits us. A new world is to be made, for in its concept of community life Christian teaching has no limits of geographical boundaries, political frontiers or racial differences. It thinks, and requires its adherents to act, in world terms. Its distinction, says one of another faith, is that it provides its followers with sharper ethical judgments than do other religions. But it also educates them to make these judgments from the standpoint of the entire common interest of humanity. Not only "under the aspect of eternity" does the Christian view the problems of life but also in the presence of all humanity.

Herein lies the authority of Christian ethical teaching. Its "thus saith the Lord" rests not alone upon historic revelation but also upon the common suffrage of humanity. It risks its future upon the capacity of all the people for development in reason, in righteousness, in good-will. Christianity must indeed abide the verdict of the democratic process it has itself evolved. So far it has come by the willingness of mankind to respond to ideals which are the unfolding of man's own higher nature. Now it must stand or fall upon its ability to retain the allegiance of the world democracy it is creating.

This means that the remainder of the task of Christian ethics and the larger part of its answer to the challenge of the hour is the further development of its ideals of conduct. It is one of

the temptations of ecclesiastical administration to regard its standards, whether of dogma or conduct, as fixed and absolute. But the Christian ethical ideal is neither static, absolute nor infallible. It does not say to mankind: "Here is a set of principles, a form of conduct which is the highest that could be conceived or worked out several thousand years ago; 'thus far shalt thou go and no farther'." Its word is rather: "Greater things than these shall ye do also." It is an organic growth, whose roots are in the stream of all human life and conduct. It is then the task of Christian ethics not only to know what obligations in conduct the teachings of the Bible carried in the day when they were spoken but to find out what will be the full form of the germ within them when it is developed in the environment of today, and also to discover what contributions have been and can be made to that development from other sources.

Those sections of the associated life of mankind wherein the Christian ideal has been the least formulated are industry and the state. The political and economic relationships of mankind have in the main developed outside the sphere of Christian thought and action. They have largely drawn their nourishment from other sources and their form from other schools of thought. In recent times large sections of organized Christianity have disclaimed all responsibility for the common political and economic life, and until the past decade American Protestantism has made no attempt to express the Christian ideal in industrial and political standards. It has finally been called to this attempt by a growing recognition of the social nature of Christianity and also by the pressing need of many of its adherents who have found themselves hard pressed in their religious life, because the church has taught them to love and to serve, and industry and the state have urged them to seek first their own interests and to regard others as competitors and enemies. For many a quickened Christian conscience, the ethical situation is so serious that again the cry sounds: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" For these bound and suffering spirits there is no release until the Christian ideal is more clearly formulated in relation to the state and to industry.

Entering upon this undertaking Christian teaching finds itself confronted by an industrialism which insists that self-interest is the only adequate motive by which the world can provide for its common economic needs, that Christian ideals are impractical because they will not pay. Christian teaching is also met by a philosophy, and still more by a practice, of the state which again is based upon pure self-interest and seeks only material ends. That such a view of life should be glorified into a religion—the religion of the great state—is not so serious as that it should be widely followed by those who do not yield intellectual consent to it. The situation is crucial, because the organized form of human life for the future is necessarily the industrial state and human destiny hinges upon the question of whether the industrial world-community, which is an economic necessity, shall be organized for material ends around the ethics of self-interest or around the ethics of cooperative service with the common spiritual development as the goal.

At this point, there is no doubt concerning the historic content of Christian teaching; there can then be no hesitation or compromise in its attitude. In such a situation Christian teaching may properly speak with inherent authority for it has the message of life for humanity. It cannot consent to be subordinate to the economic and political organization of mankind except as the Servant in the House, animating every section of life with its spirit, and therefore leading in and through its service. In bondage of compulsion it must refuse to serve. Behind its ethical teaching is the authority of a jealous God who will brook no rivals. Not even for its own sustenance will Christian teaching make terms with an industrialism which is not willing to attempt the working out of the Sermon on the Mount because it yields no gain to the profit-mongers. Not even for its own life will it bend the knee to a state which declares the necessity of its perpetuation and glorification to be superior to the imperative of morals and religion. Christian teaching has learned by this time that this supposed natural necessity of industry and the state is nothing but the need and desire of ruling classes to maintain and enlarge their own power and privilege. It knows still better from the story of its own past the ethical results of any compromise with idolatry. It is not to be tempted by any

vision of the kingdoms from which it may draw tribute if it will but bend the knee to Mammon. If need be, it can again take the open road and risk the uncertain lodging place.

Yet Christian ethical teaching does not separate itself from the practical activities of men. It is not a mystic affair apart from industrial and political life. Because its ethical ideal has come out of the common life by historic development, it is in and of the stuff from which the day's work as well as the dreams of eventide are made. It is to be, and is being, wrought into our food and clothes, our railroads and factories, our primaries and treaties. Not ready made from the sky does the City of our God—the House of Man's Dream—come upon the earth, but the divine impulse achieves form in time and space only by the slow building of human hands, the slower welding of human hearts.

Consider for example, that section of our task which is involved in the Christianizing of industry. Is this to be accomplished by superimposing some abstract ideal upon the work life of the race, or by a process of development in which Christian teaching utilizes the science of economics for its application? The Christian ideal for the economic life of men is a mutual service in the production and distribution of goods which shall be used for the enlargement of the highest life of all the people. Our present economic organization develops somewhat in this direction. The natural growth of the economic activities of mankind involves a discipline of coordination between larger and ever larger units. The production of goods evokes the sincerity and good-faith of true craftsmanship. The widening exchange of goods increases travel, promotes acquaintance, removes suspicion and enmity and paves the way for the exchange of spiritual goods. The necessity of business promotes honesty, fidelity, trust and loyalty. This process may be called the natural ethic of industrialism. Yet there is present another tendency, working in the opposite direction. When the economic process is carried on as a competitive struggle for the acquisition of material goods, the law of profit dominates the law of service, there develop friction, hatred and strife between classes and nations until economic capacity is destroyed. Thus is death the end of the natural process. The Christian teaching, however,

would develop the natural law of economic development into its spiritual content and possibility. It would inspire the classes and nations to organize the work process as a brotherhood of mutual service making for the largest and fullest life for all. Thus economic activities become a part of the spiritual life, which is endless.

Consider again that section of the development of the ethical ideal of Christianity which is involved in the attempt to Christianize the state. The present nationalistic state has its ethical values. It is not to be utterly cast out and some ideal scheme put in its place. It is a form of association evoking loyalty, calling forth supreme devotion, courage and sacrifice. It affords a discipline for the cultivation of heroic virtues. Herein is the natural ethic of the state. Yet the nationalistic state with its absolute sovereignty, its inevitable imperialism, ends by destroying both its virtues and itself. Evoking these virtues for limited ends, it creates widespread distrust of their worth, because it turns them into instruments of destruction. If it avoids revolt from within, it finally develops a world conflict that wastes both itself and the future resources of mankind. Even though it were able to flee the wrath of God, it could never escape the outraged conscience of mankind. Here again is death the completion of the natural process, and here again the Christian teaching would unfold the fuller content of the natural virtues of the state. It calls the separate states into a larger association in the service of the common life. Asking them to use their virtues for a nobler, greater end, it thereby develops them in greater degree.

A League of Nations is now within the sober thought of mankind. Let it not be forgotten that the Christian teaching has long been calling the people of the earth to the goal of a fraternal community. Let the leaders of Christian thought face fully the obligation of this heritage. Let them take their full part in the laborious task of giving it form and content as well as in developing those ethical qualities without which such an association is impossible. Let them also insist that this next step in the development of the associated life of mankind be not a mere partnership for material profit, but a mutual service for common spiritual development from which no classes or peoples are excluded.

This then, in briefest summary, is the present task of Christian ethics: To hearten mankind in the defense of accepted standards of Christian conduct; to require the further application of the Christian ideal in all the activities and relationships of life, particularly in matters of sex and property; and above all, to develop the content of the Christian ideal in terms of the world-wide cooperative community. Humanity stands at the forks of the road, choosing its course for a long time to come. It is the manifest obligation of Christian ethical teaching to direct men and nations away from the long travelled road that leads to destruction into the way of life—even life everlasting.

VI

THE INAUGURAL ADDRESS

By

PROFESSOR LYMAN

THE RELIGION OF DEMOCRACY[1]

The relation of religion to democracy is the most challenging problem in the field of the philosophy of religion at the present hour. Is religion a matter of indifference from the standpoint of democracy? Or is it even a serious obstruction to the democratic cause? As people become more democratic will they become less religious, and will democracy develop institutions that will displace those of religion altogether, or at least, crowd them into a corner? Such questions as these receive an affirmative answer from important groups among us —notably the socialists and organized labor in general, and, at the other end of the social scale, some of our more progressive intellectuals. The socialist and labor groups see in the church one of the chief defensive lines of special privilege, and even in the more liberal interpretations of religion they find too little that is vitally connected with what they have most at heart. Those progressive intellectuals who are prepared to dispense with religion appear to feel that religion is, by its very nature, alien to the democratic cause—that its goods are too otherworldly to promote social well-being, and that its virtues are too self-absorbed and acquiescent to develop social initiative. Science and democracy—yes, they are held to be compatible, or capable of being made so. But religion and democracy are believed to be incapable of a helpful interaction with each other.

But the rank and file of religious people themselves would have the questions put and answered very differently. Is not religion—they would ask—the absolutely indispensable ally of democracy? Must not the common man be made religious

[1] Owing to limitations of time only the introduction and first main section of this address were delivered at the time of inauguration.

before he can be trusted with democracy? Will men ever be unselfish enough to make democracy succeed unless they are first religious? Has not religion proven to be one of the great sources of democracy, and have not the attempts to establish democracies without an adequate religious basis always been failures? Is not irreligion, theoretical or practical, one of the chief among the forces that have compelled democracy to fight for its security? And are not the institutions of religion vigorously supporting the war for democracy? Questions like these, while they may not have been at the forefront before the war, would be answered unhesitatingly in the affirmative by the great body of religious people.

Now the existence of this sharp contrast of attitude between the groups mentioned is itself a menace to the democratic cause. It produces a state of social tension within the more idealistic portion of the community which is unfavorable to democratic development. A kind of balance of power is established between the left and right wings of the forces for democracy instead of the cooperative league that social progress requires. Here, then, is a problem in the field of the philosophy of religion which is of the utmost practical importance. The campaign for democracy suffers check partly by lack of co-ordination in the intelligence department. There is need for thoughtful examination of the grounds on which these sharply contrasting attitudes rest. Perhaps the struggle against class privilege and against illiberalism has blinded the eyes of the industrial and intellectual radicals to the presence in religion of great potentialities for democracy. Perhaps, also, existing religion has lurking within it elements of autocracy or aristocracy, carried over from the time when those principles largely dominated society, and remaining unsuspected by most religious adherents. If so, an investigation should be ordered without delay.

But something more than negative criticism, balancing off the errors of the contrasting groups against each other, will be required. Otherwise, like a battle plane which, during a fight, simply maintains its equilibrium, our argument will be constantly falling to the ground. An effort at constructive thinking is also needed, which shall seek to bring out for the contrasting groups some positive basis of cooperation. And,

fortunately, there is at least one constructive principle at hand upon which these divergent groups are bound to agree. We all, indeed, doubtless assent to the principle that the supreme test of religion hereafter will be its power to promote democratic progress. In humanity's great struggle for freedom, justice and cooperative unity among all its sons religion must not be found wanting, if it is to survive at all. The religion of the future will be the religion of democracy.

Assuming, then, that any positive solution of the problem before us turns primarily upon the degree in which our religion proves to be really a religion of democracy, let us go on to inquire what some of the main features of such a religion must be—making matters of negative criticism incidental to the effort at construction. And in this inquiry the following three questions will prove of service: Will the religion of democracy be anything more than an enthusiasm for democracy—democracy "touched with emotion?" How can it contribute to the further development of democracy? To what extent will it be a new religion? The attempt to answer these questions will lead us to consider the religion of democracy, first, as to its philosophical basis; secondly, as to its function; and thirdly, as to its method.

I

First, then, the philosophical basis of the religion of democracy. Will this religion be simply a worship of the democratic ideal—democracy "touched with emotion"—or will it be grounded in a valid experience of God?

This question, made familiar by Positivism and by Ethical Culture, will undoubtedly be thrust still more into the foreground by the war. As evidence of this, let me cite the position now taken by the former leader of modernism in the Catholic church, M. Loisy. This position, as reported in a recent number of *Foi et Vie*, is as follows: There is developing under the stress of the war an idealism without God, which is destined to displace Christianity. We observe today, M. Loisy says, a religion of the fatherland that all Frenchmen profess. This religion of the fatherland, which was narrow, particularistic, is enlarging itself little by little and is in process of becoming a religion of humanity in which every fatherland will have its

place, because each will have its rights. The enthusiasm which this religion arouses in M. Loisy appears in the following direct quotation: "The moral notion of humanity, of human solidarity, gives to human existence a significance the grandeur of which cannot be exaggerated. . . It is a veritable faith, and it has its martyrs. . ." M. Loisy finds that the adherents of the old faiths are laying firm hold of this religion of the fatherland, which is turning into the religion of humanity. They do not, indeed, perceive its contradiction with Christianity, which he holds to be essentially an otherworldly religion, but after the war they will discover that they have left the confines of Christianity.

Now evidently the position thus described is no mere academic one. On the contrary, it throbs with the loyalty to country, with the idealism of humanity, and with the passion for reality, which are the nobler aspects of the present spiritual crisis, and to which we all are bound to respond. But does it rightly forecast that democratizing of religion which is bound to come? Will the religion of democracy be an idealism without God?

So far from this being true, I would urge that faith in God will be the fundamental and permanent basis of the religion of democracy. And this for two reasons: first, the democratic ideal postulates a democratic God as the supreme power in the universe; second, this postulate can be verified from the facts of experience.

In support of the first of these reasons there are one or two considerations that I wish briefly to submit to your attention, of which the most comprehensive is the following. As wholehearted democrats, we need a universe in which democracy can succeed. And this means a universe in which a conscious purpose towards world-wide democracy is the controlling principle of natural and social evolution—in other words, a universe in which a democratic God is the supreme power. The reality of this need is unescapable as soon as one remembers that a blind universe is sure to defeat democracy in the end. A few words of Bertrand Russell's will trenchantly bring out this fact: "Brief and powerless is Man's life; on him and all his race the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark. Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter

rolls on its relentless way." "All the labors of the ages, all the devotion, all the inspiration, all the noonday brightness of human genius, are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system, and . . . the whole temple of Man's achievement must inevitably be buried beneath the débris of a universe in ruins." [2] These mercilessly frank words show the ultimate fate of democracy in a blind universe; and as we squarely contemplate that fate, it seems inevitable that we should recognize the need of democracy for a universe that is not blind, that has democracy as its conscious purpose, that is in the control of a democratic God.

By this postulate of God which springs from the democratic ideal we, to be sure, should not mean that no one can possibly cherish that ideal who does not believe in God. Russell is in his own person a refutation of such an idea, and so are many others who, without a belief in God, are devoted to democracy. Nevertheless, as such men work for the democratic cause, they must do it with minds averted from the questions of ultimate destiny, or else with the heroic desperation of Russell. Similarly, soldiers may fight a rear-guard action to the bitter end, knowing that their whole division will be cut to pieces, or even that their whole army is certain of final defeat. But the morale of armies cannot be sustained on such attitudes of mind; and it seems scarcely less certain that the morale of democracy cannot in the long run be kept up, if its ultimate defeat is believed to be inevitable because the universe is blind.

If, on the other hand, one has a living faith in a democratic God, then in working for democracy he finds himself to be working with God. He does not need to avert his mind from the great questions of ultimate destiny, but instead may face them with the buoyancy of hope. He does not need to steel himself with the heroism of despair, for his sense of companionship with God lifts him into the more spontaneous and unconscious heroism of the faith that can remove mountains. And as he looks abroad on the democratic strivings of the masses, they cease to be a pathetically futile struggle, doomed to slow defeat, like vegetation climbing a lofty mountain and growing more and more stunted till it is lost in the icy barrenness of the top; on the contrary they become mankind's most

[2] *Philosophical Essays*, pp. 60, 61, 70.

promising enterprise—like the migration of a people from an arid steppe into a great zone of fertility—for the reason that the main trend of the cosmos, guided by the immanent purpose of God, is on their side.

But some will wish to interpose here the query: Why does the democratic ideal postulate God as the *supreme* power of the universe? Why will not a very great God do, who is yet far from supreme? Or why may not democracy postulate a number of gods, corresponding to the different forms of human genius? William James once suggested that polytheism deserved new consideration, because all that a man needed was "something to trust for the next step." Why then, so far as the democratic ideal is concerned, should one not be content with the doctrine of a plurality of ultimate cosmic forces, or even of a plurality of gods?

The answering of these queries leads to a second of the considerations mentioned as supporting the postulate of a democratic God as supreme in the universe. As democrats we need such a God because the democratic ideal aims at the organic unity of ethical values, and so needs a universe that works for the support instead of the defeat of that aim. The doctrine of a fundamental pluralism of cosmic forces—the doctrine of polytheism, or of a God hedged in by insensate powers—tends to support a radical pluralism of ethical ideals, which accords to each social group a moral code of its own. On the other hand, a universal human brotherhood postulates a universal Divine Fatherhood, and the supremacy of democracy as the organizing principle of human values postulates the supremacy of a democratic God as the guiding power of the universe.

The extent to which a pluralistic ethics was gaining currency at the beginning of this century has been too little noted, but it must be counted among the causes of our present world tragedy. And this pluralistic ethics tended to ally itself with a pluralistic view of ultimate cosmic forces. As at least a symptom of these tendencies let me cite a criticism of Christian ethics which appeared a few years ago, by H. W. Garrod, entitled "Christian, Greek, or Goth." This author, a Fellow at Oxford, criticizes the Christian ideal, "the spiritual man," and also the Greek ideal, "the man of understanding or intelli-

gence," and praises by contrast what he calls the Gothic ideal, which he considers to be "the best kind of natural man," and which has as its main virtues, chivalry and honor. And then he goes on to quote, as a not unworthy illustration of the kind of religious sentiment which he calls "braver and better than the Christian or Hellenic," the following passage from Beaumont and Fletcher:

> Divine Andate, thou who hold'st the reins
> Of furious battle and disordered war,
> And proudly roll'st thy swarty chariot wheels
> Over the heaps of wounds and carcasses,
> Sailing through seas of blood: thou sure steeled sternness,
> Give us this day good hearts, good enemies,
> Good blows on both sides, wounds that fear or flight
> Can claim no share in.

One feels at once that this exaltation of the Gothic ideal, with its gory implications, could have been made only when a world war seemed an utter impossibility, and that it is very far from expressing the motive of those who are honestly fighting for democracy today. But most important for us now is the way in which this author further develops the religious implications of this ideal, under the caption, "The Religion of All Good Men." This religion he portrays as a worship of power, and of the beauty which belongs to power. The good is included only as it is first proven to have power. In its expression this religion is concerned largely with hero-worship and with the worship of places made sacred by the ties of home and country; but with anything so vague and abstract as "humanity" it will have nothing to do.

Here, then, is a sufficiently clear example of the disposition to give a kind of absoluteness to ethical ideals derived from racial genius, like the Gothic, which was increasingly prevalent before the war, and of the corresponding tendency to support such an ethics by a pluralistic view of the object of worship.

But it is the disposition to give absoluteness to racial and national ideals that has proven to be the chief menace to democracy. Hence it is that democracy aims at the organic unity of all human values, and hence it postulates a universe that supports that aim. If democracy has found itself in vital danger because the Teutons were worshipping a Teuton

God, and if it needs to be on its guard lest also the Slavs prove to be worshippers of a Slavic God, the Latins of a Latin God and the Anglo-Saxons of an Anglo-Saxon God, then the need of democracy is not for a philosophy that will vindicate these narrow nationalisms, but for one that will sanction the effort to overcome them. If democracy has been flouted by a theory of evolution whose supreme principle was the Will to Power, it needs for its support a theory of evolution whose supreme principle is the Will to Service. If democracy is undermined wherever there is one ethics for the captain of industry, the great financier, the political leader, the empire builder, and another for the common man, it should welcome the aid of a religion that makes for the unifying of ethics, regardless of the special claims set up by the men of privilege. In short, whenever our present military struggle may end, the war for democracy will be a long war, will require the alliance of all the realms of genuine human interests, and will turn at last upon the success with which the resources of these realms are organized under a single High Command. That is to say, the God postulated by the democratic ideal will be the supreme power in the universe.

But our argument that faith in God will be the fundamental and permanent basis of the religion of democracy rests upon something more than a postulate. There is, as I have already said, a second main reason for this argument, namely: The postulate of a democratic God as the supreme power in the universe can be verified from the facts of experience. We must now briefly consider in what this verification consists.

Most broadly viewed the verification consists in the trend of evolution towards world-democracy. Evolution in the animal and early human stages cannot, of course, show definite democratic results, although it produces those purposeful and social functions without which no democracy could later arise. But as human evolution proceeds, it becomes increasingly evident that progress and democracy are bound up together. It was the democracy of the Hebrew prophets that made Palestine the cradle of the world's most ethical religion. It was the democratic organization of the Athenian aristocracy that gave the world its most harmonious culture. It was as a republic that Rome laid the foundations for its contribution

to human progress. It was the relative democracy of the free cities of Europe during the Middle Ages which made them distributing centers for civilization. It was the growth of democratic institutions in western Europe and America that fostered modern science, education, and economic enterprise. And today the greater part of the western world is dominated by the principle of political democracy and is reaching out toward some more highly socialized form of democratic life. Facts like these certainly afford important verification of the faith in a Central World-Purpose towards democracy.

And there is further verification in the fact that independent streams of social evolution make for similar democratic results. This argument, employed by Bergson in the biological realm to prove an immanent directive tendency, has still more significance in the social realm. China has produced a type of democracy which, even though it be still relatively primitive, is of immense importance for the future of humanity. Russia, in spite of the incubus of despotism, has developed a democracy of her own which, though temporarily debauched by its own sudden success, will surely emerge into sobriety and play a great part in the new world. India brought forth in Buddhism one of the great democratic revolutions in religion and is now restlessly feeling out towards political democracy. Movements like these, largely segregated from each other and from the greater movement in the west, make for the corroboration of the belief that a unified conscious Purpose towards democracy is immanent in social evolution.

But it will be objected: These trends toward democracy are very partial and interrupted, and besides them there are other trends of a different nature—trends towards autocracy, towards exploitation, towards empire. How then can it be that evolution affords any real verification for so vast an idea as that of a Divine Purpose towards democracy guiding the process as a whole?

In reply it must be pointed out that democracy cannot be manufactured, it must grow. It cannot be set up swiftly and perfectly like the Hebrew Tabernacle, each part of which was patterned in heaven; it must be organized slowly and with uneven progress, as a fruitful land is won from the wilderness. Moreover, a Central World-Purpose towards democracy can-

not work by the methods of autocracy. The God of a democratic theism will not have sovereignty as his chief attribute. He will not be like a monarch who tolerates *lèse majesté*. He will be like Jesus—sometimes denied, sometimes betrayed, often misunderstood. Clearly, if we are to find evidence in nature and history for a democratic God, we must avoid setting up undemocratic tests of his activity.

But the more intensive verification of a Divine Purpose towards world-democracy is to be found in present democratic experience. If we feel in our hearts a passion for democracy as the richest, noblest form of human life; if we are gaining some clear, convincing insights as to how a better democracy than we now possess may be achieved; if we find ourselves lifted to a great resolve that this passion and this insight shall control all our efforts; then we are already having the kind of experience that belongs to a life with God—with the only kind of God in whom, as defenders of the democratic ideal, we ought to believe. We have a right, therefore, to accept such experience as so much evidence of the reality of God, and, by so doing, to make the most of what the experience brings us. If, again as we look abroad upon human society, we see there a mighty purpose to defend the democracy we already have and to develop a new and better one; if we find this purpose to be the one really unifying principle of society and the chief hope of progress; then we have all the material we need for the experience of actually co-working with God in the world. And this experience, so far as it brings new strength and insight for social service, supplies cumulative evidence for the reality of a democratic God.

It is, of course, quite true that, according to this interpretation, the belief in a conscious World-Purpose towards democracy will be only partly a matter of evidence, and will remain to an important degree a matter of courage and faith. But what meaning for men today would there be in a religion of democracy that was not pervaded by courage and faith at every point? Yet the courage and faith need not be those of the averted mind or defiant will—held in the face of an indifferent or hostile universe, and in imminent danger of passing over into despair. They may instead be open-eyed, strong and buoyant, because sustained by a growing evidence of the co-

working of God. And since the enterprise of democracy is so vast that every resource for its promotion ought to be drawn upon to the full, we are justified in the confidence that the coming religion of democracy will be no mere democracy "touched with emotion," but will have as its philosophical basis a reasoned faith in a democratic God.

II

But the verification of a theistic religion of democracy turns, in the long run, on the answer to our second question: How can such a religion contribute to the further development of democracy? We must proceed, then, to the consideration of this question; that is to say, we must seek some comprehensive conception of the function which the religion of democracy may hope to fulfil.

Our discussion of this topic is facilitated by the fact that two great goals for the development of democracy in the immediate future are taking on pretty clear shape in the public mind. These goals are industrial democracy and internationalism. The validity of these goals is, of course, by no means a matter of demonstration as yet. They cannot be said to be the assured results of sociology or of political science. But they certainly have established themselves as great working hypotheses, the reasonableness of which the present war has only served to strengthen. Accepted as such they give to our question a more specific form. It becomes the question: In what way can the religion of democracy help towards the attainment of industrial democracy and of internationalism?

Now with respect to industrial democracy there is a deep-going dualism of opinion, which often threatens to become a complete deadlock, and which therefore must be solved if democratic progress is to go on. Let us note what this dualism is, for I believe that it will prove to be of precisely the kind that the religion of democracy may hope to solve.

On the one hand there is what may be called the benevolent employer theory of the welfare of the masses. I heard this theory rather graphically set forth a couple of years ago at a religious conference by an excellent representative of the benevolent employer class, in some such words as these:

In the old days Jim and his employer worked side by side, and there was perfect mutual understanding. Then the business flourished, the employer built a great house on the hill, and Jim and the numerous other employees lived in small houses at the foot of the hill. Still all was well. The employer knew Jim and his fellows personally, and they in turn had confidence in him. If Jim fell sick, his place was kept for him, his wages were continued, the employer's wife drove around to Jim's house with flowers and fruit, and the employer paid the doctor's bills. In short, the employer had the welfare of all his employees at heart, and they in turn were entirely loyal to him.

Then came the time when the business grew immensely larger, and the great house on the hill was abandoned for a luxurious house in the metropolis, another at the seashore, and still another in the mountains. The employer no longer knew his men, and the men dealt only with the employer's cold-blooded agents, appointed to get results. Strikes, lockouts, boycotts, and blacklists then followed in due course. The whole cause of these evils was that the employer had ceased to be the benevolent employer, and the sufficient remedy was to return to the old relations between the great house on the hill and the small houses at the foot. The situation thus sketched by this employer himself had one other feature of importance which he omitted. He totally disbelieved in recognizing labor unions, and would not even tolerate unionism in his shops. It might be added, too, that he gave a thousand dollars for the objects of the conference.

Now this benevolent employer theory evidently does not aim at industrial democracy at all. It holds that to be a false ideal, because it requires of the masses of men an intelligence and unselfishness of which they are incapable, because it never could make production efficient, and because it interferes with the natural and legal rights of the employers. So it maintains that political democracy is enough, and that, if only employers will be benevolent, the welfare of the masses will be secured better than in any other way.

But over against this benevolent employer theory stands the theory very widespread among the masses as to their own welfare—the theory of economic determinism and class war.

This theory holds that economic opportunity is the only determiner of man's capacity, that so far as the masses lack capacity for industrial democracy it is due solely to economic oppression by the privileged classes, and that hence the true remedy for social evils is a class war which shall issue in the expropriation of the privileged classes. A corollary of this theory is that most of the institutions valued by the privileged classes—the church; the schools, or at least the body of intellectuals that run them; the courts; and the state in general as now constituted—are simply means by which those classes have entrenched themselves in order to maintain their privileges.

This theory, then, repudiates the idea of the benevolent employer and the grateful and loyal employee and aims directly at industrial democracy. But the means it would employ seem to endanger the goal. For economic determinism and class war involve the overthrow of the chief sources of the democracy we already have, and give poor promise of developing in the masses of men the capacities on which so vast an enterprise as industrial democracy will necessarily depend.

Here, therefore, is a dualism of opinion which is seriously retarding democratic progress today, and which, if not removed, may well become fatal to such progress. And what does the religion of democracy offer towards its removal? It approaches the question from a new and more fundamental standpoint—a standpoint made possible by the resources which we already have brought out. It reminds us that a democratic society is the purpose of God himself, and so is something far richer and completer than we have yet attained. It reminds us, too, that human personalities are sons of God, and therefore possess far greater capacities than we in our unfaith have dreamed. And it tells us that there is an experience of co-working with God in which all things become possible and for which constantly new possibilities for mankind unfold.

And so it says to the benevolent employer: Your benevolence is far too limited an affair. It does not extend to the fundamental matter in the life of your employees—the relation of their work to the development of their personalities.

If you would really serve your men, you must help to make them free. And their freedom must consist in something more than higher wages and shorter hours; it must extend to self-direction in their work. Moreover, you must not be content with aiming at this freedom for your own employees—thus making it one more instance of your benevolence. But you must aim at a social order in which this freedom shall be secured for all workmen as a matter of justice. In short, you are not benevolent in a thorough-going way unless you are aiming at an industrial democracy.

And similarly, the religion of democracy says to those who have espoused the doctrine of economic determinism and class war: You have set forth, in industrial democracy, the true ideal. You have a right to aspire to freedom and self-direction in the field of industry. But you have not grasped the fundamental conditions for the attainment of this ideal. You cannot really be free unless you are at the same time skilled to serve. Let your economic determinism become creative self-determination and your class war become the fight for social progress as a whole. There are elements of democracy in the faith of the churches, in the science of the intellectuals and in the institutions of political life, without which industrial democracy can never come to pass. There is a democratic trend in social evolution which is the manifestation of the purpose of God. Your ideal is bold and your program radical; make them still bolder and more radical by thinking of yourselves as sons of God and industrial democracy as the will of God. And then you will have great added resources for developing those capacities of human personality which alone can make industrial democracy succeed.

Thus the religion of democracy overcomes the dualism of opinion so threatening to industrial democracy because it develops radically socialized personalities. Its watchwords are: freedom, service, and faith—no true freedom except that which serves; no real service which does not set free; and the fullest freedom and service where there is faith in God and fellowship with him in the toil of the world.

But we must turn for a moment to the other part of our question—How can the religion of democracy help towards internationalism?

The Great War has become for most of us a mighty struggle for the preservation of democracy. But it is growing more and more evident to thoughtful minds that the preservation of democracy cannot be secured apart from its extension. That is to say, we must go forward to internationalism, or else our democracy will be robbed of much that makes it of such priceless value. But internationalism, like industrial democracy, is threatened by a far-reaching dualism of opinion. It is the dualism between the idea of benevolent imperialism on the one hand and the bare idea of the self-determination of peoples on the other. And it is as a means of overcoming this dualism that the capacity of the religion of democracy to promote democratic development can be brought out.

The idea of benevolent imperialism was popularized by Kipling's poem, "The White Man's Burden:"

> Take up the White Man's burden—
> Send forth the best ye breed—
> Go bind your sons to exile
> To serve your captives' need;
> To wait in heavy harness,
> On fluttered folk and wild—
> Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
> Half-devil and half-child.

It has been given theoretical expression by such writers as Benjamin Kidd. In the essay *The Control of the Tropics*, for example, Kidd, after criticizing the Dutch and the French colonial policies, argues that the tropics should be permanently administered by the Anglo-Saxon race as a trust for civilization. His chief reasons are: that civilization cannot get on without the raw materials from the tropics; that the tropics cannot be colonized by white people; that the people of the tropics can never govern themselves; and that only the Anglo-Saxons have developed the faculty for administering the tropics with due regard for the natives.

Now this benevolent imperialism is radically different from junkerism. It definitely repudiates the imperialism of exploitation, and it sanctions only ethical aims and methods. And though in actual practice it seldom appears in its pure form, it has done the world great service. But after all its ethic is aristocratic rather than democratic. It does not aim at world

democracy. And the time has come when doctrines that fall short of aiming at world democracy are dangerous to existing democracy. In particular this benevolent imperialism, because its ethic is aristocratic, develops a serious state of tension between itself and the idea of the self-determination of peoples.

The idea of the self-determination of peoples has come forward in the world's consciousness today as an essential part of democratic ethics. But in its actual manifestations, particularly among the Slavs, it appears to be pushed in a purely abstract and unpractical fashion that is in danger of playing over into the hands of imperialism. All is inchoate and in flux at this point, of course, and one cannot speak with any confidence as to the present meaning of the idea in question. But one thing seems clear. For the future the self-determination of peoples must be guaranteed by some form of internationalism, and any use of the idea that would make the relation between the self-determined peoples nothing but "a fortuitous concourse of atoms" is foredoomed to produce its own failure.

But in the case of this dualism between benevolent imperialism and the bare idea of the self-determination of peoples, as in the case of the dualism previously mentioned, the religion of democracy has a part to play. It summons the benevolent imperialist to a more far-reaching purpose and to a greater faith in mankind. In other words, it asks him to transform his aristocratic ethics into one that is genuinely democratic, and to abandon his benevolent imperialism for internationalism. If there were no God and no fundamental spiritual kinship in mankind, then, indeed, the ideal of internationalism might be merely utopian. But if God himself is working towards world democracy, and if internationalism lies upon the pathway thither, then it cannot fail to come to pass, if only men will become co-workers with God and sharers in his purpose.

And for the radical believer in the self-determination of peoples, in turn, the religion of democracy also has its message. It invites him to a less pessimistic view of the world as it now is—even including the Great War—and to a less apocalyptic ideal for the future. It asks him to put more faith in the method of evolution and less in the method of revolution. It urges that God has been in the social evolution of the past, not as its

sole determiner, but as a great guiding power working in conjunction with men. It holds that nationalism, in spite of its sins, is a real achievement in social evolution and a needed step towards internationalism. And so it teaches that self-determination, for peoples as well as for individuals, must be a matter of growth and can be secured only through education and international cooperation. And it appeals to peoples—as well as to individuals—to couple freedom and service, and to think of themselves as co-workers with God.

We have, then, in the vital relation of the religion of democracy to industrial democracy and to internationalism, important evidence that this religion has a most significant function to perform in democracy's further development. We have brought out this relation, in each case, only at a single point, but if our reasoning has been at all sound, many other points of connection may readily be found. Moreover, as the future unfolds, we may well anticipate that many new answers to the question: How can the religion of democracy promote the further development of democracy? will appear. And it is enough for our present purpose if we have shown, even by way of suggestion, that the next great steps in democratic development require the religion of democracy for their accomplishment.

Nor should we fail to note that the answer gained to our first question has now received genuine reinforcement. For if the service of democratic religion to industrial democracy and internationalism depends in a fundamental way upon faith in a God who purposes democracy and upon the experience of co-working with him, additional evidence that such a God is really there will be increasingly at hand as democracy progresses, and the religion of democracy that the present situation portends will be theistic.

III

But it is time for us to turn to our third question: To what extent will the religion of democracy be a new religion? The religion of humanity that Loisy foresees is, in his judgment, destined to displace Christianity, not only because it will be an idealism without God, but also because it will be a religion

of this earth, and of human progress, whereas Christianity is essentially an otherworldly religion. Must not, then, the religion of democracy, as we have found it to be taking shape in the midst of our present crisis—even though it be an idealism grounded in God—also stand forth as a thoroughly new religion, and hence as one which, so far as it succeeds, is destined to displace Christianity? Are not its ideals—industrial democracy, internationalism, continuous and ceaseless democratic development—entirely different from those that Christianity in the past has been cherishing? And is not its theism—presenting, as it does, a God immanent in natural and social evolution—thoroughly at variance with the idea of God that has prevailed in historic Christianity?

The answer to these questions depends largely on our conception of the method by which the religion of democracy can best serve the cause of democracy as a whole. If we think of the religion of democracy as furnishing the fixed norms of a new social order that can be set up suddenly by revolution—just as the older forms of faith have been believed to furnish the fixed norms for the old social order—then indeed we should regard it as a totally new religion. It will be, in fact, simply a philosophy of social revolution, supplying the fundamental features of the revolutionary program. But if we think of the religion of democracy as furnishing creative ideas for a new social order that is to come to pass by evolution, we should cut its tap root if we regarded it as a totally new religion. It will, on the contrary, seek to preserve its continuity with all that is vital in the religion of the past, and will find in history much material that is indispensable to creative life in the present.

We may safely assume, I think, that it is the method of creative evolution rather than that of the revolutionary program which is most in accord with our reasoning thus far. And on this assumption I venture to formulate an answer to our question: *The religion of democracy will be neither a new religion displacing Christianity, nor will it be identical with any historic form of Christianity, but it will be Christianity recreating itself for the new age.* We must give the remainder of our time to testing this answer and the method on which it depends.

The first part of this answer—that the religion of democracy will not be a new religion displacing Christianity—is borne out by the fact that Christianity, whenever it has manifested itself with new life, has proven to be essentially democratic. Jesus was, in Dean Bosworth's phrase, "the people's prophet," and his gospel was a gospel of democracy. Not that Jesus had a program of political and social reform. One may not so misread the story of his life. But his whole message and career took shape through the sharpest antagonism to the aristocratic religion and ethics of Phariseeism, and were profoundly liberating for the common people. And here is the sufficient reply to Loisy's position, so far as the New Testament is concerned. For while undoubtedly apocalyptic religion, with its otherworldly scheme, furnished the only soil upon which the people's prophet could work, yet the really significant fact is that from that soil he produced a movement which was wonderfully emancipating, both religiously and socially, for the masses of his fellowmen.

In its early expansion, too, Christianity, while having no political program, was a powerful democratic force. It broke down every "middle wall of partition," whether between Jew and Gentile, or Greek and barbarian, or male and female, or master and slave. And if the otherworldly scheme became, as Gerald B. Smith has so well shown,[3] a means for establishing an aristocratic ethics in the Christian church, yet Christianity proved to have within itself a democratic ferment that could escape the new bondage. The Bible was always a powerful leaven for democracy. The Reformation, with its doctrines of justification by faith, freedom of conscience, and the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Christian believer, was a mighty democratic advance—notwithstanding the alliance which its leaders were too ready to form with the principle of external authority and with the established political order. So, too, Puritanism, however far short of democracy it may have fallen, was a long step towards it. What democracy would we have to fight for today, if it had not been for Puritanism? And the Wesleyan movement in its turn both stimulated democratic progress and helped it to succeed. Nor is evidence wanting that these and similar movements in Protestant Christianity still

[3] *Cf., Social Idealism and the Changing Theology.*

have vitality for the democratic cause. A competent observer tells me that many of the leaders in the British Labor Party received their training in public speech and in moral idealism through the chapels of the free churches of England. Modern social Christianity, too, is a force that no lover of democracy can wisely neglect. And while the armies of the allies are fighting today a mighty defensive campaign for democracy, the chief offensive for world-wide democracy belongs to the far-flung battle line of foreign missions.

If, then, the religion of democracy is to work by evolution, it will recognize itself as continuous with the more vital forms of historic Christianity. It may draw, like a mighty river, from many tributaries to swell its tide, but its head-waters will always be in the New Testament, and as it moves on through the centuries, fertilizing civilization, supplying it with power, and bearing the commerce of its thought and life, the direction and the urge of its main current will be due primarily to the religion of Jesus.

But this first part of our answer cannot be maintained without the second part: The religion of democracy will not be simply identical with any historic form of Christianity. No historic creed can be its final norm, no venerable ecclesiastical system can form its enduring temple, no canonized scriptures can set bounds to its revelation. Nor can any neatly rationalized or liberalized scheme of Christian thought be forever its chart and compass. All such attempts to secure a religion of democracy by selecting, as its absolutely changeless basis, certain historic forms or elements of Christianity are doomed to failure. For the religion of democracy—this is our hypothesis—works by the method of creative evolution. Its function is to help produce a democratic world order and to contribute to ceaseless democratic development; and for this it needs from the past, not fixed norms, but creative ideas. Whatever thoughts it takes from the past must be re-thought, whatever types of experience it seeks to reproduce must at the same time be remolded, if it is to play a real part in human progress. And only through such creative use can historic Christianity remain a perpetual source of democracy. If we treat Christian truth simply as a cargo to be freighted from the past into the future, then, as a food supply for democracy, it will soon be-

come exhausted. But if we treat Christian truth as seed—to be cultivated by constantly new means and in ceaselessly new varieties—there is good reason to believe that its increasing fruitfulness will keep pace with democracy's growing needs.

And so, when we emphasize the essential oneness of the religion of democracy with the vital forms of historic Christianity, we must make sure that we are doing it in the right way. Liberal Christianity in recent decades has been going "back to Christ," and in doing so has been brought nearer to the life of democracy—witness, the fact that it is to Jesus that the working classes respond with welcome, more than to anything else in Christianity. And many of us now feel that this movement back to Christ must mean helping men to become sharers—each according to the measure of his capacity—in the religion of Jesus himself. But even at this point we need to be on our guard—not lest we should go too far, but lest we should not go far enough. In the last analysis it is the moral and spiritual creativity of Jesus, made possible by his experience of God, that we want to appropriate. Jesus has meaning for us supremely because he was what we want to be—the creator of a new and more democratic age. We owe to him and his movement, more than to any other person or event, our chance for such a new age. But we shall loyally respond to our indebtedness only as every thought and every experience that we derive from him takes on fresh meaning for our own minds and gives us some measure of creative power for our own time.

When, then, the complaint is made that Jesus lacked some of the interests that are most important for us—the interest in art, or in science, or in political reform, or in the labor problem—or when it is charged against him that modern social methods have set aside some of his precepts—charity organization replacing almsgiving, provident societies superseding the taking of no thought for the morrow, organization of force for social protection proving more adequate than absolute non-resistance—when such complaints are made, we reply: It is well that Jesus did not anticipate all these interests and work out all these methods. What he did was to take a stand for human values in the name of God, to attack whatever endangered those values in the concrete situations of his own environment, and so to simplify and unify those values as to create a new

leaven for civilization. And he expressly repudiated the attitude of those who build the tombs of the dead prophets and stone the new ones that God sends.

> Children of men! not that your age excel
> In pride of life the ages of your sires,
> But that ye think clear, feel deep, bear fruit well,
> The Friend of Man desires.

And so the final stress must fall upon the third part of our answer. The religion of democracy will be Christianity re-creating itself for the new age. Great creative ideas for democracy Christianity certainly has. The faith in the fatherhood of God, the ideal of the sonship of man, the goal of a kingdom of God on earth, the method of human brotherhood, the principle of freedom through service, the hope of personal and social immortality, the instrument of the organized fellowship of believers, the servant nation—from the Old Testament—forgiveness, redemption through love and its limitless power of sacrifice—these ideas are big with meaning for democratic progress. There is no one of them, of course, that may not be immobilized and rendered barren by a merely formal or traditional use. They may all be used in a merely individualistic or exclusively mystical way, their social meaning may be missed, and so they may be made to minister to an aristocratic instead of a democratic ethics. But taken as a means for producing the experience of co-working with God in the midst of our present social tasks they will be found to be full of creative power. They will prove positive constructive forces for the next great steps in democracy: industrial democracy and internationalism. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear!"

But in the nature of the case the claim that the religion of democracy will be Christianity re-creating itself for democratic ends cannot be established simply by amassing evidence out of history. It must be regarded as a great summons, issuing from our present spiritual situation, and to be vindicated by the response that it secures. If Christianity desires to be the religion of democracy it must address itself humbly and whole-heartedly to the work of its own re-creation. Its theology must be thought through again from the democratic standpoint. Its Biblical interpretation must be given new

scope and passion by addressing itself to democratic needs. Its church organization must be ready for the melting-pot, if need be, that it may become a real instrument for democracy. And its evangelistic and educational methods must be made plastic to the ever enlarging requirements of democratic progress.

Moreover, the summons to a democratic re-creation of Christianity cannot be rightly responded to without the progressive assimilation by Christianity of all large human interests. The warfare between science and theology has often been proclaimed to be over, but it is a question whether it has yet issued in a democratic peace. The separation of the church and the state is for us an accomplished fact, but not their efficient cooperation. The production of wealth, the development of art, the organization of play have all been given religious sanction in these days, but they have not yet been thoroughly humanized and ethicized by being assimilated heartily into the Christian program of the Kingdom of God. The democracy of the future must provide for the rank and file of men a rich life, and the religion that is to serve democracy must be eager to assimilate all that contributes to life's enrichment.

Fortunately, signs are not wanting that this self-re-creation of Christianity is already going on. Our seminaries contain professors of religious education, of Christian theology and ethics, of Biblical and historical interpretation, and of practical theology who are working for the democratic ideal. Our churches are arousing themselves to the task of bearing an efficient part in the world struggle for democracy. And among the masses of the common people there are here and there stirrings of a real movement towards a more democratized Christianity. Yet these signs of re-creative power should by no means satisfy us. They simply furnish encouragement for a much more aggressive pushing of the great campaign and for a much fuller coordination of its moral aims.

It is, then, of much significance that this summons to a democratic re-creation of Christianity is in these very days being heard and responded to across the Atlantic. Paul Doumergue, the editor of *Foi et Vie*, after stating Loisy's theory of an idealism without God that is to displace Christianity,

which we cited at the outset, goes on to discuss it; and his conclusion is that: "For a new democracy we need a revitalized Christianity." For the success of democracy without Christianity he sees small hope. "No thoughtful person doubts"—I quote his words—"that after the war there will be, under the form of peace, a time of trial quite as severe as the war itself. It will be necessary to repair the ruins: ruins material, of cities, of homes, of public and private fortunes—ruins spiritual: diminished number of births, social conventions laid low in the dust, all the forms of wholesome custom broken; and for this superhuman effort the country will have only a body politic bled white by the wounds and mutilations of the war." But Doumergue finds that no mere work of restoration will suffice, but that the entire social order will have to be remodelled. But this great re-creative work can be accomplished by us only as we ourselves are new men. "In truth," he affirms—again I quote—"for the making of the new world there will be need of a great deal of faith, of idealism, of courage, of renunciation of material interests and the principle of each for himself; there will be need of a great deal of sacrifice. Does anyone really believe that it will be possible to dispense with Christians?"

But the Christianity that can meet this crisis will not be, in Doumergue's judgment, simply the Christianity of the existing churches. "The Christianity of tomorrow" to which he points will be one whose leading ideas—creation, incarnation, redemption—will have been transmuted into present experiences of the living God and guiding principles for personal and social living. And so he concludes that Christianity can and will be the religion of democracy, but only on the condition that it be a Christianity revitalized—renewed.

The deepest motives of the present hour spring from the sense of the solidarity between our national destiny and the cause of democratic idealism across the sea. Under the compulsion of this new consciousness we are sending millions of our youth to France and billions of our wealth to all the Allies. And out of this same sense of solidarity comes a challenge to our deepest religious life as well, as the words of the French Protestant thinker just quoted make clear. Democracy needs a religion; but this need can be adequately met only by a religion grounded in a living experience of the Christian

God. In the task of building a new democracy Christianity has a great new opportunity; but this opportunity can be met only as Christianity proves to have within itself abundant re-creative power. These are facts that will become increasingly evident on both sides of the Atlantic. As Christian teachers and thinkers let us wholeheartedly respond to the challenge that these facts present. Let us join hands with all Christian teachers and thinkers who love democracy, in France, in England, in any country on the face of the earth, and address ourselves unitedly to the task of re-thinking Christianity in democratic terms and of energizing democracy with Christian faith, in order that the old world may not die in its travail until the new world has been born.

VII

SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP

Commencement Address, 1918

By

Professor Henry Preserved Smith

"War is the father of all things, and the one thing worth taking into account is change." This is not the dictum of a recent observer reflecting on the world-conflict which now overshadows all other events. It is the opinion of one of the earliest Greek philosophers, and he was moved not by the conflicts which raged chronically among the Greek states, but by what he saw going on in the world of nature. He anticipated the natural science of our own day which has given us the formula "the struggle for existence." The ancient philosopher and the modern investigator agree in this paradox: The only thing permanent is that there is nothing permanent; everything is in flux and flow.

That this truth is brought home to us by the world-situation in which we find ourselves is only too evident. It seems to be the irony of history that when men think they have arrived at something firm on which they can rely they are roughly shaken out of their dream. Five years ago we were congratulating ourselves on the progress which peace was making in the world. The Hague conferences seemed to promise a comparatively settled state of society, in which the nations could pursue the aims of civilization in friendly rivalry and mutual helpfulness, without resort to the last argument of kings. Then came the great catastrophe and gave us a rude awakening. It was as though, having built our house on what seemed to be a solid rock, we suddenly heard the rumble of an earthquake, felt the ground beneath us rock like the deck of a ship in a storm, and saw our walls laid in shapeless masses of rubbish about our feet.

Nor is it otherwise in the intellectual world. Here, also, the law of change is ceaselessly at work. No sooner does a thinker elaborate a final philosophy, a system which explains nature

and man and God, than some daring investigator challenges his premises and overthrows his conclusions, himself to be overcome in turn. In the domain of ethics many a teacher has drawn up what he supposed to be the perfect code for human guidance. Perhaps he was a law-giver, and promulgated his statutes with all the authority which the most solemn sanctions could give. Or perhaps he was a moral teacher, setting forth counsels of perfection, instructions for those who are seeking the right path. In either case, the supposed perfect system was unable to resist the law of change, and now the most of these codes, like the systems of the philosophers, exist only as so many monuments of an outgrown past.

Doubtless the first effect of this discovery of the law of change is discouragement. So the Hebrew sage found it. Observing the ceaseless flow of the rivers, the monotonous journey of the sun through the heavens, the constant shifting of the winds from one quarter of the compass to another, he exclaimed: "All things are full of weariness; vanity of vanities; all is vanity, and a striving after wind." But before giving way to this mood, let us notice one thing which may give the matter a different aspect. This is that change is the condition of progress. If, indeed, all human history were simply a remorseless grind, with nothing new under the sun, then we might despair. But if there is progress, slow and uncertain as it may seem to us, then we may take heart. If we may go farther and say that change is the very condition on which true mental activity depends, we have a double reason for encouragement. We may remind ourselves here of an oft-quoted and oft-refuted saying of Lessing. His words are: "Not the truth which a man possesses, or supposes himself to possess, makes his worth, but the honest pains he takes to get hold of the truth. His powers expand not by possession but by investigation of the truth, and in these powers alone his growing perfection consists. The possession of truth makes one inactive, sluggish, conceited. If God held in his right hand all truth, and in his left hand only the ever eager and active search for truth, but with the condition that I should always make mistakes, and if He should say, 'Choose!' I should humbly bow towards the left hand and say, "Father, give me this; the absolute truth is for Thee alone." The language

which I have thus quoted does seem indeed to intimate that all our efforts after the truth will be of no avail; but this is not what the author intended. He was confronted by two classes of dogmatists, each of which claimed to be in possession of the truth. On one side were the orthodox, secure in the confidence that their system was given by an infallible revelation; on the other were the rationalists, equally confident that their system was given them by the infallible human reason. Lessing cried to both parties: Your fixed system is of no good to you; truth is not something that can be learned by rote. It must be sought by earnest effort; the mind must wrestle with it, as Jacob did with the angel, and its value is in the very effort which the mind makes to appropriate it. And the same holds true in the moral life. If we can conceive of the state of mind of a man who should say that he had attained perfection and that he needed to make no more effort to live the right life, we shall at once say that such a man is sorely self-deceived, or that he is deceiving others. As some one has said, the moral life is like the flight of a bird in the air, it is sustained by constant effort and when exertion ceases, we drop.

It is here that we must correct our notion of evolution. To our time, evolution has become the catchword which solves all riddles, and there is reason to think that we rely upon the process which it connotes as if it were automatic, something mechanical which will bring about a state of perfection without conscious effort on our part. Perhaps we deceive ourselves by using the phrase 'the survival of the fittest' as though the fittest to survive were always the one which morally we could approve as the best and highest. But in the jungle the fittest to survive is the cruel and rapacious tiger, and in the tropical swamp the fittest to survive is the ungainly alligator. If the law were to work in the world of man, as it does in the world of brutes, it might give the pre-eminence to the man most cruel and rapacious, if at the same time he had the most physical strength. But we know by observation that the advance of society does not proceed along these lines. And the reason is not far to seek. The animal who survives his fellows because he is stronger or swifter than they does not reflect on the desirability of strength or speed. But the man who attains something better than his predecessors has at least some idea of what he is striving for.

The progress of society depends upon the *intelligent* choice of the members of society. As has been well said: "Man is now as civilized, rational and humane as he is because man in the past has changed things into shapes more satisfying, and has changed parts of his own nature into traits more satisfying, to man as a whole."

This fact is not always recognized. In our search for something permanent in the flow of things we fix upon what we call the primitive motives, and assert that they are the real unchangeable element in the history of mankind. We look at the savage and say: This is man, and here we may find the secret of his history. And, so looking at him, we add: It is plain that the elemental passions, hunger, lust, hate and fear, account for all his actions. The simplicity of this hypothesis attracts us at once, and we easily find facts that seem to confirm it. Our novelists delight to strip off the mask worn by civilized man and show us the savage whom they take to be the real man. And that the elemental motives are still powerful in those of us who suppose ourselves to be the most advanced in character we are sometimes obliged to confess. But when we assume that these elemental motives are all-powerful, we are at once confronted by facts of another nature. Powerful as they are, men are ever struggling to overcome them; at least to regulate them, to bring them under the control of something different, to put them in the second place. The whole drama of human history is in fact the struggle between this something other—let us call it at once the spiritual, as distinguished from the material or animal—the struggle between this other and the more primitive forces. All art, all science and all religion witness to this never-ceasing warfare.

One thing more needs to be taken into consideration, and it is this which deserves our special attention. This is that human progress needs and always has had leaders. The mass of men are indeed moved largely by the elemental passions of which I have spoken. But here and there an individual has a vision of something higher and seeks to attain it. Let us take the case of so obvious a virtue as truthfulness. To men in what we call the lower stages of civilization this does not seem a desirable quality. Even when well beyond savagery men think it safer to deceive their fellows than to tell the

truth. "Lying is the salt of a man," is an Arab proverb which would find approval even at the present day. Evidence of the reluctance of men to tell the truth, and to keep their promises, is given by the elaborate devices, oaths and sanctions by which they have sought to bind their fellows. Now at some point in the upward progress of the race there was borne in on some individual the conviction that it is more worthy of a human being always to tell exactly what is so, and to keep the promises once made even if no oath has been required or taken. This conviction was not motived either by desire or fear, for these would tend in the other direction. The man had an intuition that this quality of veracity is in itself better than lying, even if it brings no material advantage. On this ground it is that the Psalmist commends the man who swears to his own hurt and changes not, and this shows what the enlightened conscience declares. My point is that such a man becomes a leader by the very fact of his embodying his ideal in his conduct. Doubtless he will at first be called unpractical and visionary by the majority of his fellows. But if he is steadfast in obeying his conscience, he will at last win their respect; the more thoughtful will follow his example; and in time the standard of conduct in that community will be changed, and truthfulness will become one of the recognized virtues. This is the result of leadership, either indirect by example, or direct by precept and exhortation.

I have supposed a case of leadership in the development of morality. Turn now to the history of human thought, and notice such an illustration as is given us by Socrates. In him we see a man who was certainly dominated by something other than the primitive passions. He found in himself an ineradicable desire to know the nature of man, especially the moral nature of man. In endeavoring to satisfy this desire, as you will remember, he inquired into the nature of justice. Here he was confronted by one Thrasymachus, whom we may take as a type of the materialist. To him the problem stated by Socrates was easily solved. Justice, said he, is simply the right of the strongest; might makes right, and there is nothing else to be taken into account. We need not go into the argument which followed. What concerns us is the fact that the sufficient refutation was the example of Socrates himself.

Here was a man who ignored the so-called primal instincts. What he should eat and what he should drink, how he should gratify his passions—these were to him negligible questions. His days and nights were spent in seeking knowledge. Had Thrasymachus expostulated with him and said: "Socrates, you have good abilities; why not devote them to something practical? You might make a fortune for yourself, if you would go into business; or you might attain high office in the state if you would go into politics." Had he made such an appeal we know very well what the answer would have been. The philosopher knew of higher values than wealth or office, and he devoted his life to the pursuit of these higher values.

What the example shows us is that Socrates by his emphasis of these higher concerns awakened in other minds an appreciation of them, and thereby became a leader, the real founder of a school of thinkers which has not ceased to have influence twenty-three centuries after his death. Doubtless to some of his contemporaries his course was unintelligible. They could not see that there was any money in it for him, and any other than material advantage was beyond their comprehension. Take the similar case of the Old Testament prophet. In the days of Jeroboam the Second, of Israel, there was a great boom in business. Trade had followed the flag. The leading men of the nation congratulated themselves that they had command of the situation, both in the military and in the commercial sense. Religion, too, seemed to be flourishing. The services had never been so well attended and had never been conducted with so rich a ritual. Only one man sounded a discordant note in the general chorus of rejoicing. This was a plain countryman who appeared at the chief sanctuary and rudely interrupted the worship with the demand: "Let justice flow down as a river and right as a perennial stream." The only way in which the official minister of religion could interpret so unmannerly a proceeding was by supposing the preacher out for gain for himself. What he said was, in effect: "Amos, there is nothing in this street preaching for you; you cannot take up a collection here, and the police have their eye on all disorderly characters. Go down to Judah; perhaps you can make your living there." The answer of the prophet shows how mistaken was the priest: "The lion roars, who will

not fear; the Lord Jehovah has spoken, who can refrain from prophesying?" And Amos was only one of a long line of men equally unmindful of material gain.

These examples show the method of advance by spiritual leadership. In a society which is seemingly absorbed in the pursuit of material things, there arises a man who has a vision of something higher. This vision has compelling power. Within the man himself it may be a disturbing element, and he may have to fight a strenuous battle to bring the passions into subjection to it. When it prevails he becomes a leader. Often this is not by his own choice. He would perhaps prefer by his example to be a simple witness to the reality of virtue. But his contemporaries cannot remain ignorant that in him self-control has overcome appetite, courage has overmastered fear, love has taken the place of hatred. By this very example he takes the lead, and men look up to him with an affection comparable only to that which they feel for a father.

These are ancient examples. Let us turn to our own time. What is the reason that in the present crisis we hear so many criticisms of the Church? Loudly we hear it proclaimed that Christianity has failed, because it has not prevented the war. Bitterly men complain that the churches have not given a clear and unequivocal declaration of principles, such a declaration as would make men realize exactly what their duty is in such a crisis. And the ministry is assailed, because, as is alleged, it has sat contentedly by the fire, warming itself while the greatest tragedy of history is enacted at its very doors.

It is not my purpose to refute these charges, or to defend the Churches and the ministry. Let us take to ourselves any criticism that is justified, and repent of our timidity or sluggishness. What now concerns us is that the complaints and criticisms show that men are demanding leadership in moral and spiritual affairs, and that they look to the Churches and the ministry to furnish it. And who shall say that the demand is unwarranted? Is it not the claim of the Church that it not only instructs men in right living, but that it gives them the motive which alone is able to overcome the natural passions and appetites? To doubt that this is its mission would be to deny its birthright. Yet to affirm it in the present crisis may seem too bold. This is an age of democracy, it will be said.

Men are no longer amenable to teachers who claim a divine right. But to this the reply is obvious: An age of democracy is just the age when the true teacher comes to his own. The mass of men need guidance all the more when the power is in their hands. The appeal to force must be replaced by the appeal to reason, and he will be the true leader who is able to persuade men of the truth.

It is said that after the war we shall have a new world, and all our old institutions will be thrown into the crucible in order that a new society may be brought forth. In this there is something of truth but also something of exaggeration. It is dangerous to predict what the future has in store, but of one thing we may be sure, human nature will remain what it has always been, and the struggle between lower and higher will go on as before. We may say also with some confidence that what we have already attained will persist. That is, moral values which by hard fighting we have gained in past ages, will still claim our loyalty. The standard of character for the individual will still include those fruits of the spirit which the Apostle so engagingly sets before us—love, joy, peace, patience, fidelity and self-control. And it is evident even to superficial observation that the line of progress is already marked out for us. What is now demanded is the extension of these individual virtues to the larger units which we call nations. No other conclusion can be reached by one who considers the present outcry against secret diplomacy. As in the intercourse of man with man we demand that one should speak the truth openly, so now the conscience of mankind is demanding that the nations should be open and aboveboard in their intercourse with each other. An ancient prophet in answering an inquirer as to the path of duty said: What doth the Lord require of thee except to deal justly and love mercy and walk humbly with thy God? The most obtuse observer will confess that if groups, societies, corporations, communities, and nations were to act according to this simple rule the reign of God for which we look would already have begun.

That consummation is still far away, but we are moving towards it. Surveying the path along which we have come, it is plain that the moral and spiritual advance has been not only intensive, but also extensive. That is, the ideal of character

has not only become more elevated but the responsibility of the group has become better realized. In the primitive horde there was no thought of duties toward any one outside the group, and that was a group of limited size, perhaps less than a hundred individuals. All mankind outside was frankly treated as hostile or as legitimate prey. From that stage we have moved forward by extending our interest and obligation, first to the tribe, then to the city, then to the nation, and now vaguely we realize that we owe something to all mankind. We are holding these larger groups to the law of morality, and it is here that the preacher of righteousness must apply his standard. This is implied by the criticisms we have already considered. These criticisms are in strange contrast with some that we have heard in times past. Often when the minister has attempted to apply the ten commandments to state or nation he has been reminded that it was his duty to preach the Gospel, and not to meddle in politics. Or if he attempted to show that corporate morality lags far behind the standard which we apply to individuals he was told that he knew nothing of business. True it is that the minister is not a politician and that he is not a business man. But he is a specialist in the art of right living, and nothing that concerns human life is foreign to his interest or outside his sphere of influence.

Whether the world will be a different world after the present crisis is past depends on whether we will to have it different, and whether we make a sincere effort to put the will into action. Undoubtedly we have much to encourage us. The crisis has brought out unsuspected stores of heroism. Our hearts have been thrilled by the willingness of our sons to lay down their lives in the cause of liberty, by the eagerness of our daughters to bring help to their brothers in arms, and most of all, perhaps, by the readiness of fathers and mothers to give their dearest treasures to the great cause. We have faith that the same spirit of devotion will show itself when we face the problems of reconstruction. But we cannot close our eyes to one fact; that is, that it is more difficult to live for our ideal, and for human brotherhood, than it is to die for them. To take up the monotonous tasks of daily life and perform them with fidelity, calls for as much courage and more steadfastness than to brace one's self for the charge upon the enemy's lines at the

hour of supreme activity. There will always be need of men to encourage and instruct those who desire to be faithful to the daily round, and perhaps the need will be greater after this upheaval than before. The first danger at the close of the conflict will come from the great weariness and lassitude of men who, having made a mighty effort, suffer from the reaction. Moreover, many of the finest spirits, the idealists who would have contributed to our advance, will no longer be with us. The generation now coming onto the stage will be only a broken fragment of what it ought to have been. And the load of debt under which all the nations will be staggering will make purely material interests absorb much of the attention and effort that would otherwise have gone to the upbuilding of society. These considerations show us that the need of wise leadership will be as great as ever, even greater than ever.

What, then, are the qualities which will be demanded of those who are called to this high task? This is the question which concerns us here. To answer it we may look again at the criticisms which have been so freely directed at the Church and the ministry. These show at least what the common opinion demands. First is the charge of a lack of intelligence. The ministers did not discern the signs of the time, it is said. To this it is not enough to say that neither did anyone else, for we have a right to expect the minister of religion to know some things which escape the observation of the man in the street. No one could foresee the storm which has burst on the world, but the thoughtful student of humanity and history might have seen whither the nations were tending in their mad race for armaments. He whose horizon was bounded by the limits of his own parish, and who took no interest in national affairs, may well reproach himself with failure.

A graver charge is that men have lacked courage. Excuses may be found for a man who is ignorant. He may not have had competent instructors; he may have been perplexed by the complication of movements in modern society. But for cowardice there is no excuse. He who shrinks from declaring the mind of God because of his fear of men has thrown away his chance for usefulness. Fortunately we are able to point to a noble army of witnesses for the truth whose lives and

deaths prove that courage has never been lacking to the ministers of religion. The history of religion is the history of reformers, and the reformer is the man who stands out bravely against the traditions and the vested interests of his own time. Hence the tragedy of religious history. Jeremiah uttering his message to a generation which refuses to hear; which regards him as a madman; which puts him in the stocks; which arrays his nearest kinsmen against him, is only one in a long line of men who have been faithful to their convictions. Our confidence is that the line is not yet ended, and that when occasion arises like courage and self-sacrifice will be shown by the preachers of truth.

And finally, let us say that courage must be founded on faith. Taking a long look at the course over which mankind has come we see that there has been progress. With many an eddy in the stream there has been movement from a lower to a higher stage. There has been advance in moral ideals both for the individual and for society. Much remains to be done. But faith tells us that the divine power which has impelled this movement from the start is still at work, and that if we are faithful it will not fail us. It is this faith which makes us real *spiritual* leaders. By it we see the spirit of God at work beneath this long process of human advance. By His inspiration the prophets and reformers have been moved to mark out the path by which advance has been made. It is He who puts into our hearts that ideal of a kingdom of righteousness and peace which nerves us to strenuous effort on His behalf. Therefore we work out not only our own salvation but the salvation of humanity, because it is He that works in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure.