

IV

RELIGION

At first sight it may seem strange to include religion in the factors which go to the making of the citizen on this continent. In the United States there is no official recognition by the State of any Church or Churches. The Law acknowledges their right to frame and modify their creed and to hold property on that basis, but the process of secularization has gone so far that in state schools and universities even rudimentary instruction in subjects dealing with religion is not permitted. There are curious inconsistencies, as, for example, that official gatherings of state institutions are often opened with prayer, though their youth are kept insulated from official religious influence. On the other hand it might be maintained with some reason that organized religion is actually more potent in America than in Europe, and that except in a few countries secularization has gone further there than here. That religion has always been and still is a strong factor in the life of the American people cannot be denied, especially in the sections deriving from the original stocks, though many of the descendants of later immigrations also have remained as true to the religions which their fathers brought with them as have those left behind in Europe.

Reviewing civilization as a whole it may be concluded that Religion, if not an essential element in it, has been a very common one; and that hitherto it has almost always entered into the culture of any people that has been profound and

permanent. But before proceeding to enlarge upon this affirmation I must define what I mean by Religion. In my judgment it involves belief in an order above, within, and sustaining the present visible phase of life, and constituting the reality of ideals of the true, the beautiful, and the good. Further, this belief involves that those who hold it should endeavor to conduct their lives in such a way as to realize these ideals in the highest possible measure. I make another statement in which some will not follow me, that belief in such an ideal order is dependent upon the existence of a Divine Being whose eternal Person is the source and support of it. This has been expressed by Bridges in *The Testament of Beauty* thus, when he says that our love of wisdom and of beauty will lead us to

joyful obedience
with reverence to'ard the omnificent Creator
and First Cause, whose Being is thatt beauty and wisdom
which is to be apprehended only and only approach'd
by right understanding of his creation, and found
in thatt habit of faith which some thinkers hav styled
The Life of Reason; and this only true bond of love
and reasonable relation (if relation ther be)
'twixt creature and creator, man and nature's God,
the which we call *Religion*,—is fundamental.

(IV, 1082-1091)

It is almost needless to remark that there are and always have been thinkers of high quality who do not believe in a personal God, and yet who maintain the most exalted moral ideals. They may regard Duty as a "stern lawgiver," but they do not see her "wear the Godhead's most benignant grace"; nor do they admit that natural laws "weave for God the garment thou seest Him by." Moreover there are millions, such as the followers of Buddha, who have inherited an enduring and a comforting religion though without a personal deity at its heart. But Buddhism has not taken

64 Making of the Complete Citizen

hold on western civilization, and philosophy rather than religion is the term I would use of the activity of the thinkers to whom I have referred. My purpose is not to enter upon a broad discussion of Religion, but to keep in view its place in the making of a citizen of the western world.

Here, however, I may be challenged as to my definition of what in the western mind constitutes religion, by those who are applying the term to the attitude of the Russians to their social experiment and industrial Plan. Recently Lord Passfield, better known as Sydney Webb, said that "he was inclined to think that here was the emergence not only of a new civilization but of a new religion, a religion amazingly like the religion of humanity identified with the name of Auguste Comte." Also Professor Arnold Toynbee has recently said: "For the Russian Communist Party member, his Communism is a religion. At least, it is a Cause to which he devotes his life; it is a view of life which embraces every side of life and inspires every social and almost every personal activity; and it is a way of life for which he feels such enthusiasm that he cannot be happy unless he is propagating it to the ends of the earth and trying to convert the whole of mankind to it. And if that isn't a religion, I do not know what the word religion means. . . . And unless you grasp the fact that Russian Communism is a religion of a kind, you will not be able to understand 'The Anti-God Campaign.'" Having officially deposed the old religion they have substituted the new order of the State as its surrogate, calling a new creation into being to redress the balance of the former world of superstition, which they assert religion always is. They have been fired by the idea of the Plan; it has become to them an almost mystical ideal; the hope of its realization has swept with emotional effect over the nation, and average folk have such faith in

its successful outcome that they are willing to make the utmost sacrifice in order to bring it in triumphantly. Similarly in regard to the ideal of Fascism. Its adherents have confessedly found in what has been offered them something to which they may devote their energies so completely that the individual loses his own aims in the mass, and throws himself into it both for protection against an evil social order, and for fellowship in mass emotion and purposes. The freedom of the individual thinker or idealist has become of no account; it is almost sublimated into the authority of the order.

But it is a misuse of terms to call this devotion to a plan a religion. The early Christians, it is true, had such utter devotion to their Cause that they soon became a conquering force in the world; but that Cause was professedly the establishment of the Kingdom of God which was to come in with power as their world-age passed away. The very essence of it was that it was a new supernatural order, and that what mattered was the realization of eternal values, which were indeed manifested to some degree within the social life of their communities, but only as an earnest of what was to appear when the new Day would dawn and the glory of the full Reign would break upon them.

The new Russian experiment has so stirred the imagination and hopes of the youth that one is lost in amazement at the way in which millions of uneducated people have been bent to the will of their leaders to carry out even partially their five-year Plan. But the effort seems to concentrate itself so completely upon the securing of better industrial conditions as to let them fill the whole human outlook. Religion, however, bids men lift their eyes sometimes from the earth, and even while their gaze is upon their work and their hands are busy, to keep in their hearts

66 Making of the Complete Citizen

the song of the invisible choir, the music of the spheres. At present the Russian ruling class are determined to dispense with religion. What the result of the attainment of such an utterly industrialized society will be, it is futile to prophesy. Doubtless many human virtues will exist in a nation which is devoting itself on a large scale to cooperative effort; but to banish religion can hardly fail to atrophy the spiritual character of the people. Hitherto civilizations with a high grade of culture have had some place for religion. As to whether Russia will return out of her agony and travail to the spiritual and bring forth a new quality of culture it is idle to speculate.

But some may reply that in all ages civilizations have been materialistic, and that most governments and peoples have been absorbed in selfish aggrandizement. All around us is *Realpolitik*, policies determined by the frankest self-interest, nationalism expressing itself in utter indifference to others, the Orient having gone to school to the western world to learn lessons in rapacity. In our industrial and social order, we are told, the selfishness of an acquisitive system surpasses that of the Russians, who at least lose themselves in order to find a better distribution of the means of living, and who toil hard for their subsistence. In all this there may be some truth. Support is lent to it by those among us who in frantic fear appeal selfishly to religion to save the world from its present industrial disorder; and by those who practically meet Russia on its own materialistic basis, grounding their hope for the failure of the great experiment on the reassertion by the individual of the desire of possession, and on the likelihood of the bricks cracking under the strain of the sacrifice demanded.

There is, however, this difference between western civilization and Russian; from the latter religion is excluded, in

the former there is at least a core, a saving remnant, who openly challenge the materialism of public or private policy; and it is a vital nucleus of great power; it is an essential element in the culture as apart from the external civilization of the nation. While it cannot be maintained successfully that religion is always and solely the source of the moral force in a community, if its voice should be drowned without hope of recovery, there would be little reason for expecting that a healthy judgment would long survive among the people. And religious faith depends, if not in individual cases yet by and large, upon institutional expression in churches, just as the promotion of knowledge and beauty depends upon the maintenance of schools, universities, museums, and galleries with their staffs. The extinction of organized religion would be followed by dark ages disastrous for culture, which is the soul of civilization, though in the murk and the gloom there might be a sufficient number of individuals in whom the spiritual would still shine strongly enough to allow the world, under their lead, in time to grope its way back into daylight.

In the greatest periods from which our culture has been derived religion has been a factor of much significance. I shall refer to the Greek, the Roman, the Mediaeval, and the Renaissance.

“From the period during which Greek architecture was being built up to its maturity, say from the seventh century B.C. to the completion of the Parthenon in the fifth century B.C., the whole life of the Greek was coloured and dominated by his religion and its observances. . . . He himself was content to live in a poor house, so long as he had his market-place, his ceremonial theatre, and the glorious temples of his gods. Moreover, to whatever depths the Athenians may have sunk in the time of St. Paul, in the heroic

68 Making of the Complete Citizen

days of Pericles they were remarkable for constancy of purpose and the steadfastness of their ideals. They stood on the ancient ways, and it never occurred to them to abandon the tradition of their fathers, their business was to carry it forward to perfection.”¹

No finer representative of Roman civilization and culture at its highest can be found than Virgil. He gathered up in himself the noblest ideals of his day, was a fervent prophet of the empire as the guardian of the order of the world, felt deeply the sorrows of human kind, expressed in matchless form the purest aspirations of his age, and even in his own lifetime became the teacher of the rising generation, a place which he held in Western civilization for a thousand years, and from which even yet he has not been entirely dethroned. It is needless to remind you that the *Aeneid*, and the *Georgics* as well are religious poems. Virgil's purpose is to show that the destiny of Rome has been determined for her by high Heaven, and that in the observance of *pietas*, or loyalty to a divine order, and *justitia*, she will work out her purpose for mankind and bring in a golden age. If man goes about his labor in reverent performance of his duty to the gods, he will find that in spite of all its sorrows, hardships, and failures, his lot has been cast on a land that is the Lord's and the fullness thereof. But Virgil also was burdened by the sin of his age and hoped for redemption from it. So much was his mind felt to be Christian by nature that St. Augustine held him to be a prophet of the Gentiles, and Dante approaching Virgil with reverence took him as his guide in everything but supreme religious truth.

Turning now to the Middle Ages: it is obvious that the most marvelous and original creation of architecture after

¹ Blomfield, *Legacy of Greece*, 404f.

the days of Greece and Rome was that of the Gothic cathedrals of France and England, beginning about the time of the earlier Renaissance in the eleventh or twelfth century, and coming to its height in those that followed. In the guilds of workmen there was glad freedom as they brought by their chisel out of the stone their own imaginings, and in unison fulfilled the one great purpose of erecting a glorious temple worthy of Him who inhabiteth eternity and yet stooped to redeem the children of men.

We cannot linger upon the wonderful accomplishment of the Roman Church in subduing the pagan nations of central and northern Europe, and by its authority imposing upon their minds a sense of order, teaching that the moral law and that of nature are both of Divine origin. As we shall see this far-reaching principle, no less than its architecture, has greatly influenced our modern culture.

The Renaissance was the Age of Invention and Discovery, and it has often been emphasized as also a revolt from authority, especially that of religion. But this may be overdone. That there was a revolt from authority is shown by the Reformation itself; in fact a new era in history begins with the assertion by the individual of his right to approach God himself and to realize himself in response to the dictates of his own conscience; this conviction also found expression in national life. But the rise of the liberal spirit of Humanism was the most potent element in what is called the Renaissance. In one aspect it was a reassertion of the spirit which in paganism had gone forth to explore with zest and to find joy in the present world. That this spirit, however, was not incompatible with religion is shown by the fact that among its leaders were Petrarch, Vittorino, Pico della Mirandola, Erasmus, Michelangelo, Raphael, and Leonardo da Vinci. These words of Professor Jebb,

70 Making of the Complete Citizen

himself one of the greatest of modern humanists, set forth the spirit of the Renaissance: "After centuries of intellectual poverty, men entered once more into possession of the poetry and the eloquence, the wisdom and the wit, bequeathed by ancient Greece and Rome. The period of this revival was one in which the general tone of morality was low; and cynicism, bred partly of abuses in the Church, had well nigh paralyzed the restraining power of religion. Some of the humanists were pagans, not as Seneca was but as Petronius Arbiter; and, far from suffering in public esteem, enjoyed the applause of princes and prelates. Not a little that was odious or shameful occasionally marked their conduct and disfigured their writings. But it is hardly needful to observe that such exponents of humanism were in no way representative of its essence, or even of its inevitable conditions in a corrupt age. . . . The German mind, earnest and intellectually practical, had not the Italian's delight in beauty of literary style and form, still less his instinctive sympathy with the pagan spirit. . . . The first period of humanism in Germany presents a strongly marked character of its own, wholly different from the Italian. So far as concerns the main current of intellectual and literary interests, the German Renaissance is the Reformation."¹

No further evidence is needed in respect of the British attitude towards the Renaissance than the mention of the names of Colet, Sir Thomas More, Spenser, Milton, and George Buchanan. Religious freedom was breaking through the crust of ecclesiasticism, an adventurous spirit quickening what it touched with new life.

In our present world the remark is often made that by the process of enlightenment religion is gradually lessening

¹ *Cambridge Modern History*, I, 568.

as an influence on the culture of the time. That is a statement which may be supported or challenged with a good deal of confidence on either side. One indubitable fact is that there is a far more widespread apprehension than formerly of the distinction between religion and the institutions that promote it; also between religion and the traditions and doctrines which have been regarded as essential to its expression. Scientific hypotheses and methods are the most active constituent elements in the "intellectual climate" of today, and these the modern man breathes into his system, as his father absorbed other theories, dogmas, and methods from the circumambient medium of his day. This climate, however, has affected other forms of culture than religion. No idea has captivated the modern mind more completely than that of scientific research. Universities have been transformed by the application of scientific method. The sciences have been given the place of primacy; when psychology in the name of science makes wide claims, philosophy, that ancient mistress, is almost put on her defence; as for the humanities they need apologists; theology appears to many to be an antique. Consequently the generation who have been so completely exposed to the atmosphere of science, and who breathe the optimism of discovery, have unconsciously assumed, in an uncritical frame of mind, that her methods and results are universally valid. But this self-confidence is on the wane, and while science has brought her critical method to bear upon religion, as upon every other domain, the result has been to clarify rather than to destroy. As Höffding, the Danish philosopher, said: "The religious consciousness is always inclined to drag about with it traditions which have neither religious, intellectual, nor ethical significance, dead values which no human being can really experience, but which it does not dare

72 Making of the Complete Citizen

to throw away, lest in their fall they should tear away something more with them." By the application of the valid method of scientific enquiry the religious consciousness has become more untrammelled. That in the educated world the nature of religion has become better understood intellectually can hardly be doubted; whether among average people religion is as powerful a motive as ever in conduct is a question which it is more difficult to answer, perhaps indeed it is unanswerable. The churches certainly have a strong hold upon all classes of society in the English-speaking world, and, in spite of the usual recurrent lamentations within and without, they do not seem to have lost their vitality. It is therefore important to consider briefly what the Church does for the making of the complete citizen.

Just as the spirit of science, of beauty, of learning is embodied in institutions which propagate it and afford opportunities for fellowship among those in whom the relevant spirit is a controlling influence, so the Church in principle is the universal fellowship of those who accept the Christian faith. But this is an ideal which has never been realized. Since the disruption of the sixteenth century, which we call the Reformation, the ideal has been less visible than before. After that time national churches arose, but disintegration went further as in almost all countries dissent appeared, and now in most European countries the divorce between Church and State has become so absolute that recognition has been refused by the State to any Church as being national. In a few cases even public worship has been either disallowed or supervised, on the ground that the Church had been exercising inconvenient political influence. But in general, states have come to realize the difference between the Church as an institution, which if it interferes in political affairs does so illegitimately, and as a society of

the faithful who may practise their religion in worship or fellowship. Almost universally it is accepted in western civilization that the individual citizen or group of citizens must have freedom for the exercise of religion. The State cannot justifiably lay claim to control all the activities of its citizens. There is a wide field besides religion in which it should not exercise jurisdiction, and into which it can only enter if it has reason to believe that the practice of the activities, promoted by the relevant societies, thwarts the end of the State, which is to regulate the community in such orderly fashion as to guarantee the citizen reasonable freedom to work out his own salvation, material, intellectual, moral, and spiritual.

Churches then are to be taken into account as one of the independent factors in the creation of the character of the citizen. But they are neither inclusive of all who have religious faith, nor are they solely religious associations. There are some devoutly religious persons who belong to no church; on the other hand many members of churches take no active part in them, just as many citizens do not, more is the pity, evince enough interest in the State to vote. Even for those, however, who become interested members of it, a church does more than provide a means of satisfying their devotional aspirations; it surrounds them also with an atmosphere in which their lives are unconsciously fashioned to traditional forms of conduct and thought. Inherited ideas are woven almost inextricably into faith; buildings and worship mould the aesthetic judgment; methods of conduct and moral opinions reproduce generation after generation a society like-minded in its outlook on life, against the authority of which it is very difficult for the average individual to assert himself. This is especially marked in such an historic institution as the Church of

74 Making of the Complete Citizen

England. It transmits a boundless store of conservative tradition, in which approximately half the nation has received its impression as it has moved within it from the days of childhood, and as a dominant social influence it has created an *ethos* distinctive of itself. It is very easy in England to distinguish the Anglican type of citizen from the Nonconformist. It is not that they differ in their fundamental religious beliefs; in respect of these large sections of both types are not far apart: but the individuals move in different circles of society in which different outlooks on life open on different ways of conduct. In politics the Anglican is as a rule conservative, the Nonconformist liberal, radical, or labor; in morals the code of the Anglican is a well defined "good form"; that of dissent with a puritan tradition was once called "the Nonconformist conscience." Essential Christian principles are so differently emphasized in both that they often issue in antagonisms. Also on this continent similar results prevail. Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics differ greatly in thought and conduct. There is no universal ethical opinion pervading all the ranks and classes of the churches. They do not speak with one voice. During the decades that preceded the Civil War in the United States, the clergy of the South were able to furnish arguments out of Scripture for the defence of slavery in support of the slave-owners with whom they associated, and of a system on which they thought the welfare of their society depended. In the exercise of private judgment it has never been difficult to justify practices and beliefs out of Holy Writ. Conservative clergy will continue to preach quiescence and acceptance of the *status quo*; liberal clergy will advise a gradual modification of hampering conditions; radical clergy will urge drastic and speedy reforms. On the relations of capital and

labor, prohibition, divorce there is no unison in theory or practice among the churches of America. Further, even in this democracy membership in churches, except in so far as it has been derived from those who brought their divisions from Britain or Europe into this country, is in general the mark of membership also in a certain grade or clique of society.

But in spite of these obvious differences the Churches have inculcated in the citizen who belongs to them some powerful regulative principles. In the first place they have insisted that morality has a divine sanction, and they have transmitted the core of that morality from its Christian beginnings. Indeed it was of earlier origin. Christian morality took into itself the Hebrew conception of a Deity with an ethical personality whose will was announced in the Decalogue, and claimed that his new law was fulfilled in the Sermon on the Mount. As the primitive Church spread into the Gentile cities it was largely recruited from the proselytes, who had found in the Jewish synagogues, scattered over the civilized world, a purer faith and a more satisfying morality than was offered by contemporary religions. But they brought with them their own best ideals and practice, which were the generally accepted standard of western civilization, moulded by the widespread Stoic doctrine. In principle this ethic was not dissimilar to the Jewish, being based however on natural law instead of revelation. But multitudes of the finest people of that old world discovered in the Christian Church a richer morality and an intenser hope. By the end of the Apostolic Age the young Church had almost codified the spiritual teaching of Jesus, especially as set forth in the Sermon on the Mount, into their new Law, and gave it a still higher sanction than the natural law or the Decalogue, thus fixing it indelibly

76 Making of the Complete Citizen

in the conscience of Christendom. Where the modern Churches differ is in the application of that law, not in their regard for the principles of the law. This creation by the Church in western civilization of a moral mind recognizing divine sanction for an order of life, which in the large appeals to the average man, has been a great accomplishment.

Again, the Church has from the earliest days inculcated respect for Government. This well known verse in the Epistle to the Romans has been of profound significance: "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God." Also early Christian practice was thus authoritatively enjoined in the first epistle of Peter: "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the King." It has often caused no little perplexity to reformers that the apostles accepted with submission both the government and the many social evils of their day, that they kept free from political controversy, and were silent on such practices as slavery, infanticide, and many forms of injustice and oppression. Two remarks may be made in regard to this: first, they believed that the end of the world was at hand, and that their small communities should withdraw from it, attracting to themselves only those who would listen to their message regarding Christ and the Kingdom of God; second, they were conscious of their own political feebleness and social negligibility, living as they did under a government "of relentless spirit and iron hand prepared at any moment to crush or to crucify." This attitude changed as time went on and the Church grew in power, but to this day there is great diversity of opinion in any one church as to how far it should openly espouse definite social causes. In certain crises men under the conviction

of religion have overthrown governments, but nearly always they have made the claim in doing so that they were fighting for freedom of conscience to worship God according to its dictates. Instead of creating a spirit of revolution and sapping the foundations of government, these militant Christians held that their opponents by their tyranny and injustice were themselves the subverters of the only foundation on which solid government could be established, namely the Divine moral law. In spite, however, of the divergent political tempers of the various churches, it may be confidently affirmed that they have promoted stability in government and that their members have made good citizens.

A third principle which the Churches have inculcated in their members is, that man and his world are part of a Divine purpose which is more or less intelligible to him. They supply a certain philosophy of life. That it is based on the conception of the revelation of a supernatural order does not invalidate the claim. In the noble philosophy of Thomas Aquinas, which is now dominant in the Church of Rome, its members have been provided with one of the great systems of human thought which will continue to cast a spell over many powerful minds. The non-Roman churches also have their systems of thought in their theologies, which are really attempts to construct philosophies of religion. In the past more than now these doctrines were preached in sermons, and the theological system was incorporated into a creed which was held to be the essential interpretation of the Gospel. Like the Roman these systems were thoroughly coordinated, but unlike the Roman these were believed to be deduced wholly from the Scriptures.

Protestantism, however, is facing greater difficulties than Rome, because the advance of scholarship and the introduc-

78 Making of the Complete Citizen

tion of the historic method have shown that not a few of the theological dogmas were infiltrated into Christianity from the religions and philosophies which surrounded it from its birth; and those who are called "modernists" regard the creeds as periodic and only partially satisfactory endeavors to give formal expression to fundamental religious faith. Strongly opposed to the modernists are those popularly called "fundamentalists." They deny the right of human reason to set to work uncontrolledly upon divinely revealed truth, and they accept the transmitted dogmas as being so interwoven with the faith that the one is inextricable from the other. They hold the bridge so strongly that no crossing is allowed into the true fold for one whom they think to be little better than an unbeliever. In spite, however, of the profound differences between Roman and Protestant, Modernist and Fundamentalist, all the Churches have imbued their respective members with the conviction that a Divine purpose is working out in the universe and the world of men. And this is another great accomplishment; for history shows how scepticism as to the existence of such a purpose leads to pessimism, and how the warring whims and passions of a pantheon create chaos in the thought and conduct of those to whom they are a reality.

As a result, therefore, of the differences between the Churches, and of the fact that so many citizens neither belong to them nor hold their doctrines, there cannot be taught in the schools supported by the State any such doctrines as would seem to favor one Church or group of Churches. The public school system is a balanced arrangement whereby, in order to secure the great common good of elementary and also more advanced education, it has become necessary to eliminate from the provided instruction whatever would

excite strong feelings in any section of the community. The task of the public teacher of today has increased in difficulty because society is no longer homogeneous. The majority of people live in great cities, and both in these and in the country the population is drawn from diverse grades of society and equally diverse religions or none. To promote unity in such composite groups with such mutually unsympathetic backgrounds is extraordinarily difficult. Controversy and prejudice are so easily aroused by the social, doctrinal, or ecclesiastical accretions of religion that safety for the common school depends upon avoiding them. On the other hand, in very many communities the majority of citizens believe that to deprive their children of all religious influence in the day-school, is to send them into the world with a narrow and motiveless education. Possibly this class is increasing, and if so the common school may meet a new problem. Some, realizing that the important factor is not the form of words in which "religious knowledge" is taught, but the character of the teacher to whom the child is exposed, will use their influence to see that great care is taken in choosing the teacher, and then in allowing liberty to train the spiritual aspiration of the child towards the highest ideals of conduct. But there are many who hesitate to entrust their children to the common school because in it, they fear, the commingled diversities obliterate those cultural and religious standards which they hold to be supreme. Therefore, if their means permit, they send their children to private schools in which the atmosphere and educational purpose are influenced by religious ideals. How far this separatist movement is social, and how far religious, it is hard to decide; but if our system of public education is to fulfill its purpose without impoverishment, a spirit of concession ought to prevail towards those who feel strongly

80 Making of the Complete Citizen

that their children should not be exposed to complete secularization.

In the colleges and universities conditions are different. In so far as in them religious beliefs are subjected to disintegration, this is due not to a frontal attack upon the Scriptures or Church doctrine, but to the undermining by philosophy, psychology, biology, or archaeology of the bases on which the creeds have been constructed. This fact devolves upon the professor the responsibility of securing for immature minds fair treatment. Academic freedom being assumed as a postulate, and the integrity of education as essential, the teacher must have regard for the convictions of others as well as his own. Considerateness in approach and modesty in statement are qualities to be expected in one who is aware that hypotheses are provisional, and that history taught in a prejudiced spirit may pervert the mind as effectively as false dogma. If this attitude prevails in our universities, it should not be long until in the more tolerant communities it will be quite feasible to include in universities, as courses of study and investigation, the most incomparable and influential of all literatures, those of the Old and New Testaments. If I am not greatly mistaken the day of the educational rebel is past, because so much against which he rebelled is no longer potent; in any case his place is not the professor's chair. That should be the seat of calm judgment and tolerant views, not of propaganda.

But the hand of the Churches must not be reached out behind the politician to stop the mouth of the teacher. If at this behest the politician prohibits some form of teaching, he simply induces the State to say, not that the teaching is untrue, for the State is incompetent to pass such a judgment, but that it is politically inexpedient. When this is done

to please the Churches religion is wounded by its professed friends. How often like cave-dwellers these have been not only contented to live in the twilight of faith, but have clutched at the skirts of the men of vision when they called to their fellows to venture forth with them into the fuller light of the opening day.

Great though the contribution made by the institutions of religion to civilization has been, religion itself is at once broader than these institutions, and is a more intimate and enduring factor in the formation of character on which genuine culture rests. The heart of religion is its faith. This is a conviction in the depths of a man's being that his life has been set in a sphere in which the Sovereign Good is working out His purpose; therefore he endeavors to find permanent values in his present experience, baffled indeed very often but never losing his serene belief that the search is not futile. In his religious hope he is in the line of those noble souls who have believed that there is something best of all to acquire. All sorts of alluring values—wealth, health, comfort, social position—have been and are pursued by average men; but round about the highest Good they flicker and perish. Even the scholar's learning, the knowledge of the man of science, the emotion of the artist, have never been accepted by philosophers as the final Good. These are but anticipations of the abiding and the supreme. Something more enduring and universal must be found. The essence of the Christian religion is that essential Love is enthroned as the primal and sovereign motive power of all Being, and that the Supreme Good is to be found in a Realm, partially existent upon earth, but to be revealed fully hereafter, in which truth, beauty, and goodness will be made progressively manifest in the fuller unveiling of the Divine: also that an invisible Artist of matchless skill

82 Making of the Complete Citizen

is etching in patiently, now here now there, through a life-time His unique purpose for each individual, and fitting him to realize his perfect personality as a citizen of an eternal Commonwealth.

ROBERT A. FALCONER



