

CONSERVATISM AND MORALITY.

BY T. T. BLAISE.

THE conflict between progressive and conservative thought is as necessarily endless as is the antagonism between motion and resistance. It arises largely through a difference in viewpoint, although it is to be regretted that in numerous instances the conflicting opinions are due to sentiment, prejudice, bad logic, or a false, unwarranted conservatism, as also immoderate or progressive radicalism.

The thing that is, ever abhors the thing to be, unless the latter serves as complement or synergist to the former. The *status quo* of the present is ever the *status quo ante bellum*. The "I," the subject, stands in relation ever opposite to the object, and even the right hand of an individual is designated the antagonist of the left, and we scarcely find a muscle in a living organism that has not its fellow opponent. These facts lead many thinkers to adopt a dualistic world-conception. But however we may view existence we find endless activity and conflict as it were. And how could it be otherwise in a world where the new is the old in substance, but changed in form; in a world where the old must ultimately relinquish its body and soul to become a part of the new? Thus, individuals in observing these transforming concatenations, take sides, the one group favoring more or less the conservation and preservation of existing states, while the other contends for a hastier dissolution of the old; the one becomes a conservative, the other a progressive.

Moralists and ethicists of all times have always honestly and earnestly disagreed along this line. At the beginning of the Christian era the conservatives saw in the new Christian doctrines a progressive reform movement that seriously menaced their existing institutions of culture and religion. They strove to maintain principles and doctrines that to them had not been found wanting, and

had existed from time immemorial. But such has been the case with all cultural and ethical reforms. The new was always a menace to the old, and the conflict between the conservatives and the progressives was ever on.

Since the reformer is of necessity always a progressive, it naturally falls to his lot to be the aggressor. He is therefore generally looked upon as a disturber. In matters of state he is charged with political disloyalty, may be deemed guilty of treason and suffer banishment or execution, while as a religious reformer he meets a similar fate under the accusations of heresy and infidelity. It is rather a sad fact that so many of our noblest reformers, such as Socrates and Jesus among others, were executed for agitating principles which the conservatives of their time deemed inimical to existing conditions. These reformers were radicals, and their persecutors well knew what would happen to the social fabric if they were allowed to preach their doctrines unmolested.

This contest continues to-day no less lively, but in a modern form. Agitation in church and state still begets political and ecclesiastical odium, monarchies are threatened, dissolved and republics are born, cabinets are forced to resign, modernists and higher critics are menacing with disruption a staid and revered orthodoxy, school reformers are accused of introducing fads that are dangerous to the good old three "r's," Froebel is still denied admission in some schools by ultra-conservative educators, and even the sanest sanitary measures of modern science are under fire almost within gunshot of our most enlightened institutions of learning, not excluding Oxford, Boston and others.

But all this is not an unmitigated evil. Woe to that people who without investigation accept all reforms and innovations, for they must fare as badly as those who reject them dogmatically; both are destined to irrevocable decay and dissolution.

But the import of this all consists of the fact that the conflict between conservative and progressive thought involves the greatest problem concerning humandom, that of the *ultimate principle of right*. The conservative sees in the modern tenets an instability that smacks of pseudo-morality, and he calls it the "new morality." Since modern, scientific thought, science *per se*, is the offending promoter of this new morality, the accusation is directed against the "triumphs of science." On the other hand, the ultra-progressive sees decadence in the old tenets and accuses the old school of theological thought. Both, however, are contending for the establishment of that ever elusive *ignis fatuus*, the ultimate principle of right, an absolute

guide to moral conduct. It is the old transmutation dream of the alchemist, the Utopia of the optimist.

He who would proclaim an absolute and unyielding tenet as a guide for human conduct has hardly reckoned with the Master of concatenations. The problems of human life are infinite in complexity, as infinite as are the tasks and trials that accompany the endless moments. To be sure, there are rules that in a general manner cover groups of work-a-day problems, "shotgun" prescriptions, as it were, but it must be confessed even at the hazard of seeming radical, that all the principles and rules of ethics at our command are frequently inadequate as an unerring guide to our conduct. It would seem that nothing more disastrous could befall our future ethics, than to accept as sufficient and final our present code governing right living. Rules of conduct, moral, mental or physical, have their origin and foundation in the creative order of the world. Moral conduct must above all always mean adaptation of the individual to the All, or rather, there must be unison of aim between the individual who is the creature, and the Creative Process which is the Creator. The motive force of the individual and the process of creation must be identified, since the individual is a part of creation. If, then, there is such a principle or principles that are ultimate and absolute as a moral guide, we must seek them ever in the all-dominating creative order. Thus as we familiarize ourselves with the immutable law and order of all creation, so shall we likewise become familiar with the meaning of moral conduct, duty and humanity's religion.

True, many of the maxims of our past moral code given us by our immortal forebears are beyond contradiction of highest quality, and we may well consider them sacred and divine. They have guided us over a multitude of pitfalls, and, no doubt, shall do so for time everlasting. The maxim that man must be true to himself and others seems beyond question one that can never be contradicted, but after all, the maxim is but first aid to the needy, for the all important question is how always to be true, so that in each instance of human procedure the question demands solution anew. But granting that our old code of morals is quite adequate as a moral guide, who is there gifted with such prophetic foresight to assert that we shall never have another moral genius like Socrates, Mohammed, Lao-tze or Christ? Who would have the audacity to bid us shut our eyes against a future saint because the past, forsooth, had one? And if no one of equal luster should rise again on earth,

would that of necessity preclude the discovery of new laws governing human conduct? Let us hope not.

True conservatism at all times is commendable, but when it approaches the extremity of denying the future's competence to achieve what the past has achieved, then it loses the dignity of the name conservatism, and approaches something more akin to scepticism and prejudiced intolerance. At first sight it would seem that under the leaven of modern enlightenment such pseudo-conservatism were exceedingly rare, but it is abundantly prevalent among all so-called, strictly orthodox ethicists. These are usually men of intense moral and religious bent. Their chief, if not sole, authority, consists usually of a text, a ritual, a code of reputed supermundane origin, which last attribute renders all so-called "infra-mundane" authority incompetent as a test or criterion. Transcendental revelation, then, falls not within the pale of mundane adjudication.

From this it follows that there still prevails to a remarkable degree the notion that there are two classes of truths, the one divine and sacred, the other secular and profane. That one truth may possess a moral application and another not, goes of course without question. That man must be charitable is an injunction involving a moral worth, and is an indisputable truth, but that gravity tends toward the center of the earth is another truth, but devoid of moral attribute; that is, it is unmoral, not immoral. But gravitation is not to be looked upon as having no moral applicability. The law of gravitation enters so abundantly and intimately into the form of the human body, into the shaping of our sensations, our thoughts and very souls that we must acknowledge its application in the moral domain to no small extent. But this is merely reiterating the fact that in the realm of the creative order we must ever look for our principles of right living.

It is a quaint and yet perfectly natural excrescence of a defunct dualism that would have one truth more true than another. The "Holier than thou" notion is one of the tenacious logical obliquities of the race. A conservatism that defends a supposed truth against another on any other grounds than its intrinsic practical applicability in the realm of right conduct, defends it because of its reputed extra-mundane source, or because of antedating another truth, or because of the unique character of the person who first enunciated it, is a conservatism that harms both the truth it defends and assails.

But this species of pseudo-conservatism lies at the bottom of much of our present-day pseudo-morality. From it springs the notion that one day of the week is holy and six are secular. One

day we act as holy as we can, and six days we are,—I was about to say as profane as we can be. It is nevertheless true that on the week days we practice conventionalities that we refrain from on the Sabbath day for the sole reason that they are questionable. We know well the hollowness of it, but we continue the practice. Nor is that all. We carry this subversive standard of morals into our varied activities. We recognize "holy vestments," speak of the "divine cloth," make wearied and laborious pilgrimages to the "sacred Ganges" and kindred places, bow before sacred statues, altars and vessels, wear on our bodies for their amuletic charm icons, crosses, swastikas and an endless array of portentous and mystic accoutrements and oracular symbols and superstitious excrescences, all of reputed power to ward off evil, physical, moral and spiritual. Now science has no quarrel with these symbols as symbols, and does due reverence to the motives underlying them, but it is their employment as objects of miraculous and talismanic power that science condemns.

It may be urged that the belief in the miraculous power of the cross is a factor of great power in furthering the good faith, and besides we have seen a furious mob quelled by the mere display of the cross in the hands of a good priest, but ever and ever does science demand a reply to the question: would there have been any mob had these people been truly enlightened of the non-miraculous and true meaning of symbols? No class of humanity is more inflammable than the superstitious. It is these who would have a panacea for each illness as well as for moral afflictions. To follow in series each precedent and sequence to ascertain the several combined causes of a phenomenon cannot appeal to them, besides it is too laborious. A cause with one handle is to the man of nescience ever attractive. A succession of meteorological factors indicates fair or foul weather to the scientific thinker, but the "hang of the moon" has still its adherents among the countless simple folk who guard these quaint faiths with an unyielding conservatism. And as we ascend the scale of human intelligence we find these elements of an ultraconservatism lurking in the minds of even reputed thinkers. The one prefers the single-handed materialism to explain all phenomena, the other sees nothing but mind and spirit and denies even the existence of matter, the other sees it all in Buddha, or Kant, or Christ, or Darwin, each however deeming the others' doctrine in error.

Comes now the true conservative thinker who sees in neither of the various "isms" a panacea nor a solution of the moral problem confronting humanity. He prizes and praises with equal fervency, and with due candor, that which survives the test of truth, be it a

tenet of the extreme conservative wing or of the radical progressive. To him all data are of equal value, be they of the realm of bio-chemistry, psychology, ethnology or history both profane and sacred. In no one thing, in no one individual does he see the consummation of the "higher" knowledge, the ultimate principle of right conduct, but ever in immutable truth, in the revelation of the eternal, evolving process of the All does he see the true light that illumines the path that leads to man's destiny. To him the meaning of creation, endless creation, call it evolution, revolution, genesis, mutation, cataclysmic or catastrophic, is the meaning of the "Word of God." What the Creator *does*, that is ever of highest import to the true conservative scientist and scientific philosopher, and in these creative deeds he seeks revelation, he recognizes the unimpeachable revelation of the Author of creation, His will and Word. If he finds not here the providential pabulum whence spring our rules of ethics and morals, then science must stand condemned as a failure of having achieved its highest and noblest purpose.

Can it really be otherwise than that right conduct, moral behavior, means the harmonious adaptation of man's conduct to the creative motive, to the aim and purpose of the All-process? Is man in need of greater knowledge than that which gives him an insight into the immutable laws that govern his sole destiny, yea, moreover the destiny of his soul? The norm governing the evolvement of all things must be the true guide for rational beings who are the creatures of it. That act of man which is not in attune with the laws governing creation, that act is either unsanitary, immoral or impious—nay it is a degree of insanity. Live as God acts, and there will be less need of quarreling over what He is supposed to have said.

It seems without question that all the truths and maxims ever uttered, be they ever so sublime and lofty, ever so sacred and divine in character, are but a small part of all the truths and maxims yet to be learned. Nor can any new truth invalidate one single historic truth, but,—and here is the nub of it all,—*a modern truth may and can be of more practical applicability to modern conduct*, and let us note that there is only modern or present conduct. Past conduct belongs to the past and is unalterably as it was. But past truths and maxims live in the present and we may well be concerned regarding their preservation, but only against the influence of falsehood and the spurious need we defend them, never need we fear the unwholesome effect of a new truth upon an old one.

That the "light of science" and "its dazzling triumphs" may

have a material rather than an immediate moral tendency, is in a measure true. But this is only the inevitable temporary reaction following all innovations beneficent and maleficent. We cannot abolish the law of the moral pendulum and we must let it swing in obedience to the behest of Providence. When science deals with lavish hand it is then that man is apt to overindulge, but never can we condemn the blessings of science because of our shortcomings. So the novelty of a sudden triumph in science may raise man's sensual proclivities into a wave of immoderation, but the crest of this wave must in obedience to eternal law give way to the dip of the curve of cooler judgment and moderation. That we must endeavor to restrain indiscretion, irreverence, and overindulgence, goes without question, but what we must not do, is the inhibition and condemning of science. Though we abuse them, these new truths of science are all blessings nevertheless. They can never harm an older truth, though it be hoary with age. How otherwise could a modern truth affect a past truth than embellish it? Truth, ancient or modern, represents positive life in all its phases, biologic, moral and spiritual, while falsehood is life negated.

To one whom modern culture and scientific triumphs imbue with a radiant hope for humanity's future welfare, nothing could have a more lamentable ring than the despairing deprecations of Rev. Orde Ward in *The Open Court* of December 1912, viz., that "the danger seems to be, that practical ethics, or ethics of the gutter, in which right yields precedent to the expedient, will eventually be the confessed creed of the world," or that "we seem returning to something immeasurably inferior to ethnic morality"; or that "nothing just now seems to be taken seriously, and perhaps least of all the sacred," etc.

This attitude has a note of gloomy and despondent foreboding. It is a conservatism begotten by a fear lest the triumphs of to-day will bring decadence upon the "religious and ethical standards" of the past. It is a note of alarm and warning that "dislocation of establishments suggests, if it does not create, dislocation of the sanctities." It has of late become quite fashionable among writers on ethics to "view with alarm" the present civilization. The cry of a negative conservatism, that "the civilized world is in a state of decadence," as a prominent educator recently proclaimed, is, to say the least, bad philosophy. It is quite untenable, difficult to verify, and its effect upon society is decidedly open to suspicion. And this in the face of our increasing number of institutions of charitable and eleemosynary character, the raising of the standards

of these institutions from one of humility to that of at least a semblance of respectability, the reform movement in the management of our criminals and institutions of correction, inaugurating a training and educational method in place of the old "eye for eye and tooth for tooth" method of vindication and revenge, the multiplying of hospitals, schools, libraries, the increase of philanthropy among rich aristocracy, especially in America, the Hague Tribunal, the organization of a formidable International Peace Society who advocate with the Carpenter Philosopher the principle of "Peace on Earth" and are trying to do literally what others for twenty centuries have only preached, and believe firmly that soon "Neither shall there be war any more."

True, in many instances the glamor and dazzle of modern, scientific discovery and invention entices the irreverent individual to rush on as if bereft, and trample under foot the sanctities of established society, and yet, modern states of irreverence need have no alarm in a competitive comparison with analogous states of irreverence of the past. It is not necessary here to recite *ad nauseam* the lax morals of our ancestors, for they are only too well known, besides, it were a pleasanter task to point with pride to those indomitable human characteristics by dint of which the race forged ahead to the present state of high culture in spite of the moral morass it encountered through the centuries.

But where does the conservative alarmist chiefly err when he characterizes our present civilization as lacking in due appreciation and reverence for the sanctities and moral tenets? Let us consider:

To the scientific thinker it can but seem strange that upon science the blame is so often saddled for modern epidemics of moral obliquity. In no sense can science itself be conceived as being either moral or immoral; at most we might acknowledge that science is un-moral, possessing no moral qualities at all; that is, science as a method or system of investigation and research, as a means of acquiring pure knowledge and facilitating revelation, can no more possess the attribute morals and ethics than can time possess the quality of color, and space the property of energy. Nor does it seem aught but maudlin to suppress, or put a restraint on science, because, of its very efficient productivity, weaklings succumb to too much milk and honey.

There is, however, a justifiable element of alarm in the fact that science in its quest for truth is ruthless and unsparing, is devoid of sentiment and compassion, dealing death to the false and spurious regardless of rank or color. To the orthodox conservative this

must on occasions give rise to offense, especially when an old authority is found wanting in the test of a relentless crucible. And it is likewise true that its "dazzling triumphs" do intoxicate at times the hoity-toity class of thoughtless beings to the extent that they lose sight of the sanctities and the sacred side of existence. But because of this it does not at all follow that the blessings of science are a curse.

It is an old and homely saying that a weak man can not stand prosperity. This man, however, succumbs under prosperity not so much perhaps on account of an evil bent, as he does because of his inability to adjust himself to a new and unaccustomed condition of plenty. The moral laws governing a poor man's conduct demand a different application than in a state of prosperity. That the mendicant must obey a somewhat different code of morals than the opulent individual, may seem at first sight paradoxical, yet let those numerous unfortunate ones who perish under the change from mendicancy to opulency attest. But the important point here sought is the unimpeachable fact that moral conduct is a question of adaptivity to dominating conditions.

Man's life is an interminable succession of contacts with the objective world, and for each contact he must render a moral or ethical judgment either consciously or subconsciously, *nolens volens*. No one can in advance project a code of guidance that will solve human problems as they are met. This were only possible if he knew actually the conditions of the subject acting and the object to be acted upon. And let us emphasize that *act* is the word *per se*, for acts alone can be moral or immoral. Though we say, this man is moral, it is in fact not he who so is, but his acts or deeds are so or not so. In a narrow sense we may term his desires, or the inclinations of his will moral or immoral, but only as mental acts can they be so, for who sins in thought must think a wrong act.

Now, since act or deed always involves irrevocably the object to be acted upon, because in this world of unbroken continuity action implies of necessity interaction, is it not then paramount to our moral acumen that we scrupulously familiarize ourselves with the existing world in a scientific manner, learn to comprehend the laws dominating subjective and objective existence, acquire a sane conception of the laws governing sanitation and of the ever impinging elements of destruction and construction, and at least render Dame Science the homage due her as an incontestible and impartial revealer of truth?

It is therefore time we cease laying at the door of science the

blame for the shortcomings of our moral rectitude. Nor should we restrict the attribute of sacredness to isolated pretexts and writings, or to some of the objects of antiquity and here and there a historic individual. Though trite, it is true that "holy is that holy does"; nor does it matter when or where it does holy. A maxim's value does not depend upon its authorship nor time of birth. A truth is a truth though it issue from the mouth of Ananias, and a falsehood is not the less so if uttered by a saint. Human language is exceedingly amenable to error. The truest prophet has but the language of mankind with which to convey and express his truths. Even though his truths were infallible, his language is of necessity fallible. And in ancient times, or, to be accurate, in all times, language had to be guarded so as not to offend the conservative authorities, because many an unguarded word led to the execution and imprisonment of many a noble reformer. It is no small wonder that so many of the old writers resorted to parable, similitude and allegory. This fact burdens many of the old texts with perplexing ambiguities.

It is in part also due to this fact that all systems of morals and religion develop sooner or later internal dissension and then more or less conflicting factions and sects. The spirit and the meaning of the text we may deem sacred, but the words intended to convey these, they are the husks and dross enveloping the golden kernel within. Thus conflicting interpretations must ensue, and what other than science, the method of truth, can come to the rescue? In no other realm can science do greater service for man than in the domain of moral and precept, and instead of an enemy, it would become, if permitted, the defender of true ethics and religion.

The true scientist recognizes in all things an inherent divinity and sacredness. This is good orthodoxy, for the lexicon defines the word "divine" as "proceeding from God, appropriated or pertaining to God," etc., etc., and since all would seem to proceed from God, all must be divine. He with due reverence recognizes the fact that to certain objects, especially historic, there attaches a lofty or sacred sentiment, but cautiously avoids the common error of revering the symbol instead of its message and purport.

The custom of ascribing sanctity and divinity exclusively to a few score of objects, such as scripts, vestments, rituals, and various acoutrements and paraphernalia, is not altogether an unmixed blessing to our moral habits. The odd dual conception of a part sacred and divine world, and the other part secular and profane, has led to its logical consequence, inasmuch that we now entertain something like contempt for "common things," and even our nearest kin we

assign a place outside the pale of holiness and divinity. In fact, we live as if this were a dual world, constituted of a divine spiritual quantum, and a corrupt, material one. It is remarkable how we carry this into our every-day activities. Cults and numerous systems of so-called philosophy are waging war against the "unholy and material." We associate under the same meaning "sin and flesh," speak of the "temporal earthy," of this "vale of sin and corruption," of six secular days and one "holy" one,—nay, this double standard of ethics has become so fundamentally impregnated in our soul-fabric as to form a dominant factor in our every-day moral judgments. It ultimately leads to that form of ultra-asceticism which regards life on earth as a term of penal service, a reformatory.

But true, modern conservatism, tempered and guarded by science as the conservator, tends more and more toward a monistic world-conception, seeing in all things a common origin and destiny. It knows of no cleft between subject and object. Its adherents do not fear the invasion of the new, since the new is but the old in change of garb. In all existence they see the throb and meaning of divinity, and inasmuch as this be true, so much must all existence be divine. Thus they deal with things godly alway, and thus they would fain bid the habitué of the old double standard morality turn about face and behold in all creation and creature a compelling majesty, a true divinity,—nay, more, he shall behold all things dominated by a unifying mandate that bids him fraternize in good fellowship with all existence. Thus the true scientist finds himself always in the realm of God, and with him obedience to His laws alone means success, and disobedience leads to defeat, morally and physically. To him Christ is nearer than is commonly accepted. He meets the Good Man from Galilee in his daily walks.

"I heard a child's cry tremble up,
And turn to share my scanty cup.
When lo, the Christ I thought was dead,
Was in the little one I fed."

Nor does he see the world through the eye of pessimism. Here on earth within reach of us is all worth having:

"Here, here, on earth I find it all—
The young archangels white and tall,
The Golden City and the doors,
And all the shining of the floors."

The modern conservative ethicist does in fact reject in form, and in form only, the sanctities and precepts of the old orthodox conservative. He does not reject the faith in immortality, but with

him immortality is a law far more than a mere belief. All things in existence are in essence immortal, that is, he knows that man and all are immortal, and, be it observed, he has no fallacious idea of the meaning of knowledge. Knowledge can only be relative and never absolute, that is, our knowledge of the objective world.

The old concept of heaven has also undergone a change of form in the mind of the modern thinker. Heaven has become a reality to him as much as bread and butter, and he has transformed the concept of heaven into a condition instead of a place. Modern man lives fast and furious, and he is impatient to wait for the celestial heaven, but has set out with a will to build a terrestrial one. He finds earth God's workshop, and has become well pleased with it himself. He finds here the material and the tools to construct and bring about that condition which his forebears called heaven, and who can foretell his eventual result?

"To be sure," said one of these modern philosophers of cheer to the writer, "we are going to have heaven on earth, and it is a simpler project than some might imagine. I enjoyed a respite in heaven the other evening literally for the pittance of a twenty-five cent admittance price. It was like this: A small girl scantily clad came along the street weeping until I thought her heart would break. She was apparently searching for something and she could not see me for her tears: Upon inquiry I learned that she had lost the piece of coin that was to purchase the supper for the family, and that this caused a calamity of no small scope in the household. To the little one it seemed something irreparably awful, for she entertained no further hope of finding her lost treasure. Right here I then and there violated the 9th commandment. I told that grief-stricken child that I had found her money and gave her the amount she alleged to have lost. When I saw the light of joy displace the anguish in her face and listened to her effusive expression of gratitude, I experienced that soul-feeling called heaven, or at least that should be denominated heaven. Yes, you are right," he concluded, "man can and will master the art of being happy on earth, and trust God to see to the life beyond."

This man intentionally prevaricated so that he might not in the least degree fail in giving a full measure of happiness to a grief-stricken child. Nor did he stop to think about the sanctity of a holy mandate, "Thou shalt not lie." He is a man who has faith in modern sanctities. He does not pray, "Give us our daily bread," because he wants to earn it in the sweat of his brow. In fact the modern world has turned earners. Witness the present-day conflict

for the "job"! Men commit crimes to procure labor, the mere right to work. Idleness and vagrancy are almost universally condemned by laborers. Time was when the problem how to make men labor demanded solution, now they appeal to court for the privilege to labor, and resort to violence to further their end. Labor bureaus both private and public dole out jobs at a premium. A distinctly new enterprise has sprung into existence, and it is typically modern; it is the labor-giving enterprise. If men still believe in the happiness of idleness, they have at least learned that they must procure idleness through arduous labor. The sense of duty is a distinctive characteristic of modern man. He has ceased to pray, "Give us our daily bread," but has formulated a new "sanctity" and prays, "Permit us to do our duty." What prophet of the past dreamed that in *anno Domini* 1914 we would be called upon to solve the problem of how to give men as much employment as they want?

Our sane aristocracy know this. Our silly aristocracy are the only remaining vestige of humanity who do not know that in labor there is true dignity and genuine sanctity. Achievement to-day ranks above preachment. Doctor Montessori has startled the world with a new system of education, the chief feature of which is that she relies upon the child's sense of duty to initiate its own method of learning. This profoundly religious and highly cultured woman avoids to a large degree all mandate and "thou shalt or shalt not." She would not dwarf the divine will and freedom of the child, and acting under this principle her success has been in many instances almost marvelous. She laid aside old rules of conduct and looked into the soul of a child, finding there a new sanctity, a sermon, a commandment which reads, thou, father and mother, shalt obey thy children. Thus she not only lets little children come unto her, but she has learned to obey them.

We need not, then, be immoderately alarmed at the turn modern ethics is taking. The old and sacred precepts are not as much cast aside as they are applied to modern conditions. The Good Samaritan of to-day wears the garb of a Jane Addams, and she is indeed a modern representative of the olden types of saint and saviour. Even a modern artist had the temerity to paint female angels which brought upon him much criticism and odium from the orthodox conservatives, and for a time furnished the press attractive copy.

The modern Good Samaritan plies his craft of charity on a different scale than his prototype of old. He profits by the aid of science and method. He does not carry the stricken victim to his home and there nurses him. This would be exposing his family to contagion

and disease. Society to-day strives hard to supply the unfortunates with asylum and home. Organizations carry on a veritable enterprise in caring for the helpless. Commercialism, however crass some of its features may seem, has transformed Good-Samaritanism into a colossal business corporation that encircles the earth, but has retained the original essence of the altruistic motive, and through the aid of scientific development has heightened its efficiency. Scientific charity means Christian charity reduced to a science, systematized, coordinated and rendered effectual with modern appliances of power and precision. One of its chief aims is also to reduce the cause of pauperism, rather than alleviate. Prevention and the knowing how to prevent has become its great aim. The eradication of hovel and slum, the purifying of air, water and food, the cleansing of streets, public places, conveyances and buildings, these and countless other measures for immediate results, and then general race betterment and eugenic improvement for ultimate results, all these are distinct phases of modern charity and good will on earth to men. We might mention that colossus of civilization, the public school, for this is indeed the greatest and most efficient charitable institution of all times, and how distinctly modern in its mode and method! These are to-day some of man's ethical forces that make for heaven on earth.

The heaven *post obitum*, it must be confessed, is becoming a more secondary consideration, for the welfare of the present life is making greater and greater claims on man. To reach heaven by worshiping the Architect has become somewhat obsolete, but to help the "least of these" and then take chances on heaven is getting decidedly popular. It is the philosophy of doing; doing rather than enjoining others to do, acting instead of asseverating, performing of duty instead of preaching duty.

If the world has become less God-fearing, it has become more God-law respecting. Man is acquiring a wholesome regard for the laws and principles dominating creation in its varied phases. No man of research, investigator, educator, discoverer, moralist, and religionist can for a moment afford to disregard them. They dominate soul and body and shape the destiny of all things. If they are not the word of God, they are the compelling *modus operandi* of the Word. They are immutable, but themselves the cause of all mutations. Though imperishable, by their behest all present forms must perish to be transformed into their irresistible equivalents. But never need edict or precept fear these laws as long as either is in attune with them.

And so it has come about with the sweep of time that the

beautiful romance of the Star of Bethlehem interests men less than Arcturus, nebula and cluster stars. These have become more and more replete with presages of a wondrous revelation. When,—nay, how soon will flash from that starry silence of eons startling messages on wires of ether, bearing tidings of the life romance of strange races in the skies, bearing epic and slumber song that lulled to sleep the skyman's babe! The cradle of man has journeyed from Eden to the very border of the archaean, azoic realm: Not content, comes now a venturesome Arrhenius and proclaims the birth of man in pre-archaic cosmic dust.

“Though old, though new
What does it mote,
If tale and rote
Are only true?”