

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-1-1929

### The Idea of God in 20th Century Philosophy

Frederick C. Stein

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir\_steinf@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Stein, Frederick C., "The Idea of God in 20th Century Philosophy" (1929). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 724.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/724>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

B. D. Thesis  
Concordia Seminary  
Saint Louis, Missouri  
May 1st, 1929

<sup>Stein</sup>  
Frederick C. Stein

The Idea of God  
in  
20th Century Philosophy

While the criticism of contemporary thought makes one attempt to analyze underlying concepts and premises, there is evidence of insouciance and intelligent reacting for the purpose of setting forth the analysis of the enemy.

Passed.

*P. G. Gaudin*

Read & approved.

K.

The Idea of God in 20th Century Philosophy.

What a hodge-podge! What god-makers our 20th century philosophers are! When revealed religion is condemned to the rubbish heap and modern philosophers<sup>philos</sup> rely solely upon their intellect, senses, experiences, nature, etc., what unimaginable and oftentimes <sup>in</sup>unintelligible ideas of God do they not create for themselves. We are inclined to exclaim with Pyrrho, who lived 365 before <sup>the</sup> the time of Christ or twenty years after the birth of Aristotle, "There are no two schools of philosophy that agree upon the essential problems. Speculation brings us only trouble and uncertainty and involves us in endless contradiction. Abandon barren speculation and - instead of the suggestion of Pyrrho to obey the laws of nature - let us study the revealed word of God, which is not speculative but positive, affording the greatest comfort and peace of mind to those<sup>who study</sup> its "glad tidings" in the proper spirit.

What an impossible task it would be to harmonize the conceptions of modern philosophers! How manifold are their gods, and how different their descriptions of them. It is true, modern philosophers agree in certain <sup>points</sup> points, but it seems that before one can hope to be recognized as a real "philosopher" one must have conceived of an idea of life or God that is at least partially original<sup>or disagrees with what has been</sup> propounded before. To believe what another philosopher has said, and <sup>and</sup> to subscribe to all of his views, brings with <sup>it</sup> very little recognition in the field of philosophy, since a strict adherence to another's views requires <sup>faith</sup> faith to which philosophy is fundamentally opposed, so in order to be considered a philosopher of note, one must think for oneself and under no circumstances <sup>ac-</sup>cept blindly what another has said. The more original a man's ideas and the more opposed they are to traditional ideas, so much more of an opportunity <sup>has</sup> he for becoming recognized as a great philosopher.

PRITZLAFF MEMORIAL LIBRARY  
CONCORDIA SEMINARY  
ST. LOUIS, MO.

A few good definitions of what we commonly understand as philosophy, will make it clear why all the modern ideas of God are in some points at variance

A portion of Wm. K. Wright's, "Students' Philosophy of Religion" (P.2) <sup>will</sup>

help us to better understand the definitions that follow: " The purpose of <sup>this</sup> book will be to help the reader think out his philosophy for himself. While the author will always conclude by giving his own opinions, the reader <sup>should</sup> never accept any of them, unless, after criticizing them in every way he <sup>can</sup>, they appear to him more reasonable to him than any alternative opinions <sup>that</sup> occur to him. No educated person can ever acquire any beliefs on the subject of religion that will be of the slightest benefit in his own life or that will increase his effectiveness as a member of society until he has thought them out for himself and made them his very own." This puts a rather single-minded interpretation on the seeming all-embracing, universal, truth-seeking definition which follow:

Weber and Perry, 1925: "Philosophy is the search for a comprehensive view of nature, an attempt at a universal explanation of things. In philosophy <sup>the</sup> human mind endeavors to rise beyond such groups and their particular laws <sup>and</sup> to explain the world as a whole, or the universal fact or phenomenon, by <sup>the</sup> cause of the causes, or the first cause. In other words it attempts to answer the question, Why does this world exist, and how does it happen to be what it is."

The Standard Dictionary: "Philosophy: Etymologically, the love of wisdom as leading to the search for ~~it~~ it; hence the resulting knowledge of general principles, elements, powers, or causes, and laws - as explaining facts and existences. In popular usage: The general principles, laws, and causes that furnish the rational explanation of anything; the rationale by which the facts of any region of knowledge ~~of knowledge~~ are explained. H.B. Smith: "Philosophy is the product of human thought, acting upon the data given by the world <sup>with</sup> out or the world within and eliciting from these data principles, laws, and <sup>y</sup> systems."

Will Durant, 1926: " Philosophy is a hypothetical interpretation of the unknown ( as in metaphysics) or of the ~~in~~ factly known ( as in ethics or political philosophy); it is the front trench in the siege of truth. Science is the captured territory, and behind it are those secure regions in which knowledge and art build our imperfect world. Philosophy seems to stand still, perplexed; but only because she leaves the fruits of victory to her daughters, the sciences, and herself passes on, divinely content, to the uncertain and unexplored. The philosopher is not content to describe the fact; he wishes to ascertain its relation to experience in general and thereby to get at its meaning and worth he combines things in interpretative synthesis; he tries to put together, <sup>bet</sup> than before, that great universe-watch which the inquisitive scientist has ~~an~~ analytically taken apart.

Max Carl Otto, "Things and Ideals", 1924: " There is something exhilarating in the attempt of the philosopher to survey all time and all existence and <sup>to</sup> report the result in one all-comprising picture; to take stock of all we know and to house all we know under one intellectual roof. For, taking us as we <sup>are</sup> come, we know so little and so superficially. In so far as the vast majority of us are equipped with anything resembling an outlook upon life and the world, consists of a substratum of superstition about the supernatural, a smattering of social theory, a nest of group prejudices, a few wise saws, a rumor or <sup>tr</sup> from science, a number of slip-shod observations of life. To call this hodge-podge a philosophy, is to take unwarranted liberty with language. No, the <sup>be</sup> that can be said is that, speaking generally, we are spiritually hungry and hanker after cosmic interpretations. It is this lack of philosophy which acc

for the ease with which any philosophic wind sweeps us off our feet." Max Carl Otto's definition seems to be a frank admission of the incompleteness, vagueness, and superficiality of nearly all philosophic speculation concerning the idea of God.

Though the god-images drawn by the modern philosophers are in themselves very often vague and unintelligible, the arguments which these men employ for the existence of their gods are at times very sound and convincing, though not conclusive, and may readily be employed in the rational defense of the Christian conception of God. The suggestion has been made by W.K.Wright, that although no one of the classical arguments for the existence of God is in itself conclusive, still some when taken singly are probable, and all combined establish a decided weight of probability in favor of the doctrine. In order to understand more fully the conceptions advanced by modern philosophers, we had best study a few of the more important arguments which they employ:

The main arguments are: the moral, cosmological, teleological, ontological, idealistic, pragmatic, or those based on religious experience, the "right to believe" argument, the happiness argument, and that of Kant.

J.A. Leighton, in "Religion and Mind of Today", P. 281: "The most powerful argument for the belief in a Supreme Reality which includes, conserves, and transcends the highest spiritual qualities of human personality is to be found precisely in that undying urge of the human spirit, that unquenchable aspiration after a more perfect life, which impels men, notwithstanding their own grievous errors, lamentable failures, and sins, to pursue spiritual self-fulfillment. The constant struggle of man for a harmonious spiritual content of life, for the possession and enjoyment of beauty, truth, and reality, goodness, and the transformation of their beings by these things, is the best witness to God. The divine in man implies a more divine in the universe. It is in man's vocation as a being capable of continuous quest for a more harmonious, deeper, and more comprehensive spiritual life that we find the surest evidence of the reality of God. For it cannot be for those qualities, without the partial achievement of which man is never satisfied and the partial achievement of which only spur him on to more of the same kind, are illusory byproducts of a meaningless and worthless universe! This argument is much akin to the moral arguments which follow:

G.P. Conger, "A Course in Philosophy", P. 450: "The moral argument proceeds by inference from an unavoidable or unequivocal requirement to the belief in the existence of a Power able to help us fulfill that requirement.

This was the great argument of Kant, that we must postulate the existence of God as the implication of the "categorical imperative": the fact that have un-avoidable duties must bring with it the possibility of our getting help in their fulfillment. One of the objections to this theistic argument is striking; it is that there may be a Power outside of the individual adequate to moral requirement, but that this Power might be human society, and not the God of theists. This gives us the religion of humanity!"

Wm. K. Wright, P. 345ff: "A moral universe implies a God. To be a moral being and to be morally responsible, and so to act in a manner that is either morally praiseworthy or blamable, implies consciousness, reasoning power, choice, and volition. From this analogy it follows that to the extent that this is a moral universe, - that is, a universe aiming at ends which include the development of man as a moral being, - it must be a universe that is guided in its course by a Being that is conscious, that is rational, and that wills the ultimate triumph of what is good. Must we not suppose that there has been a divine Mind immanent in the processes by which the achievements of mankind have been accomplished, and that human interpreters of history, law, art, literature, science, and religion are gaining self-consciousness of the thoughts of this God?"

On page 346: "The consciousness of a duty implies a God. Therefore if moral obligation or duty, really is what it appears to be, a command to absolutely just and holy, to accomplish to the full all our possibilities of service, and to realize all of our capacities to the utmost, it means that man is immortal and that there is a God. In the experience of the call of duty man has a precious assurance of endless life and of divine support. A lazy soul might be discouraged at the prospect of an endless task, and become pessimistic but the more active spirits must rejoice. For the rewards in life come not in the mere having of things or the gaining of goals, but in the joy of work and the consciousness of accomplishment. To the rightminded man, therefore, there is every reason for joy in the consciousness that his task is infinite, and that in that task he is accomplishing the work that God had given him to do."

Cosmological Argument - Leighton, "The cosmological argument is that the existence of an orderly universe implies the Cause or ground of the whole order. Obj: It does, but not in the sense of an extra-mundane cause or divine mechanism."

Conger, P. 442: "The cosmos must have originated in the act of a primal Cause or Agent who brought it into being. Objections: While a thing which is made doubtless requires a maker, a thing which grows does not necessarily a Grower. (Evolution). God and matter existed eternally and God created the cosmos out of the existing matter."

Teleological Argument - Leighton, "The teleological argument is that the adaptation of the various parts of the world implies a purposive designing Intelligence. Objection: The imperfections, wastes, failures, maladaptions, in nature and human life. W.K.Wright, P. 341, "That there is a God of some sort seems almost an inevitable consequence of believing that the world order is purposive in its development. For, wherever we see the evidences of purpose, we are inclined to assume a purposer. If the world is purposive, it seems to imply a world Purposer."

Five teleological in G.P.Conger, P. 444ff, ---1.) "The first type proceeds from what are interpreted as evidences of the adjustments of natural structures and processes to one another to the belief that these structures and processes have been contrived in accordance with the preconceived plan of some Mind. Proof: The stars do not collide; the magnificent spectacle of the stars in their courses must evidence a design, and with this, a Designer. Your body equipped with an eye more wonderful in its structure and adaptations than I

any camera - how then can you suppose that the eye could have appeared as the result of coincidences and not have involved the work of a Designer? Another argument traces the complicated processes of symbiosis and cross-fertilization of certain plants by certain insects to a preconceived design.

No. 2 - The arguments for contrivance pass over easily into the Vitalistic Arguments which proceed from the view that the structures and processes of organisms differ from those of mechanical systems to the belief that some specific life-force is directing or controlling the development of the organisms. The vitalistic arguments in their simplest forms call attention to the things which an organism can do and a machine cannot do - like seeking its food, repairing its losses, restoring its lost parts, modifying its actions, reproducing its kind.

No. 3 - Arguments from organic character of reality as a whole. These proceed from the fact of the mutual relations of parts in a whole, whether organism or cosmos, to a statement of these relations in terms of teleology and sometimes of purposeness. Those who like J.S.Haldane, employ this type of argument usually maintain the Aristotelian view that in a living organism the actions of the parts are constantly adapted to the needs of the whole, and hold that where the action of the parts are conditioned by their effects on the whole, we have an organic unity, as is the case in the universe.

No. 4 - The fourth type of argument cites the world's fitness to our purposes and argues from that that we are justified in at least assuming the existence of purposiveness in the universe. Hobhouse argues that what exists must be capable of being harmonized, or else our understanding of experience would not be valid - since we can define our experience in a way to give us rational satisfaction only by defining it in terms of development along definite lines of tendency.

No. 5 - The fifth type of teleological argument we have called the argument from natural selection; they are to the effect that structures and processes of preceding levels, in the cosmos, though not contriving, nor vitalistic, nor mental, have merely in their own natural course constituted the structures and processes which we know, rather than others. This last argument is one based on evolution and, in my estimation carries little or no weight.

Objections by Mechanistic biologists: 1.) Organisms obey the laws of physics and chemistry. 2.) Living organisms have been analysed in terms of physical, chemical, or electrical structures or processes. 3.) Living organisms can be imitated by artificial structures. 4.) results of certain experiments in artificial fertilization. J. Loeb has shown that the unfertilized eggs of sea-urchins can be made to produce a new generation by physical means (puncturing the egg-membrane) or by chemical means (altering the composition of the water), without the action of the male. They must admit that authentic and accepted results in this field are only fragmentary, and they themselves say, Certain possible beginnings have been made, and certain steps which are possibly intermediate have been taken in the way of a synthesis of living organisms from non-living compounds.

Teleological arguments are also criticized from the standpoint of Pessimism with its estimates of the evils found in the world. These evils sometimes seem so monstrous that, even if one thinks that the world is to be traced to the agency of personal forces, it appears that those forces are reckless or incompetent.

The Ontological Argument - Leighton - "The ontological argument is that the idea of a Perfect Being necessarily implies the existence of such a being, since to add existence to all other attributes of an idea is to increase its perfection; and therefore the idea of God minus existence is not

the idea of a perfect being. Objection- This argument does not prove the existence of a loving, a good, or even an intelligent Supreme Being, but the existence and continuance of the imperfect with its ascent (aspiring) towards a greater measure of perfection, does imply a Perfect Reality of some sort which realizes itself by self-expression in the successive gradations of the imperfect. Conger P. 443 - "Anselm said, 'I have an idea of a Being than whom none greater can be conceived, But a Being which exists is greater than one which does not exist; therefore the Being which I conceive must exist,'"

Idealistic Arguments - Mentalism - W.K.Wright, P. 350, "Since we all experience a common world, composed of the same objects, the same Mind must be the common cause of all our ideas of the external world. The so-called uniformity of nature is the regular manner in which God imparts the same ideas under the same conditions. There is no matter; what we call matter is the system of ideas which God imparts to all of us in a uniform way. As separate individuals you and I never perceive any of the contents of each other's minds; we can only perceive each other's bodies. We can never get inside each other's mind's at all. Yet we do communicate; we are able to disagree, and if we are fairly reasonable and good-natured folk, we can sometimes even agree with each other. Consequently it must be that in reality are minds are not sundered as in appearance they seem to be. In reality we share, however imperfectly, in the mind of God. The assumption of God is therefore necessary in order to explain the possibility of common knowledge on the part of different individuals. The conception of God is also necessary to account for mutual sympathy and understanding for common recognition of standards of goodness, truth, and beauty, and for united effort in the formation and realization of common ideals."

Speculative Idealism - "The meaning of earthly environment cannot be understood apart from man. Man is organic to the world; through man the world reasons, appreciates its values of beauty and morality, and other of its meanings, and so comes to consciousness of itself. To be a speculative philosopher one must ask why things are, what are they for, and what is their meaning, their value, and their significance. Speculative philosophy is a coherent whole, and the truth of each detail in the system is seen in the light of the system in its entirety. To know anything thoroughly is to see it in its relation to Reality as a whole, which includes God. The position is well expressed in Tennyson's lines:

" Flower in the crannied wall,  
I pluck you out of the crannies,  
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,  
Little flower - but if I could understand  
What you are, root and all, and all in all,  
I should know what God and man is."

Pragmatic Arguments - W.K.Wright, P. 355, "The method of investigation is, that any idea, belief, theory, hypothesis or doctrine should be tested by the practical consequences that follow from accepting it and acting upon it. If it gives men more pleasant emotions to believe that there is a God, why there is one. James does not go this far. His pragmatic argument is based upon the fact that the acceptance of God leads to desirable consequences in the life of the individual. Such a belief leads to the quickening of human powers and furthers their development. Other beliefs as to the nature of the universe, such as atheistic materialism and the sort of Pantheism that makes God indifferent to distinction between good and evil, weaken man's resolution. There can be no question that the belief in the right sort of a God stimulates man to his best.

The Right to Believe Argument, Faith, P. 364- Is very similar to the foregoing. "If a man believes that the weight of evidence, considered rationally, and without regard to his preferences or prejudices in the matter, is in



favor of a God, but is not absolutely conclusive, has he a right to believe in God? ----- He certainly has this right. What man or woman ever married, who was absolutely certain that the marriage would prove a happy one? Who ever made a fortune who did not run some risk of losses in his investments? What successful business house could go thru a day's transactions without running risks of making some mistakes and possibly serious ones? How often in the history of science itself men have walked by faith, have believed in and have devoted a large part of their whole lives to investigations based upon hypothesis of which they were not absolutely certain? And it can be as right to act in religion as in other fields where momentous decisions have been made upon probable but not conclusive evidence. ----- If the evidence in favor of God seems reasonably probable, and if man knows that the acceptance of this belief, and acting upon it, will enable him to be a better man, to achieve a nobler life for himself, and to be of more service to others, than would otherwise be possible, is it not his duty to believe? Is it right for a man to refuse the enrichment that might come to his life through consecration to God, and the aid he may be able to give others and receive from them by participating in the public worship of the church or synagogue in which he has been brought up, or which for other reasons he finds will be of most service to him, or in which he can be of most service to others?

The Happiness Argument - Although few persons probably think that the considerations of one's personal happiness should serve as the sole standard of duty, almost everyone believes that those who do their duty in life, as faithfully as they can, deserve to be happy. However, no one needs wide experience to be aware that virtuous people often suffer unmerited misfortune of all kinds, while wicked often undeservedly prosper. It is accordingly urged that there must be a future existence in which the wrongs of this world are righted, and virtue and vice receive their deserts. Moreover, as there is no inevitable necessity that connects the attainment of virtue with happiness in this life, the mere continuation of these in another life would not guarantee the ultimate fulfillment of justice. Consequently there must be a God who as Judge, by an act of arbitrary volition ultimately will effect a union between <sup>virtue</sup> and happiness.

Argument Based on Religious Experience - When we consider the great voice of testimony to the experience of God that has come down through the ages from men of every race, nation, and religion, and when we consider the multitude of people in every walk of life today who feel comforted and sustained by the presence of God, can we regard this evidence as negligible? (W.K.Wright P. 344) To many of us no doubt the empirical argument appears strongest when someone whom we personally know and revere - some good man or woman the strength and helpfulness of whose personal character has been a source of moral benefit to us and to others, - tells us ( or better, does not need tell us) that the experience of God has been the support of his or her life. Everyone has known such people and profoundly respected them, and considered it a privilege to have come within their influence. Stronger than any reasoned argument, will appear to many the evidence that such lives afford. It cannot be that these people have been deluded - that the God who has been the inspiration of their lives, and thru their lives, of ours - is merely a product of their imagination.

Arguments Against Belief in God - P. 361 (Wright) Holbach, "If there really were a God, we have no doubt upon the subject at all. Such a Being as God is thought to be, all wise and powerful, who expects men to believe in Him, would certainly have made Himself known to men in some absolutely unmistakable manner, and not merely by the mode of improbable miracles and revelations which are unconvincing to the most thoughtful of men. If God exists, why has He not declared Himself? Kant's answer to this question, is a consequence of his doctrine.

that the main value of human life is good will, that is, character and fidelity to duty. If men knew the existence of God beyond question, they would automatically do what he requires, as mere puppets, out of fear of Him, and they could develop no regard for duty and character for their own sakes. Expressed a little differently, we might say that probably the main reason for the existence of mankind is the expression in finite beings of character, and that this is better secured by faith in a Supreme Being than by certain knowledge of Him. (Atheism)

Agnosticism - does not deny that there is a God; it merely denies our ability to find out whether there is one. Herbert Spencer, First Principles: All human knowledge is relative. The ultimate scientific conceptions, such as space, time, cause, effect, matter, and motion, are all relative to the human point of view, and full of contradiction if taken in any absolute sense. Ultimate religious ideas are unattainable. There are only three ways of explaining the world, - atheism, pantheism, and theism. If, with atheism, we suppose that the universe is self-existent, we have explained nothing about its nature. If, with pantheism, we believe that the universe is self-creative, we are unable to state the character of this creation; we have explained nothing. If, with theism, we believe that the universe was created by an external agency, we find ourselves unable to explain where the materials came from that were used by the Creator; not how the Creator himself came into existence. The ultimate ground of all existence is therefore Unknown and Unknowable.

The Eternal Existence of God, by Leander Keyser, in "Problem of Origins" "Who made God? There is something now, for the universe is here and we are here. Since there is something now, there must have always been something; for if there ever was a time when there was nothing, nothing could have ever been. "Ex nihilo nihil fit". Therefore there must be some ultimate reality that has always existed. (P. 28) If the cosmos were an eternally unfolding one, it should have reached its present state long ago; because it had eternity in which to develop. But since it has reached only its present imperfect stage of development, that fact is prima facie evidence that it had a beginning in time. Therefore it must have been created by some Being who never had a beginning - God.

Now that we have heard the most important arguments employed by modern philosophers, we shall be better able, if at all, to understand the conclusions at which they arrive in their natural, rational, and unscriptural search for God.

To a Christian the term "Philosophy" is about as repugnant as the label "poison" on any bottle of liquid, and there is a good reason for this aversion. Philosophy itself is no greater a menace to Christianity than Buddhism, Mohammedanism, or any other divergent beliefs, but the attempt of modern philosophers to introduce their theories under the guise of Christianity, is most destructive to Christian fundamental truths, and has resulted in Modern Religious Liberalism which threatens to rob Christianity of its very essence. This practise is a counterfeiting of Philosophy as well as the Christian religion, and should be most distasteful to all intelligent and honest-thinking men.

The Modern Religious Liberalism, which is a result of an attempt to harmonize philosophy and the teachings of Christian religion, is described by Dr. Arthur Sachs, a Jewish <sup>prof.</sup> at the university of Breslau, in the following manner: "Every liberalistic religion carries in its bosom the germ of death. A religion without dogma is a creature of the imagination which under no <sup>circumstances</sup> is able to give to the individual man, much less to the human <sup>family</sup>, the necessary anchor-hold in this life and the hope for perfection in the beyond. At the moment it becomes "liberal", it begins to degrade into a mere philosophy. No system of philosophy has yet been able to satisfy the <sup>supernatural</sup> longings of man, and we may confidently prophesy that philosophy will always fail in this respect, for very philosophy originates in the human brain, while religion represents a gracious, divine revelation. The liberalist <sup>attempt</sup> to solve the problem between Christianity and modern culture. Admitting that scientific objections may arise against the particularities of the Christian religion - against the Christian doctrines of the person of Christ, and of redemption thru His death and resurrection - the liberalist seeks to rescue certain general principles of religion, of which these peculiarities are <sup>thought</sup> to be ~~more~~ temporary symbols, and these general principles he regards as "the essence of Christianity". The liberal attempt at reconciling Christianity <sup>with</sup> modern science has really extinguished everything distinctive of Christianity, so that what remains is in essentials only that same indefinite type of religious aspiration or philosophic speculation which has always existed outside of Christianity.

Whenever such theories are attempted I ~~will~~ <sup>shall</sup> endeavor to disprove them on the grounds of Scripture; but whenever a philosopher does not attempt to harmonize his theories with those of the Bible, as the case usually is, I <sup>shall</sup> merely present them for their face value. Horsch, in his Modern Religious Liberalism, says, "The most striking thing about philosophy is the variety of <sup>opinion</sup> among its representatives, or, in other words, the unreliability of their <sup>con-</sup> ~~con-~~ <sup>clusions</sup> ~~con-~~ <sup>clusions</sup>

Leslie Stephen says, " State any proposition in which all philosophes

agree, and I will admit it to be true; or anyone that has a manifest <sup>ance</sup> balance of authority, and I will agree that it is probable. But so long as every philosopher flatly contradicts the principles of his predecessors, why effect certainty? Philosophy cannot take the place of Scriptures as the <sup>basis</sup> basis for the Christian faith. Scripture, being divinely inspired, is the only true basis for theology.

My theme, "The idea of God in 20th Century Philosophy", is an attempt to collect the various ideas of God propounded by those men who are regarded as the greatest thinkers in the modern philosophic world. I shall pause a moment at the threshold of the 20th century and briefly review the conceptions of such men as Nietzsche, Haeckel, and Spencer, and continue from the year 1900 on till the present day, ordering my material according to the <sup>date</sup> date of appearance of the various publications from which the following quotations have been taken:

Friedrich W. Nietzsche, 1844-1900, Uncompromising foe of Christianity.

"The Twilight of the Idols", P.142: "The Christian concept of God - God as the deity of the sick, God as a spider, God as a spirit - is one of the most corrupt concepts of God that has ever been attained on earth. Maybe it represents the low water mark in the revolutionary ebb of the godlike type. God degenerated into the contradiction of life, instead of being its transfiguration and eternal Yea. With God war is declared on life, nature, and the will to live. God is the formula for every calumny of this world and for every lie concerning a beyond. In God nonentity is deified, and the will to nonentity is declared holy."

"Human - All too Human": What thinker still needs the hypothesis of a God? No religion, direct or indirect, either as a dogma or as an allegory, has contained a truth! "Antichrist", P. 185: The doctrine of immortality is the great lie". Ibid., No. 38- "It is indecent nowadays to be a Christian". Ibid. No. 62\* "Christianity is the one great curse, the one enormous and innermost perversion, the one great instinct of revenge, for which no means are too venomous, too underhand, too underground, and too petty ----- the one immortal blemish of mankind."

"Thus Spake Zarathustra", p. 108 and 419, "Dead are all Gods; now we <sup>will</sup> that superman live. Man is something that shall be surpassed. I teach you <sup>super</sup> man. What have ye done to surpass man? What is great in man that he is a <sup>bridge</sup> and not a goal? What can be loved in man is that he is a transition and a <sup>destruction</sup>. Love unto the most remote man is higher than love unto your neighbor. Durant, P. 454- "Nietzsche is not content with having created God in his <sup>own</sup> image; he must make himself immortal. After the superman comes Eternal Recurrence. All things will return in precise detail, and an infinite number of times; even Nietzsche will return."

Nietzsche stands as an example of naked, natural humanity, without <sup>meta-</sup> physical background, without God, immortality, and religion. He is Christianity <sup>its</sup> most determined foe, its bitterest defamer.

Ernst Haeckel, 1834-1919, Represents "the philosophical generalization of science in terms of the conception of evolution", Evolutionary materialism.

"Riddle of the Universe": "The 'monism of the cosmos' which is established on the two basic principles of substance and evolution, proclaims the absolute dominion of 'the great eternal iron laws' thruout the universe. It thus <sup>shatters</sup> at the same time the three central dogmas of the dualistic philosophy - the personality of God, the immortality of the soul and the freedom of the <sup>will</sup>. The emancipated mind will worship nature itself, or 'the Goddess of Truth' <sup>who</sup> dwells in the temple of nature! Haeckel proclaimed this natural religion in

opposition to the other-worldliness and asceticism of Christianity. (Monism of substance)

Herbert Spencer, 1820-1903, Agnostic realism and evolutionary survey of nature and man.

Though he remained a dissenter to the end, in regard to the substance of established religions, he nevertheless recognized a certain disciplinary value in religious beliefs.

"Autobiography", Vol. I, P. 171: "Thus religious creeds which in one way or other occupy the sphere that rational interpretation seeks to occupy and fails and fails the more it seeks, I have come to regard with a sympathy based on community of need." P. 16, Vol II: Truth generally lies in the cordination of antagonistic opinions."

Though Spencer is a skeptic by nature, he proves that the human heart needs religion, which no amount of theoretical insight will ever succeed in banishing.

"First Principles", P. 56: The scientist, more than any other, truly knows that in its ultimate nature nothing can be known. P. 83: On watching our thoughts we see how impossible it is to get rid of the Consciousness of an Actuality lying behind Appearances, and how from this impossibility results an indestructable belief in that Actuality. But what that Actuality is we cannot know. Mind and matter are equally relative phenomena, the double effect of

an ultimate cause whose nature must remain unknown. The recognition of this "Inscrutable Power" is the core of truth in every religion and the beginning of all philosophy."

L. Tolstoy, 1828-1910, "Kingdom of God, What is Art, What is Religion" Complete Works, Vol. XX, P. 317: "No religion ever proclaimed statements so obviously out of agreement with reason and contemporary human knowledge. I believe in God whom I comprehend as Spirit, as Love, as Source of all. I believe that He is in me and I in Him. I believe that the Will of God is the most clearly and comprehensively expressed in the teachings of the man, Christ, - to regard whom as God, and to pray to whom, I deem the greatest sacrilege. I believe that true welfare of man lies in the fulfillment of the Will of God; and that His will consists in men loving each other, and therefore behaving towards others as they desire that others should behave with them. I believe that the meaning of the life of every man, therefore, lies only in the increase of love in himself; that this increase of love leads the individual man in this life toward greater and greater welfare; that after death it gives the greater welfare the more love there be in man; and that, at the same time, more than anything else, it contributes to the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, i.e., to an order of life where the discord, deceit, and violence which now reign will be replaced by free agreement, truth, and brotherly love between men."

William James, 1842-1910, Pragmatism and Pluralism.

Will Durant, P. 560: "Can a philosophy be found that will harmonize both the reliance of people upon their senses and their need for religious belief? James believes that a pluralistic theism affords such a synthesis. He offers a finite God, not an Olympian thunderer sitting aloof on a cloud, "but one helper, primus inter pares, in the midst of all the shapers of the great world's fate." I/bid, P. 298, "The cosmos is not a closed and harmonious system; it is a battle-ground of cross-currents and conflicting purposes; it shows itself with pathetic obviousness, as not a uni- but a multi-verse. Perhaps the ancients were wiser than we, and polytheism may be truer than monotheism to the astonishing diversity of the world. Such polytheism has always been the the real religion of the common people, and is still so today."

H.M. Kallen on James, P. 186: "The gods may be like concepts, consubstantial with percepts, with actual tables and tangible chairs and still be derivative and secondary functions, mere meanings whose significance is in their prophetic outcome, not in their active and individuate being. Indeed the reality of the concept God is just such a functional reality, the reality of a tendency in our private nature, of a "faith-state" rather than a living implement in an independent object, existing by the primacy of its own will and maintaining that existence by its own force. P. 194, Men and gods may be fellow soldiers in a struggle to banish evil from the world, and in this struggle men may help gods perhaps as much as gods help men. P. 519, Varieties of Religious Experience, "Who knows whether the faithfulness of individuals here below to their own poor overbeliefs, may not actually help God in turn to be more effectively faithful to his own greater tasks?"

George H. Howison, 1825-1916, Pluralistic Idealism.

"The Conception of God" P. 113 and "The Limits of Evolution" P. 328: "Nature is the creation of our several personal selves, because we are like-minded and guided by the same rational purpose. This unifying purpose finds its supreme expression in God. As a reality, God is one person among others. Only by recognizing persons other than himself who have rights, and towards whom he

duties, can God be moral person at all. He does not include human individuals within himself, nor does he coerce them, but he acts upon them by attraction (by final or moral causation) as the ideal which they adopt of their own free will. The realm of nature, or the world of sense, also falls outside of God, as being the product of the human mind. So God is not responsible for evil but may be worshipped as the embodiment of perfection. He is the "Supreme Instance in the " eternal circle of Persons", the first "citizen" in the " all-founding all-governing Realm of the Spirit." ( Personal Idealism)

H.G. Wells, "The New Republic" Vol. 1X, P. 234, "Wells tries to supply mankind with a new Trinity and a new God. He offers a finite God. "There is first the Veiled Being, beyond all and above all, "enigmatical and incomprehensible", which "broods over the mirror upon which the busy shapes of life are moving", The Veiled Being does not concern itself about men, and men can have no dealings with it. The out of this inscrutable being comes a lesser being, " as a wave comes rolling to us from beyond the horizon." This is the Will to Be, the Life-Force, the Struggle for Existence. It is a breeding, fighting thing. In it we live as the beasts live. Of it are our passions and desires and fears. But neither of these is God. God is third and least in the celestial triumvirate. " He is spirit...the immortal part and leader of mankind." He is boundless, immortal youth, and thus naturally boundless, immortal courage and boundless immortal love. He is "our friend and brother and the light of the world". After meeting him a man" goes about the world like one who is lonely and has found a lover, like one who was perplexed and has found a solution, " Some day he may even lead the way to the Veiled Being. (Max Carl Otto, Things & Ideals P. 25 - 1908 -

"First and Last Things" P. 65-" Now my most comprehensive belief about the external and internal and myself is that they make one universe in which I and every part are ultimately important. It is quite possible to maintain that everything is a chaotic assembly, that any part might be destroyed without effecting another part. P. 106" It seems to me that the whole living creation may be regarded as walking in the sleep of instinct and individualized illusion, and that now out of it all rises man, beginning to perceive his larger self, his universal brotherhood and a collective synthetic purpose to realize power and beauty. It is only by such images, it is only by the use of what are practically Parables, that I can in anyway express these things in my mind. These two things, I say, are the two aspects of my belief; one is the form and the other the light. The former places me as it were in a scheme, the latter illuminates and inspires me. I am a member in that great Being and my function is, I take it, to develop my capacity for Beauty and convey the perception of it to my fellows, to gather and store experience and increase the racial consciousness. I hazard no why nor wherefores. That is how I see things; that is how the universe in response to my demand for a synthesizing aspect presents itself to me."

E. S. Ames "The psychology of Religious Experience" and "The New Orthodox"

G.P. Conger, P. 430:" Ames thinks that the idea of a personal God is a useful and inspiring one, but, as Leibniz would agree, not an idea to be taken literally. It is, according to Ames, like the idea of "Alma Mater" or "Uncle Sam"; without having literal validity it sums up in in symbolic form a host of purposes and loyalties.

Wm. Windelbrand, Aufsätze und Reden, Philosophy of Values.

Jos. A. Leighton, P. 482 ( Field of Philosophy):" The problem of the status of value in the universe is the problem of the status of humanity or selfhood. The idea of God is that of a supreme reality or spiritual order, in and through which human personality and its values are sustained. God is the cosmical ground of human personality, the overseer, which is the source and goal of all selfhood."

George Bernard Shaw, by Edwin Bjoerkman, 1911, "Is There Anything New under the Sun" P. 178: "As Shaw sees life it is never purposeless, never a matter of chance; it always leads onward, and the direction is determined from within by a universal force, the Life Force - the same as Bergson's *elan vital* which employs whatever has being for its own unformulated aims. What this Life Force demands according to Shaw is merely that we learn to see and act upon the truth that flashed its illumination into Blanco Posnet's heart as he cried: 'There's no good and bad; by Jiminy, gents, there's a rotten game, and there's a great game. I played the rotten game; but the great game was played on me; and now I'm for the great game every time.'"

W.E. Hocking, 1873- ) G.P. Conger P. 144: "Hocking in his "The Meaning of God in Human Experience" (1912) makes some concessions to realism. He offers a reconciliation of idealism and pragmatism - holding, with the latter, that at least "that which does not work is not true", and with the former, that our knowledge of Nature can not be "cleared of selfhood," and is hence a knowledge of another or Other-Mind. This follows for Hocking also from the fact that my knowledge is of objects which other minds know and which thus may be said to have a mental quality. But these objects constitute the world of nature upon which all our minds are dependent in common. Hence Nature must be essentially Other-Mind. Hocking believes that reflective thinking is too narrow to do justice to the meaning of worship. Worship involves a "principle of alternation," passing from fragmentary and partial interests to interest and life in the whole. To get at the real world, then, we must have recourse to an enlightened mysticism. Hocking is also the author of Human Nature and Its Remaking (1918), dealing with problems of ethics in their relations to religion."

Henri Bergson, 1859 - ) Pragmatist, Our intellect has been developed in accordance with practical needs.-

Durant P. 502: "The persistently creative life, of which every individual and every species is an experiment, is what we mean by God; God and Life are one. But this God is finite, not omnipotent, - limited by matter and overcoming its inertia painfully, step by step; and not omniscient, but groping gradually towards knowledge and consciousness and more light. "God, thus defined, has nothing of the ready-made; He is unceasing life, action, freedom. Creation, so conceived, is not a mystery; we experience it in ourselves when we act freely," when we consciously choose our actions and plot out lives! Our struggles and our sufferings, our ambitions and our defeats, our yearnings to be better and stronger than we are, are the voice and current of the *Elan Vital* in us, that vital urge which makes us grow, and transforms this wandering plane into a theatre of unending creation.

H.M. Kallen on Bergson, P. 196, a letter printed by E. Le Roy in "Une philosophie nouvelle" -:" The considerations set forth in my essay on the immediate consciousness are intended to bring to light the fact of liberty; those in Matter and Memory touch on the reality of spirit; those in Creative Evolution present *recreation* as a fact. From all this there clearly emerges the idea of God, creator and free; the generator at once of matter and of life, whose creative efforts as regards life are continued through the evolution of species and the constitution of human personalities." Such a God is totality. The whole universe reveals the force which mounts and falls, and the movement is as from a center, "a center from which worlds shoot out like rockets in a fireworks display." This center is God. God is not a thing but a "continuity of shooting out". "He has nothing of the ready-made, he is unceasing life, action and freedom.

Bernard Bosanquet, 1848-1923, Idealism. He urged the consideration of experience not in fragments, but as a rounded-out, organic whole." The univers



in its concreteness is the one true Individual. Remembering how elements of our experience are everyday transmuted as they pass from the setting of one organized value to another, we may suppose that all experiences together are transmuted in the complete organization of the Absolute Mind. The universe may then be said to be self-directing and self-experiencing. (Conger P. 131)

J. H. Randall, The Culture of Personality, 1912, "Through Man to God" P. 359 and 392: "The path that leads us closest to God is not through nature, but through human nature, not through the lower expression of the creative Power, but thru man, its highest expression. This is the expressed conviction not of a theologian but of a scientist, and a great scientist too, who has been seeking to read the deeper meaning of life and the universe, who has been trying to construe in some real and satisfying terms the Ultimate Reality behind all "appearances". He finds that while the old conceptions of God who governs from the outside are gone forever, that the newer conception of the immanent God, as the Life of our Lives, the soul of the Universe, is not inconsistent with the spiritual conception of personality, and that we may hold in a deeper sense than ever before, that

" Spirit with spirit can meet,  
Closer is He than breathing,  
Nearer than hands and feet."

Josiah Royce, 1855-1916, The chief American idealist.

" The Religious Aspect of Philosophy", P. 441ff: " We are in a practical way to realize what we now perceive to be the fulness of the life of God. So that the one highest activity, in which all human activities were to join, is known to us now as the progressive realization by man of the Eternal life of an Infinite Spirit. So whereas we formerly had to say to men: Devote yourself to art, to service to the state, or to any like work that does tend to organize your lives into one life, we may now substitute one absolute expression for all those accidental expressions and may say: Devote yourselves to loving your lives in the divine life. For all these special aims that we have mentioned are but means of accomplishing the knowledge of the fulness of the truth. And Truth is God. Whose is all this beauty that thou enjoyest in art, this unity that thou seekest to produce in thy state, this truth that thou pursuest in thy thoughts? All this is in God and of God. Thou has never seen or heard, or touched, or handled, or loved anything but God. Know this truth and thy life must be transformed to fit thee in all its significance. Serve the whole God, not the irrationally separate part that thy delusions here made thee suppose to be an independent thing. Live out thy life in its full meaning; for, behold it is God's life."

Royce argues that ignorance implies a logically possible type of experience, and that any possible experience must be actual in order to be conceived even as possible; our ignorance therefore implies an actual experience, complete, and organized, the experience of an Absolute Mind.

George A. Coe, "The Psychology of Religion", Chap. -The Genesis of the Idea of God. P. 97: " Five elements commonly appear in the early mythological representations of the gods: 1.) The form or ways of some species of animal. 2.) the form and ways of man. 3.) the ways of spirits, as hyper-rapid movement, making oneself invisible, taking possession of a man or animal. 4.) Some phenomenon or process of nature. 5.) mana. In short ( P.106) the genesis of the god-idea is a spontaneous conviction that what is most important for us is really important, that is, respected and provided for by the reality upon which we depend. For every man the world of values is the real world. The gods are simply realities of experience when it is most vivid."

Rudolph Steiner, "The philosophy of Freedom" (1916) P. 236-7: "Every man in so far as he thinks, lays hold of the universal Reality which pervades all men. To fill one's life with such thought-content is to live in Reality, and at the same time to live in God. The thought of a beyond owes its origin to the misconception of those who believe the world cannot have the ground of its existence in itself. A personal God is nothing but a human being transplanted into the beyond.

James Bissett Pratt, "The Psychology of Religious Belief" P. 278, "A larger, richer life is indeed the end of religion; but this larger life religion everywhere identifies with what it means by its God. It feels assured by its own deepest experiences that this larger life is in it, around it, and that one may draw from this illimitable source new strength for one's own need. It recognizes this larger life as not differing essentially in nature from its own; and calls it God. This God it values chiefly for what he is, not as "meat purveyor" but as a larger, richer, more satisfying life, and one with which the little life knows by its vital experiences that it may make connection.... P. 303- The concept of God will continue to vary with the individual. But beneath all these changing and contradictory manifestations will flow the one life of the inner religious experience. This inner experience, I say, is really one; all the mystics speak one language and profess one faith. The evidence which the mystics bear to a vast reservoir of life beyond us, which is like ours and with which our life may make connections, is the one dogma of the Religion of Feeling.

E.H. Reeman, "Do We Need a New Idea of God?" (1917) P. 256: of Max Carl Otto's "Things and Ideals": "God is the indwelling life of the universe, of the remotest star and sun as well as our planet - the indwelling life of the cloud as well as the soul. This God produced the universe and all living forms. We discover that this Life-Force-God began by making rude experiments in self-expression, which resulted in the production of the inorganic world. Finally, after unnumbered centuries, in a supreme effort, in a spurt of creative genius as it were, God succeeded in producing man. In the World War God's interests were at stake as much as humanity's. God was unable to accomplish enough to make it clear which side he was fighting on. In face of the hard facts, then, the only tenable view is that "God is actually now doing the best He can, and can't do better; that He is in an extremity; that He needs assistance. It isn't homage, or worship or prayers or hymns that He wants and needs, but our brain, our blood, our will, our life. And if we refuse to come to His aid, it looks as if God might actually be defeated". St. John Ervine in "Changing Winds" says of this book: "It seemed to him that God was not a being who miraculously made the world, but a Being who labored at it, suffered and failed, and rose again and achieved.... He could hear God stumbling through the universe, full of agony of desire, calling continually. "Let there be light! Let there be light!"

W.R. Sorley, 1855-) "Moral Values and the Idea of God" (1918): "Persons are conscious of values and of an ideal of goodness, which they recognize as having undoubted authority for the direction of their activity; the validity of these values or laws, and of this ideal, does not depend upon their recognition; it is objective and eternal; and how could this eternal validity stand alone;... unless there were an Eternal Mind whose thought and will were there expressed? God must therefore exist and his nature be goodness."

R. Eucken, "Koennen wir Noeh Christen Sein?" We cannot hold him to be anything resembling a Christian when he utters the following: "Between man and God there is no intermediate form of being for us, for we cannot sink back into the cult of heroes. If Jesus, therefore, is not God, if Christ is not the second person in the Trinity, then He is man; not a man like the average man

among ourselves, but still men. We can, therefore, honor him as a leader, a hero, a martyr, but we cannot directly bind ourselves to Him, or root ourselves in Him; we cannot submit to Him unconditionally. Still less can we make Him the center of a cult. To do so from our point of view would be nothing else than an intolerable deification of a human being." E. Herman (P.103) say Eucken's new Christianity, then, will have no central and normative Lord of life, no Divine Redeemer, other than "God" conceived as that powerful and loving Omnipresence that enters our life with such reinforcing and redeeming effect. It will, therefore, be nothing else than the spiritual life as conceived in his philosophy, viewed from the standpoint of inwardness and Divine initiative. In such a Christianity Jesus will be the greatest among the great historic personalities. The presence of such an individuality can become to us also a mighty impulsion and a source of new life. This new life comes to us, according to Eucken, diffused throughout the world-historical movement; and the individual reaches it through a spiritual immediacy, not through an actual and personal mediation."

Eucken has stolen the heart of Christianity and still wants to be called a Christian. He would set up Christ as a great example of virtue whom we are to imitate, but at the same time rob us of our Redeemer. He would blaspheme God, Himself by making a mere man out of His only begotten Son. He would take away the Christians' only comfort and hope and still have the brass to imagine that he can rightfully be considered a Christian, it's men of Eucken's type that are the greatest menace to Christianity and not those philosophers who are outspoken in their atheistic, agnostic, or at least anti-Christian teachings. Eucken is neither a true philosopher nor a Christian!

Samuel Alexander, "Space, Time, and Deity" (1920) a Realist.

Leighton, P. 299: "Deity is the next higher empirical quality than mind. An infinite or perfect God cannot exist. What exists is the universe's tendency toward deity. God is the ideal in embryo, always becoming deity but never attaining it. The striving of the universe towards deity is God. God must include mind, which we may say is his body, since the whole universe is the body of God. The values which our minds realize are the materials for the making of the deity. Thus God is a metaphysical name for qualities-higher-than-finite-mind, which, presumably, emerge in the endless life of the infinite motion-stuff, spacetime. Deity is the coming into being of new complications in the order of finite qualities. God is not and never will be a perfect existence; but space-time goes on enriching its qualitative wealth, and therein lies the divinity of things."

John Dewey, 1859-). Pragmatism or Instrumentalism.

"Reconstruction in Philosophy" (1920) Will Durant, P. 536: "Dewey believes that things are to be explained, not by supernatural causation, but by their place and function in the environment. Dewey is frankly naturalistic; he protests that "to idealize and rationalize the universe at large is a confession of inability to master the courses of things that specifically concern us." He believes Schopenhauer's Will and Bergson's Elan Vital exist, but that there is no need to worship them; for these world-forces are as often as not destructive

of everything that man creates and reverences. Divinity is within us, not in these neutral cosmic powers. "Intelligence has descended from its lonely isolation at the remote edge of things, whenever it operated as unmoved mover and ultimate good, to take its seat in the moving affairs of Men." We must be faithful to the earth." Max Carl Otto, Things and Ideals, says P. 288: "God only knows how many of the sufferings of life are due to the belief that the natural scene and operations of life are lacking in ideal import, and to the consequent tendency to flee for the lacking ideal factors to some other world inhabited exclusively by ideals."

Miguel de Unamuno. "The Tragic Sense of Life in Men and Peoples" translated by J.E. Crawford Fitch, P/ 184: "It is not, therefore, rational necessity, but vital anguish that impels us to believe (to-believe) in God. And to believe in God is before all and above all, to feel a hunger for God, a hunger for divinity, to be sensible of this lack and absence, to wish that God may exist. And it is to wish to save the human finality of the Universe. For one might even come to resign oneself to being absorbed by God, if it be that our consciousness is based upon a Consciousness, if consciousness is the end of the Universe. "To believe in God is to long for his existence and further it is to act as if he existed; it is to live by this longing and to make it the inner spring of your action. This longing or hunger for divinity begets hope, hope begets faith, and faith and hope beget Charity. Of this divine longing is born our sense of beauty of finality, of goodness. P. 188: And in the same way God Himself, not the idea of God, may become a reality that is inaudibly felt; and even though the idea of Him does not enable us to explain either the existence or the essence of the Universe, we at times that direct feeling Of God, above all in moments of spiritual suffocation. And this feeling - mark it well, for all that is tragic in it and the whole tragic sense of life is founded upon this - is a hunger for God, or the lack of God. To believe in God is the wish that there may be God and to be unable to live without Him. ( 1921)

George Santayana 1863-) Everything has a natural basis and moves toward an ideal fulfillment. While we should be fundamentally skeptical about everything but essences, the convictions in life engender in us certain convictions about existences.

"Skepticism and Animal Faith", Par. 7 and 8: "In natural philosophy I am a decided materialist- apparently the only one living;.....But I do not profess what matter is in itself...I wait for the men of science to tell me. But whatever matter may be, I call it matter boldly, as I call my acquaintances Smith and Jones without knowing their secrets."

"Winds of Doctrine" P. 199: "I believe there is nothing immortal. No doubt the spirit and energy of the world is what is acting in us, as the sea is that rises in every little wave; but it passes thru us; and cry out as we may, it will move on. Our privilege is to have perceived it as it moved."

"Reason in Religion" Par. 38, 34: "Faith in the supernatural is a desperate wager made by man at the lowest ebb of his fortunes; it is as far as possible from being the source of that normal vitality which subsequently, when his fortunes mend, he may gradually recover. If all went well, we should attribute it only to ourselves."

Will Durant on Santayana, P. 537-" He will not permit himself the luxury of pantheism, which is merely a subterfuge for atheism; we add nothing to nature by calling it God; the word nature is poetical enough; it suggests sufficiently the generative and controlling function, the endless vitality, and changeful order of the world in which I live."

Max Carl Otto, "Things and Ideals", (1924) P. 248ff: "Men have always <sup>made</sup> had their gods under the stress of deeply felt need, but the <sup>creation</sup> was unconscious. The god was thought to be discovered, however much he was made <sup>by</sup> people are trying to dethrone the God of our fathers and replace him by a God <sup>electe</sup> on a platform of approved social and political ideals. And for two reasons: Because the war aroused the suspicion that in this great human crisis God was careful to maintain a strict neutrality, and because it forced upon men an appreciation of the problem of evil.

On page 247, Otto gives A.E. Haydon's conception of God, which <sup>appeared</sup> in the Journal of Religion, Vol. III, P. 590: "The Quest for God"- "The gods pass across the <sup>sage</sup> of history in forms innumerable; one note of <sup>pathos</sup> dominates the drama, man's longing for support, security, companionship, and help from the environing universe. The biography of every god is an epic into which are written the dreams and sorrows, tragedy and achievements of some <sup>xx</sup> human group. The divine figures are therefore rooted in the social needs and aspirations of men. They grow and change with their people.

Another contemporary philosopher who believes in a limited God is <sup>Dr.</sup> Hastings Rashdall. He also is led to this conclusion by reason of the evil that is in the world. "The Theory of God and Evil", Book 3, "Dr. Rashdall <sup>conceives</sup> of God as alone eternal; all other things owe their existence to Him. So God has willed and is responsible for the world as it is. The evil in the world is so great that we cannot believe the world, as it now is, to have been <sup>willed</sup> for its own sake by a perfectly good and rational Being such as God. The present world must therefore have been willed as a means to some future end. It would be unjust for man to have been brought into existence merely in preparation for this future good unless he were to share in it; so man must be immortal. God has willed this universe as it now is, because it is the best <sup>x</sup> that seems possible to him, to whose mind all the possibilities of things are known. There must <sup>be</sup> eternal necessities which are part of His own eternal nature. These prevent him from willing a universe in which all the good that will ultimately be gained in this universe, might have been gained without the evil that now exists.

Another contemporary philosopher who believes in a limited God, is L.T. Hobhouse ( Otto, P. 498-503) "Morals in Evolution" Part II, Chaps. 5&6: "The history of the evolution of individual minds in the universe appears to imply, "A mind that is not limited to a single physical organism." The existence of a Purpose, so far as our experience and reasoning powers go, implies a Mind commensurate with that Purpose. So, if there is a Purpose running thru the world as a whole, and Professor Hobhouse thinks the evidence points that way, "there is a mind of which the world-purpose is the object." Such a mind must be a permanent and central factor in the universe, in short, God. But the Mind, or God, is neither the whole of things nor an Omnipotent Creator; nor is it an Omnipotent Providence. It is only a factor in the whole of things. Hobhouse does not permit us to believe that the increasing rational control of things is due to an external God acting upon the subconscious. For him God apparently must be immanent in the human mind, and especially in the human reason, and to operate thru logical processes.

Bertrand Russell, 1872-) Will Durant, P. 532: "Bertrand Russell <sup>found</sup> so much in Christianity that could not be phrased in mathematics, that he abandoned it all except its moral code. He speaks scornfully of a civilization that persecutes men who deny Christianity, and imprisons them who take it seriously. He can find no God in such a contradictory world; rather, only a humorous Mephistopheles could have produced it, and in a mood of exceptional deviltry. He follows Spencer in his vision of the end of the world and rises to eloquence in describing the Stoics resignation to the ultimate defeat of every individual and every species."

Post-Dispatch Anniversary Number, December 9, 1928, in his <sup>work</sup> <sup>of</sup> <sup>PI</sup> and Purpose; <sup>Hans</sup> <sup>Oerich</sup> writes: "Our moral feelings show us what we have to do; it

*Driesch*

Hans Driesch

reveals us our true part in the stream of cosmic becoming. For we are ourselves part of reality. Thus it is our firm conviction that, in spite of all ultra-national tendencies which we still encounter, occasionally, mankind is on the way to be one great spiritual community among which the world war will have no more meaning. And this is indeed the most important in "the view of the Universe of the future." Thus the last word of philosophy should be what Spinoza called "amor intellectualis". That means: love among all creatures and love towards the Supreme Reason of all that exists, enlightened and supported by intellectuality."

Floyd L. Darrow, "Thru Science to God", 1925: "The idea of God has grown thru the ages. The crude elemental God of the savage passed into the tribal deity, swayed by human passions and actuated by human motions, only to be succeeded by the prophetic conception of a world-God of absolute justice and perfect righteousness, and finally to be supplanted by the universal Father of the Christian religion and the Divine Immanence of the Scientific Philosophy. This everchanging idea of God has needed reinterpretation in each successive period of intellectual development. It has grown with advancing knowledge and risen with the evolution of the race to constantly higher levels and nobler ideals. The savages imagined the presence of spirits in fire and water, wind and storm, the lightning and the thunder; the patriarchal tribes a revengeful God of wrath, remorse, and repentance; the prophets portrayed an austere God of moral law, whose sovereign sway extended to all men; some of the later Psalmists had caught a vision of the confident assurance and radiant joy of the God of New Testament Hopes; in Christ we see the God-idea flower into the conception of the All-father of infinite compassion, mercy, and love while Science has added the that of a God whose ways of action are the immutable laws of cosmic evolution."

Baker Brownell, "The New Universe", 1926, (P.312) All things as in China's Taoism - may be ends, and to the spiritual eye "God", "the universal principle", "being" - the names are various - reside in everything. For the democracy of God is all pervasive. The stones are burdened with him; the little birds bear him in their songs; the clouds are heavy with his presence and every part of life is all of life. P. 314: Everything when times and localities wear off, will slip back to the same simple being and the same God. The finities of life are simple. They are one. They are always in our hearts.

Viscount (R.B.) Haldane, "Human Experience", P. 164 (1926): "God cannot mean less than the universe. But this does not signify the point of view of the pantheist. God is mind, mind that manifesting itself in us embraces a universe of thought that is more than one of matter and energy, a universe of spirit that in us has rest, and fashion all, that is for us within and without. That is the explanation of why the world, despite a contingency which is the outcome of limitations in our experiences, is ultimately rational. That is so why we have faith in the harmony of experience, and can rely on it as a basis for our faith, in the working out in the long run of probabilities. God, so conceived is closer to us than breathing, nearer than hands or feet. Yet define him in a language that does not mislead, we cannot. Such definitions are always in the end pictorial. It is only with what we sometimes call the eye of faith, the realization of things unseen, that we can behold God, but religion and art tell us that such faith can sustain us."

Thomas L. Masson, "The City of Perfection" (1927) : "The Mission of Christ was to render the abstract idea of Totality into Human values. This philosophical or ethical abstraction had hitherto been variously conceived, bear witness by the Indians as Krishna, by the Chinese as Tao, and by other races as symbolized by various concrete images such as Buddha. Plato had come close

<sup>to the</sup> spiritual truth. Later his immortal follower, Plotinus, bore onward the <sup>spirit</sup> h. It remained alone for Christ to humanize it by giving it the name "Our <sup>idea</sup> er" <sup>of</sup> Thus love in its mystical aspect was born into the carnal <sup>idea</sup> mind, giving <sup>idea</sup> he only hope there can be."

Gamaliel Bradford, "Life and I", P. 278: "Christ and I and God": "The <sup>mechanical</sup> mechanical God appears as a benevolent old gentleman, who, being otherwise unoccupied <sup>idea</sup> one day took it into his head to make the universe out of nothing, and had abundant <sup>idea</sup> cause to regret his action ever since. He is figured as much the type of <sup>idea</sup> the average human father, goodnatured enough when he is well disposed and when <sup>idea</sup> he feels that he is treated with proper respect and consideration, but by no <sup>idea</sup> means free from irascibility, and requiring like earthly fathers, to be flattered, <sup>idea</sup> petted, and caressed, so that his worshipers quickly learn to pattern themselves after the model of the exemplary, favorite child. P. 280: But when <sup>idea</sup> nature became a business of complicated, universally applicable, unalterable <sup>idea</sup> laws, the notion of God became more and more remote, until the ordinary mind grew <sup>idea</sup> indisposed to allow for it at all.

H. Rashdall has been discussed under Max Carl Otto.

F. C. S. Schiller, "XXXXXXXXXXXXX UNIVERSES" XXXX "Riddles of the Sphinx", a finist <sup>idea</sup> form of pluralism. Prefers to call himself a humanist. Leighton, P. 420-

"Here we have a God, not, indeed, as a being who is shut out from the <sup>human</sup> human self; but the picture of God as a finite superhuman agent working for good, <sup>idea</sup> and helping man in the struggle against brute accident and evil. God is hindered <sup>idea</sup> by some mysterious force outside of Himself. He needs man's aid as man needs <sup>idea</sup> His aid. We have the right to believe that in the long run man and God will win <sup>idea</sup> out in this great moral epic, of which the scene is the universe, or rather <sup>idea</sup> the multiverse, Complete harmony and a real universe may ensue in time, <sup>idea</sup> Schiller <sup>idea</sup> thinks that finally, when the blissful triumph does come, time will pass into <sup>idea</sup> eternity.

Fr. Spaulding, "The New Rationalism" P. 517, "God is the totality of values. <sup>idea</sup> He is justice and truth and beauty, both as these are above our world and in it <sup>idea</sup> he is thus both transcendent and immanent. There is a Power that works not only <sup>idea</sup> side by side with man, but also in him and thru him, flowering in that freedom <sup>idea</sup> which is given to his reason to get at truth, to his emotions, to love the beautiful, <sup>idea</sup> the good, and ~~thru~~ the true, and to detest the ugly, the evil, and the <sup>idea</sup> false, and to his will and manhood to engage in the struggle."

John Galsworthy, "Is there anything new under the Sun?" by Bjoerkman P. 200 <sup>idea</sup> Galsworthy's philosophy must be distilled in drops from his works. As in "Strife" <sup>idea</sup> "At the bottom mankind is splendid", cries the Courtier, the knighterrant, <sup>idea</sup> and they're raised by the aspiration that's in all of them." As they rise, <sup>idea</sup> they perceive more and more clearly that "God is within the world, not without it. <sup>idea</sup> Struggling onward, they are filled with "a wayward feeling that the universe <sup>idea</sup> is indivisible, that power has not devolved but evolved, that things are relative, <sup>idea</sup> not absolute." And "like children whose mother has departed from home, <sup>idea</sup> they are slowly being forced to trust in, and be good to themselves and one <sup>idea</sup> another, and so to form out of their necessity, desperately, unconsciously, the <sup>idea</sup> new great belief in Humanity."

C. E. M. Joad, "Mind and Matter", 1926, P. 118: "The world as a plurality. <sup>idea</sup> The monistic position in philosophy has many points in common with the orthodox <sup>idea</sup> position in theology. The Absolute is like God in that it is all-embracing <sup>idea</sup> and universal, and that nothing outside of the Absolute is truly real. It is <sup>idea</sup> unlike him in the sense that it is neither personal nor moral. Moreover it <sup>idea</sup> did not create the universe as a gesture of omnipotence, it is the universe."

Robert Archay Woods, "Democracy a New Unfolding of Human Power", in Max Carl Otto's, Things and Ideals, P. 313;" The new spirit, forming itself, as it were upon the restless sea of humanity, will without doubt determine the future sense of God and destiny. The deistic conception of an age now completely past that God is some distant monarch, will fade into the darkness with the social system which gave it rise; and society as a federal union, in which each individual and every form of human association shall find free and full scope for a more abundant life, which will be the large figure from which is projected the conception of God in whom we live and move and have our being. Under such a conception it will be found and felt that every one of all the points in the never-ending complexity of human affairs where one life touches another, there is a sacramental relationship which is being either revered or defiled. P. 314:

Harry Allen Overstreet, "The Democratic Conception of God", Appeared in Hilbert Journal, Vol XI, P. 409;" Consequently the God of the future is the figure of myriad lives, and yet of one vast group life, in ceaseless activity. There is no place in the figure for an eternally perfect being, and no need: no need, for the vast society by its own inherent mass-dialectic - of struggle and adaptation, cooperation and conflict - is working out its own destiny... for the society, democratic from end to end, can brook no such radical class distinction as that between a supreme being favored with eternal and absolute perfection and the mass of things doomed to the lower ways of imperfect struggle. It is ..... the conception of God that is ourselves, in whom and of whom we literally are; the God that, in every act and intention, we, with all our countless fellows are realizing. It is a God that in one respect is in the making, growing with the growth of the world, suffering and sinning and conquering with it, a God, in short, that is the world in the spiritual unity of its mass-life."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Anniversary Number, December 9, 1929.

J.B.S. Haldane, "The Scientific Point of View"--"In the first place, it attempts to be truthful and, therefore, impartial. A good scientist will be impartial between Mr. Smith, a tapeworm, and the solar system. He will leave behind him his natural repulsion of the tapeworm, which would lead him to throw it away instead of studying it carefully as he would a statue or a symphony, and his awe for the solar system, which lead his predecessors either to worship its constituents, or at least to regard them as inscrutable servants of the Almighty, too exalted for human comprehension. In so far as it places all phenomena on the same emotional level, the scientific point of view may be called the God's-eye view. But it differs profoundly from that which religions have attributed to the Almighty in being ethically neutral. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities; against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world". St. Paul thought that the world was largely ruled by demons. We know better today, and we demand the general adoption of the scientific point of view because in its absence human effort is so largely devoted to conflicts with fellow-men, in which one, if not both of the disputants must inevitably suffer. It is only in times of disaster that the average man devotes a moments thought to his real enemies, "the rulers of the darkness of the world" from bacteria to tornadoes. Until humanity adopts the scientific point of view those enemies will not be conquered.

Hans Dreisch, "A World of Plan and Purpose"---" We start from experience, but we consider it a sign or index of something Absolute. And we hope to discover the structure of the Absolute, or, to use the Kantian expression, the "in-itself" ("An sich") to a certain extent. In this way a real view of the universe (Weltanschauung) has become possible again, and all that in a scientific



established way. At present, general mutual love among human beings must <sup>and</sup> will substitute for mere force with its hatred and its rivalry. For morality, enlightened by a metaphysical knowledge, demands so. And our moral feeling shows us what we have to do, it reveals us our true part in the stream of <sup>cosmic</sup> becoming. For we are ourselves part of reality. Thus it is our firm <sup>conviction</sup> conviction that in spite of the ultra-national tendencies which we still encounter occasionally, mankind is on the way to one great spiritual community among which the world war will have no more meaning. And this is indeed the most important point in "the view of the universe of the future". Thus the last word of Philosophy should be what Spinoza <sup>called</sup> "Amor intellectualis". That means love among all creatures and love towards the Supreme Reason of all that <sup>exists</sup> exist enlightened and supported by intellectuality."

Rudolph Maria Holzapfel, "Latent Possibilities in America's Future".

"In order to deliver mankind from the oppressive burden of such an <sup>ancient</sup> ancient and prescientific tradition, the adoption of a totally new direction in the domain of society seems inevitable. Nothing but investigation, bringing to light to the deep-seated psychological processes and the fundamental laws, which most effectively govern life, can preserve us from decadence. .... A study of panidealism shows us that a substantial improvement of the morality goes hand in hand with the penetration of the conscience by artistic endeavors. It cannot be achieved in any other way. The artistic and religious perspectives of panidealism will make it possible for the American to overcome the utilitarian instincts which suppress and confine his soul; and that is the first imperative step on the road to a new development of morality. In the future really great men will rise and gain control of the utilized treasures of the spirit, and they shall develop new communities of the soul out of the great artistic and religious transformation of the resultant mixture of races. Whereas in the past, inorganic substances and mechanical motions served as media for the creative impulse, whether plastically, musically, or poetically, the future will discover the artist working principally with living people and employing them as his material in the creation of new religious and artistic forms, in an art which shall be known as the Art of Shaping Humanity.

Otto Heller, Prof. at Washington U., says: "Holzapfel's master work, 'Pan-Ideal' is instinct with a prophetic sense of human destiny. Some, the heroic labors of man have crippled his spiritual wing-power. The ambition for heights toward distant, lofty, withal definite, objectives need reviving. In a rampantly utilitarian era Holzapfel appears to many as the Messiah for man's leadened spirituality. He certainly is one great exponent of the difficulty of being human."

Benedetto Croce, 1866 - ) "An Argument Against Historical Materialism Croce is a skeptic, retaining as his only link with his native Catholic religion its traditional cult of learning and beauty. "For us, liberalism does not pertain to the bourgeoisie or to any other economy; it pertains to the human soul and to its profound needs; it has no economic qualities and origins; they are, instead, moral religious ones, and to express it all in one word, it is the modern form of Christianity (and here Hegel was right). Christianity is the absolute religion", the one that is capable of being refined by thought, but which can never be rent from the human heart."

H.W. Carr on Croce: "The whole force of Croce's polemic against religion conceived as a pure form of mind to be ranked with art and philosophy in the final triad, is that it is essentially the concept of a transcendent and not an immanent life. For this reason and not for any irreverent reasons, he rejects religion and relegates it to mythology. Religion is an imperfect and i

mature attempt to present reality, and it must therefore yield its place to philosophy. The great philosophical task before us today, Croce tells us, "is the casting off of this worn-out garment, and this will be accomplished by the rejection of the concept of a philosophy of history and its replacement with the concept of history as identical with philosophy."

James Harvey Robinson "The Age of Surprises" There are still many who harbor this ancient taste for miracles (as found in the Bible). The modern wonder worker invokes neither God nor the devil. He is humble in the face of the mysteries which confront him. Now science may be defined as our present body of knowledge of whatever kind which has been accumulated in a scientific spirit. Now the older holy man and scholars assumed that the best worthwhile things had already been discovered and set down either in the Bible, or by Aristotle, whose works constituted for the 13th century thinkers a sort of inspired body of information which they had to accept like the Bible. They sought to interpret both and make them clearer, but they felt bound by the information which they contained. In short, they relied chiefly on authority and dedicated themselves to explaining the ancient texts rather than investigating them." Like monkeys man begins his physical existence as a tiny egg and his organs suggest for a short time in his mother's womb peculiarities of a fish. He retains this life muscles to wag a tail or move his ears. We never get over being an animal and some of the worst mistakes of the past have been due to the failure to recognize ourselves as animals."

Martin Andersen Nexø , 1869- ) "Art and The Proletariat" We conceive of religion as an invisible omnipresent ingredient of a life that is vital and upborne by ideas - a current, a force, which cannot be fetched up for inspection, not hitched to formulas, but which streams beneath the totality of life as its carrier. .... Church and theology may satisfy those who have lived their lives, and for dying, a mechanical doctrine about a Beyond, will suffice. But they who are living and must take the future over, need the strong faith in the good forces of life, and need the contact with mysterious undercurrent of it all: the Mystery of Life. They need to have a frank relation to the Unknown, for from its womb shall the future be born. For all I care let the proletarian show himself unfit for the production of new theatrical effects, provided he make for it by drawing the artistic consequences of his distinctiveness of Character, and making the veryday bright and brilliant and worth living for the many. "

The Very Rev. William R. Inge, "Quo Tendimus"----" The modern man believes himself sane, and does not want a keeper. There will be a rising against inquisitorial Puritanism, as there always is when the saints make themselves a general nuisance. "Dost thou think because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?" We want a new Reformation, on the lines of Erasmus, not of Luther and Calvin. It will be neither fundamentalistic nor modernistic, but it will rest on mysticism, which means the practise of the presence of God, and on rationalism, which means confidence in science. We shall never be at peace with ourselves until we get a religion of this kind; for the scientific mode of thinking is soaking in like an atmosphere, and traditionalism will fight a losing battle if it tries to resist it. In my opinion, the typical man of the future will be a Protestant, but a Protestant of a scarcely recognizable type."

Yu Shan Han, Some Tendencies of Contemporary Chinese Philosophy, Journal of Philosophy, Vol. XXV, No. 19 Sept., 13, 1928, P. 508: " A young revolutionist sang:  
I fight alone, and win or sink,  
I need no one to make me free,  
I want not Jesus Christ to think  
That he could ever die for me.

Such is the humanized religion of today. Confidence in man is greater than confidence in Heaven. Self reliance is greater than reliance on God. The two-handed animal with a brain has already become lord of the universe; he cannot but honor himself."

Prof. Walcott, Journal of Philosophy, Vol XXVI, No. 5: " Prof Walcott proposes to view God as the light of modern knowledge, as "that force, <sup>energy,</sup> power, or somewhat other than ourselves, but of which we ourselves are also a part, that in/pires to righteousness. " As for evil, he dismissed it as" a temporary abnormality on the part of the Deity."

Felix Adler, "The Ethical Problem", Journal of Philosophy, Vol., <sup>XXVI,</sup> XXVI, No. 5, Feb., 28, 1929:" God is but conceived of as an infinite society of spiritual monads, and the human individual on ~~the~~ his spiritual side as <sup>iden-</sup> identified with one of these monads. The individual is not a creature of God <sup>but</sup> a constituent of God, having a necessary and indispensable function in the total economy of the divine whole - an objective value which is not merely as a member of human society as actually constituted, but as a member of that <sup>society</sup> society of which even the most perfect human society is but an imperfect shadow.

Now, do you agree with me? Isn't it all a veritable hodge-podge? Which two ideas of God agree in every respect? Which shall we choose as the most satisfying for our spiritual needs? If philosophers would effect <sup>a closer</sup> harmony of thought, there is no doubt that their ranks would be greatly <sup>swelled</sup> but, as it is, most people are as much afraid of trusting wholly in philosophi speculation as they would be of sailing a stormy sea in a rudderless boat. The anchor-holds are lacking in philosophy. Quo tendimus? Whither are we going?, <sup>is</sup> the question every honest-thinking man will ask. To what will philosophic <sup>spec-</sup> speculation lead? What are its fruits?

A report of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Eastern Division of the <sup>the</sup> American Philosophical Association, held at the University of Pennsylvania, December 27-29, 1928, will help answer this question. Ralph M. Blake <sup>describes</sup> it as follows:" The proceedings did not avoid common, but none the less lament- able, faults. Too many of the readers overstepped appointed time limits to abuse the patience of the auditors, to invade the prerogatives of the successors, and to discourage discussion. Too much of the discussion resembled successive soli- loquy by windowless monads. Few issues were really joined, or argued through to any furtherance of solution. Too many whose expression would have been of inter- est preferred to remain silent. The "symposia" resembled nothing less. None of

the contributors had seen, and consequently none could refer to, the <sup>-ribes-</sup> contributions of his fellows. Each <sup>own</sup> defined the question proposed according to his own sweet will. Consequently little <sup>of</sup> meeting <sup>of</sup> minds. Too little time <sup>await-</sup> time was available for personal discussion apart from the formal session. These were <sup>persis-</sup> persistently called to order at an hour later than that appointed, and were consequently overcrowded with material. It is doubtful whether any of these <sup>defect</sup> defects is without remedy." Whether anything worthwhile is accomplished at such meetings is a question. (Journal of Philosophy, Vol. XXVI, No. 5, Feb., 28, 1929)

The positiveness and great comfort found in the doctrines of the Bible, <sup>Rible</sup> over against the indefinite, vague, and negative theories of the philosophers, <sup>-or</sup> is apparent at once to one who has been reared in an orthodox Christian home, <sup>home</sup> and to one who has experienced the grace and mercy of God and the perfectness <sup>ness</sup> and holiness of His holy will.

As mentioned before, we pity the poor philosopher who has robbed himself of the hope and comfort of Christ's teachings by establishing his <sup>-son</sup> reason, senses, or nature as the only true guide in matters pertaining to the soul. We do not fear him. He is fundamentally opposed to Christianity, and his <sup>-do-</sup> theories will <sup>pen-</sup> soak into the average Christian mind to the extent that water <sup>pen-</sup> penetrates the <sup>side</sup> hide of a duck. He weaves interesting narratives of and draws <sup>fan-</sup> fantastic pictures of his pet idol, or, at the least, excites man's curiosity <sup>by</sup> by a clever vagueness and indefiniteness of style, but that is all. His theories <sup>-is</sup> will not take root in the heart of man as does the Christian religion, since they are based on reason and consequently relative. The out-and-out philosopher <sup>-an</sup> should, therefore, make no more impression on the battlements of Christianity <sup>-ty</sup> than Judaism, Confucianism, or Buddhism.

But though philosophy itself is not to be feared, the practise of <sup>spread</sup> spreading <sup>it</sup> under the guise of Christian truths is most destructive to Christianity. It is creeping upon Christianity slowly, much as disease, the symptoms of which <sup>which</sup> are hardly recognizable.

If such a disease is not carefully guarded against, it will gradually, corrupt the very soul of Christianity, and show very few outward signs <sup>of decay</sup> before the inward corruption is complete.

What is more dangerous, a bottle of poison labelled "poison", <sup>or</sup> a bottle labelled "sugar Water", to which a drop or two of poison has been ad<sup>ad-</sup>ded? Who is more to be feared, your outspoken enemy, against whom you are ever on your guard, or the person who poses as your friend and in reality wishes <sup>to</sup> to bring you nothing but trouble and misfortune. This explains the difference <sup>be-</sup> between true philosophic speculation and modern religious liberalism. The <sup>first</sup> first we know to be our determined foe and we are prepared to meet its onslaughts, but the latter has, under the pretense of harmonizing Christian truth with scientific discoveries and philosophy, relinquished everything distinctive <sup>of</sup> of Christianity. He has cut the heart <sup>out</sup> of Christianity and wishes to be called a Christian. He has abandoned Scripture, the fortress of God, and has fled <sup>in</sup> in needless panic to the open, unfortified plains of a vague, natural religion, only to become an easy victim of his opponents lying in wait there.

Religious liberalism need not be insincere in itself, if it so advertises its program to the world, but when it is preached by ministers <sup>who</sup> who have been called to preach the Word of God, it is dishonest, dishonorable, <sup>and</sup> and absolute counterfeiting. Such a person has accepted the theories of Philosophy and is either ashamed to admit it, for fear perhaps of losing his position, or he wishes to make use the good name of Christianity to spread his false <sup>views.</sup> views.

If a man misrepresents a product in the business world, he will be <sup>be</sup> subject to a heavy fine and imprisonment, if caught; so any pastor of an orthodox church who is inclined toward liberalism, must resign his charge if he <sup>hopes</sup> hopes to be true to himself and the flock over which he has been placed.

In trying to remove from Christianity everything that is objected <sup>-ed</sup> to by scientists, the liberalist bribes the enemy by those concessions which the enemy most desires.

There can be no compromise between the one who adopts reason as his <sup>guide</sup> only guide and him who bases his faith and complete trust on the revealed Word of God. "No man can serve two masters"! It must either be the Triune God or the <sup>idols</sup> idols of the philosophers.

Philosophy says, "Work out a conception of God for yourself, and I <sup>will</sup> give you a certain amount of self-satisfaction, a little recognition <sup>during</sup> during your life time, and a place in history as a thinker.

God says, " Believe in Me, or the revealed Word, and I will give <sup>you</sup> you the crown of life, eternal peace and happiness in heaven.

Take your choice!

## Bibliography

- Friedrich Nietzsche, The Twilight of the Idols  
Herbert Spencer, An Autobiography  
Wm. James, Varieties of Religious Experience  
G.H. Howison, The Limits of Evolution  
John Caird, Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion  
H.G. Wells, First and Last Things  
Henri Bergson, Creative Evolution  
J.H. Randall, The Culture of Personality  
Josiah Royce, The Religious Aspect of Philosophy  
A. Seth, (Pringle Pattison) The Idea of God in Recent Philosophy  
G.A. Coe, The Psychology of Religion  
Rudolph Steiner, The Philosophy of Freedom  
J.B. Pratt, The Psychology of Religious Belief  
E.H. Reeman, Do We Need a New Idea Of God?  
John Dewey, Reconstruction in Philosophy  
Unamuno, M. de, The Tragic Sense of Life in Men and Peoples, J.E.C. Fitch  
W.K. Wright, A Student's Philosophy of Religion  
George Santayana, Skepticism and Animal Faith  
Max Carl Otto, Things and Ideals  
Jos. A. Leighton, Religion and the Mind of Today  
" " The Field of Philosophy  
A. Gehring, The Religion of the 50 Great Thinkers  
F.L. Darrow, Through Science To God  
B. Brownell, The New Universe  
R.B. Perry, Philosophy of the Recent Past  
" and Weber, History of Philosophy  
Wm. Durant, The Story of Philosophy  
A. Meiklejohn, Philosophy, Reading with a Purpose  
Viscount Haldane, Human Experience and Absolute Mind  
H.W. Carr, Changing Backgrounds in Religion and Ethics  
Thos. L. Masson, The City Of Perfection  
G. Bradford, Life and I  
James and Bergson, by H.M. Kallen  
E. Herman, Eucken and Bergson  
C.E.M. Joad, Mind and Matter  
Edw. Bjoerkman, Is there Anything New Under The Sun?  
G.P. Conger, A Course in Philosophy  
Leander Keyser, Problem of Origins  
Horsch, Modern Religious Liberalism  
Journal of Philosophy, 1926 - 1929  
Post-Dispatch 50th Anniversary Number