

## THE CALL OF SCIENCE TO THE CHURCH.\*

BY H. E. JORDAN.

HAPPILY the time has passed when science and religion were felt to be antagonistic. The same spirit now characterizes the rational devotees of both of these cardinal interests. True religion is not incompatible with scientific ability. Since religion is the impulse to strive for the highest and best in human conduct, and since science furnishes our human test of what is best and highest, there can be no conflict between religion and science. Indeed scientific training would seem to be essential for effective religious activity. At source and with respect to fundamentals of subject matter and individual mental equipment for effective service, religion and science are largely the same. Both deal with nature and with God—God in nature. Absolute and uncompromising honesty and fidelity to fact are the marks of both the scientist and the truly religious. Another name for Divinity is Perfect Truth.

In the words of Henry Scougal religion is simply "the life of God in the soul of man"; and Sabatier speaks of man as "incurably religious." "The instinct of worship is indestructible in man's nature. Religion is the activity of our sympathies, the feeding of our hopes, the strengthening of our knowledge of the trend of things," says Professor Thoburn.<sup>1</sup> Science and the church have much in common in their overarching ideals and their underlying motives. The church stands in the position of official organ in religious matters, being simply the ecclesiastical expression of organized religion.

Too long has the church regarded science as outside its pale. "Let science do its peculiar work," it practically said, "we will attend

\*Lecture delivered before the Young Men's Christian Association of the University of Virginia, 1912.

<sup>1</sup>The quotations from Professor Thoburn are taken from Dr. David Starr Jordan's book, *The Religion of a Sensible American*.

to ours, the salvation of souls." But while science has made enormous strides forward in recent times, the church has advanced but relatively little. We seem to have reached the peculiar condition where men generally are more scientific and more religious, while the church is losing its hold on thoughtful men.

But the church contains elements of incalculable good. It is greatly to the interest of civilization and to the church itself to conserve these same elements, and to fulfil its high mission for the all-round salvation of men. Moreover science needs the help of the church in much of its humanitarian work. Science issues a call for help in its efforts for human welfare here and now. Real progress demands harmonious relationship between church activity and scientific advance. Such alliance will mean the very life of the church itself and the spiritualizing of science and the progress of the race. The call of science is for religion to put itself into action in the interests of man with reference to social conditions. Religion and science have a common ground of community of human interest.

The Reverend Madison Peters says that when he offered to preachers to speak without charge on "The High Cost of Living and How to Reduce it," four or five responded, "but when my willingness to speak became known to clubs and sororities of all sorts, the telephone rang for dates and the mail crowded with invitations, and my experience furnishes one more illustration that the work the church should do in moulding the future is done by outside organizations. With a narrow conception of her mission the church sits on a high platform of empty dignity with folded hands, while other organizations are doing the work which the church should have done."

The danger in the Christianity of to-day, according to Bernard Shaw, is "the destruction of all our moral responsibility by detaching God from man and attributing to him independent supreme wisdom, independent omnipotent executive power, and consequently complete and undivided responsibility for all terrestrial conduct and events.—If my actions are God's, says he, "nobody can fairly hold me responsible for them; my conscience is mere lunacy." But "if I am a part of God," he continues, "if my eyes are God's eyes, my hands God's hands, my conscience God's conscience, then also I share his responsibility for the world; and woe to me if the world goes wrong!"

Professor Thoburn says: "It is pathetic to see how the world is struggling towards the Christian ideal almost in spite of the great institutions which have so long stood as the representatives of

Christ. The pulpit no longer has a monopoly in proclaiming the truth. The truest religious life finds expression now in a thousand ways that have not yet been adopted by any institution.

"For the church this means that it loses that great body of true and earnest men who do not recognize their ideal of humanity in it. But for many of these true and earnest men, lovers of their fellows, it means that they classify themselves as heretics and outcasts and unreligious. This in itself does not make it so except so far as a man unconsciously lives up to the reputation he makes for himself. Custom has so identified religion with its institutions in our minds that it is difficult to think of one without the other. It is a sign of vitality when a man inside of a church or outside recognizes his religion as his life, independent of any means of expression."

Before the church will respond to the call it will properly demand an expression of science's position with respect to the church's essential interests. Before just claim can be made for help, identity of aim and interest must be shown. The church guards the interests of the ancient conceptions of God, the Christ, heaven, hell, atonement, immortality, prayer, sin, the Bible. It justly asks, "What attitude does science take towards these matters?" I do not claim to speak for scientific men universally on this matter, but in general I believe I am rightly interpreting their attitude somewhat as I shall outline below.

At this point I should like to add that I have long thought that every scientist, especially every one in the capacity of teacher or popular leader, should give an expression of his position with respect to the fundamental concepts of religion. To the youth would thus accrue inestimable benefit in thoughtful leadership concerning some of the most vexed problems of adolescence. Such expression, however, can only be expected when met by the attitude that only hypocrisy is reprehensible. If the world wants this great help from scientific men in this line, it must respect any shade of honest conviction whether so-called agnostic, infidel, heterodox or supposedly orthodox, and it must understand, and give opportunity for, change of position in matters of belief.

This is one of the lessons that the church must yet more fully learn from science, that progress means change, not blind and deaf attitude of consistency. Like Bishop Welcome in *Les Misérables*, the scientist "never solves problems of faith by hypocrisy." Personally, I do not now hold with the same intellectual and emotional content one of the religious beliefs I was taught to respect as a youth. Thought and scientific training have made me alter every so-called

religious concept of my childhood. And yet I was taught these same things by physically mature men and women who still hold; at least verbally, perhaps never have held in any real sense, these same beliefs.

How much happier a childhood many a man might have had if he had never been taught the Bible *in toto* and indiscriminately until he entered college there to study it as he studied philosophy, politics and European history! Until my college days religion had no real compelling power in my life. What a gloomy childhood I had because I believed literally in heaven, hell, the evil of death, eternal damnation, etc. I shall never forget the hours of childhood agony I spent over "the unpardonable sin," and the terror I felt at possibly having unwittingly committed it.

If I had my profession to choose over again, and if I chose it from motives of greatest usefulness rather than from native inclination, I should devote my life to attempting to formulate some comprehensive system of child instruction, including especially moral and religious conceptions. Our present system of Sunday School teaching is largely pernicious. Very early in life many men cease really to believe much of what they were here taught. Here lies one of the most serious needs and one of the greatest opportunities for the moral uplift of mankind. Science calls to the church for scientific and rational instruction in religious fundamentals.

I have a scientific friend who, after careful consideration of this matter, has finally decided to substitute for the ordinary Sunday School teaching and the moral precepts of the Bible, largely of dogmatic character, the Samurai creed of the Japanese for the moral instruction of his children. That the Bushido creed of rectitude, courage and benevolence is not without great potency in the formation of high moral character is evidenced in the superb unselfishness of the ordinary Japanese. But it is a rather sad commentary upon the church's pedagogical material and methods, when scientific men cannot find it in their hearts to entrust wholeheartedly to its light and leading their very dearest possessions, the offspring of their own aspiring souls. Much has of course been done within the last twenty years to fit and gradate religious truths to the impressionable, confiding but swiftly expanding infant mind.

The greatest care should be had not to tell the child aught that in maturer life it may come to believe untrue. The things that it cannot understand as a child, should form no part of its infant mental life. Nothing is so destructive of proper moral and religious development as dogmatic instruction in unknowable things. The

fundamental truths of religion as expressed in the Bible should be graduated to meet the receptivity and rational criteria of the blossoming mind at the several stages of its development. The important fact is too generally neglected among religious teachers of children that no one is so keen as they to detect discrepancies between words and acts. No child should be vexed, for instance, with the mysteries of the Apostles' Creed. This is unintelligible to many mature minds. Mr. Dooley says that "Since I read the Apostles' Creed, it seems less convincing than when I heard it and did not understand it."

Rather late in life the religious phase of my nature as reflected in traditional Christianity suffered a very rude shock. It was when Ingersoll died. I had long since learned to love Ingersoll's lecture on Napoleon and his lines on laughter. I couldn't believe that a man who could write such beautiful things could be the wicked man he was generally held by the church to be. The Sunday after his death, from pulpits all over the land, as I gathered from Monday's papers, ministers of the Gospel of Jesus hoped that "Bob Ingersoll was now enjoying the hell-fire he so strenuously denied." Was that Christ-like to hope that any one should be damned? Robert Ingersoll was a better character by far, whatever his open faults—and his shortcomings were many—than those who condemned him living and dead. And the time will come when the church will recognize its great debt to him for help to free itself from the thralldom of tradition and superstition.

I believe that mind is the best gift that God has given to man. I believe that one can best repay this gift by the proper use of it. Such use is thought and reason, no matter where it leads.

Some one has said that "the only sin is to be unkind." If the matter can be summed up in a few words, I believe it could be better stated thus: "The only sin is to be dishonest." The church will never progress and do the complete service it has the opportunity and mission to do until it pays more sincere homage to free thought and respects in deed, as now though sometimes only reluctantly in word, absolute honesty. This is the common meeting ground of science and religion, namely honesty of thought, word and deed. Science teaches the church the dignity, even the divinity, of honesty.

I quote from President Jordan's booklet *The Religion of a Sensible American* which quotes from Dr. William M. Salter: "We will tread the floors of hell if need be, rather than hocus-pocus ourselves into believing it is heaven. We will face reality and by long facing it, and above all working in it, we may, under the surface and the

scum, detect traces of heaven in it; not traces that *we* put there, God forbid, but that are there, immanent, struggling, and destined yet to transform the whole."

Paraphrasing Professor Thoburn: In an attempt to be rational we must not yield to the temptation to hoodwink ourselves by imagining we believe what we know we doubt; nor need we classify ourselves as unreligious altogether because we are not like some people who say they believe what we doubt, and who loudly affirm their own religion. To be religious one needs to believe only so much "as finds response in our own lives. It is only that part of God or Jesus that we can appropriate, assimilate and recognize as possible and attainable in our own lives that is of any use to us."

To return: What then does science say with respect to the religious concepts above enumerated. About God as all-encompassing nature—the thought of God—or as first, eternal and perpetual cause, it makes no doubt. The immanence of God it accepts as undeniable fact. The popular child conception of God as a "gaseous vertebrate," in the words of Haeckel, has no place among the religious concepts of a thoughtful man.

When you press science for an answer regarding a personal God who answers prayer it is pretty generally agnostic. It sees only stubborn facts and beneficent laws. It has never known these to be arbitrarily altered. It would seem reprehensible to science to expect alteration for personal good.

Prayer in the ordinary sense science cannot understand. To it a God who has ordained universal natural laws eternally the same and working for general good, is more sublime than one who could be induced through prayer to change those same laws for supposed personal good. Prayer seems natural only as it may have efficacy in working a mental change in the one who prays. An honest useful life is a continual prayer. The scientist regards the world as his country, and worthy human service as his religion.

I can well remember when it seemed altogether proper to pray for money, success, health and all sorts of individual blessings for myself or friends. Such conduct now would seem despicable. I now know that nothing can really hinder a man from achieving but his own native limitations; and that even God will not raise a man beyond the limits of inherited potentialities. I now know that health within the limits of inherited capacity is a matter of obeying natural laws. I now know that unearned money is among the least of good gifts. Intellect, free will, moral conscience—"the amount of innate knowledge"—and the like are possessions compared with

which material things are insignificant. I now know that dishonor is worse than death, and that even death has a content of sacred interest when at least a few of life's aspirations are achieved.

I well remember with what a thrill of satisfaction I first read Emerson's definition of prayer, i. e., "soliloquy." This has been satisfying to this day. Science recognizes within man reservoirs of spiritual or nervous force. In soliloquy one in a sense connects with these and gathers strength for combat with weakness and evil in the world and oneself. Here one finds weapons for offense against the inherited evil tendencies, ancestral remnants of the organic evolutionary process. We have all had the experience of feeling at rare moments almost divine; at others demoniac. More frequent soliloquy with our better selves and the spiritual forces they represent—God within us—would give us a more continuous divine earthly life.

Science can accept the Bible only as a book compounded of poetry, history, philosophy, law and folk-lore, inspired in the same sense that any other great work, literary or otherwise, is inspired, with perhaps a difference in degree; and Christ as a sublime historical fact, the great human ideal, as well substantiated as the fact of the existence of Socrates or Julius Cæsar, divine and human as you and I are. You and I are "sons of God" in the same sense that Christ was; his relationship with "the Father" was perhaps more intimate.

Heaven and hell as commonly understood are fictions of the imagination. They are states of mind figuratively attributable to present conditions, but of no significance regarding an unknowable future. "The medieval pictures of eternal torment in hell-fire are of pagan, not of Christian, birth. Except in the Book of Revelations and in one parable of Christ, fire in the Scriptures is a symbol of either purification or destruction, never of torment." Dr. Lyman Abbott continues: "I refuse to believe that the accident of death transmutes God's mercy into wrath and makes repentance impossible, and so closes the door of hope upon the soul forever."

As to Immortality, science can only be agnostic. However, science seeing that in nature there is no loss but only change, now generally adopts the attitude of hope for some sort of life after death, of the nature of which it has no adequate conception.

This I believe represents in general science's attitude to religious concepts. But it represents simply the irreducible minimum of scientific religion. The attitude is anything but antagonistic, and it is not altogether final, but only in the making, and the church

must respect it as long as it is attained by process of honest thinking. No scientist will object to this much; a great many go much further and believe much more. But this much represents common meeting ground for all and is sufficient base for both science and religion to cooperate in humanitarian efforts.

Finally all must admit that scientific proof, in the ordinary sense, of religious concepts is not possible. The highest religious faith *in extenso* cannot wait upon scientific demonstration. Still it must always accord with the criterion of rationality. Religious belief, however, in its inmost soul rests upon personal experience. Nothing less will gain and hold acceptance. There is a phase of man's complete nature to which spiritual facts appeal, and which does not respond, because of a different or higher nature, to scientific evidence.

But this "phase" develops at the top; nevertheless it has its beginning in the first unfolding of the infant mind; and at this stage can be appealed to similarly only by simple words and pictures and precepts of reason. To attempt to reverse in religious instruction this order of development, as is still so largely done, is simply to handicap or perhaps permanently blight the full blossoming of the religious nature and the closely-knit moral sense. With this understanding the church must now answer science's call for help in its effort to help man here, this being the surest way of helping him for the hereafter.

Science is particularly interested in two of the church's sacraments, namely, confirmation and marriage, incidentally the former, very specially the latter. Religion has made and held its place in the world largely by reason of its relation to the reproductive life. Slaughter claims that if the church is to grasp its modern opportunity, failing which he thinks there is little need of the church at all, it must utilize these two sacraments for their true purpose, namely in the interests of an idealism which recognizes the responsibility laid upon the present by the future.

Recent developments in biologic science which have caused the crystallization of such ideas are due to the discovery of the laws of heredity. Within the past few years a new science, founded upon the facts of heredity, has been born, namely eugenics, or the science of breeding the human thoroughbred. It has become the main interest of both science and religion to bring about the highest type of physical, intellectual and moral man within the limits of human protoplasm. Science points the way; but the end cannot be attained as fully and as speedily as seems desirable unless the church give

to the movement its heartiest cooperation. Indeed it would almost seem that unless the church grasp this opportunity of revitalization in identification with this most important world movement, it will fall into deserved desuetude. Comprehension of the facts of heredity is the truest bond linking religion to science through the love of man for man.

The bare facts are these: our present knowledge of heredity clearly indicates that men sound in body, mind and soul are born of similar ancestors. In a very literal sense is it then that out of an unclean thing no clean thing can come, that figs do not grow on thistles, nor grapes on thorns, that as the parent so the child, that like produces like. We no longer believe the sentiment in one of the hymns in Isaac Watt's hymnal:

"Diseases are thy methods, Lord,  
To make thy people good."

Dr. Johnson pronounced a far more sensible dictum in "Every sick man is a rascal"; and Elbert Hubbard gives it as the summary of his wide experience and deep knowledge of men that "only healthy men are honest." "The distemper of anemia," in the words of President David Starr Jordan, "should never be accepted as religion."

But religion has from the beginning emphasized the virtue of relieving distress, poverty and disease. Christ himself is said to have cast out devils, healed the sick and raised the dead. But the present is greatly overburdened by the calls upon its resources for care of the insane, feeble-minded, vagrant, criminal, pauper, indigent and sick. And the number of such individuals and the burden of their care is steadily increasing.

Science believes that greater virtue resides in efforts for the prevention of the steadily augmenting stream of the unfit, and science holds the key to a humane solution of the difficulty. It is a debt the present owes to the future. It seems clear that if we persist in our present emotional and shortsighted methods of indiscriminate charity and relief, evidenced more particularly in our treatment of the feeble-minded and idiot, posterity will be given a legacy of unbearable economic burdens. The prevention of this steady quota of deficient individuals lies in the control of the source of production. Science would control to some extent the mating of individuals; but the church has appropriated to itself full control of the sacrament of marriage.

To me the recent step taken by the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul of Chicago, at the instance of Dean

Sumner, is one of the most momentous events of our century. The authorities of this cathedral have declared that hereafter no marriage ceremony shall be performed for persons who cannot present a satisfactory medical certificate guaranteeing freedom from venereal taint or other genetic injury. When all the churches and clergy are brave enough and honest enough to take a similar stand, and state legislatures are wise enough to formulate laws looking to similar eugenic ends, the world will be approaching the condition so earnestly prayed for by the church, a kingdom of heaven upon the earth. It was a most gratifying circumstance when last June, Dean Hodges, of the Cambridge Theological Seminary, showed the courage to present as an exponent of the church this aspect of human service with great tact but in plain terms in a baccalaureate sermon to the medical graduates of the University of Virginia.

In the exercise of these two sacraments the church holds an opportunity for service of inestimable value to mankind. In addition to the accepted more strictly religious purposes of confirmation this should be a time for instruction in racial matters and for the shaping of eugenic ideals. It should be a time when young people are brought to realize the sacredness of their bodies as well as their souls. It is a time for the birth of altruistic aspirations, and for the awakening to knowledge of bonds to the past and obligations to the future. How the soul existed before birth or how it will conduct itself after death is not scientifically knowable; here and now soul is knit to body and dependent upon it, with possibly reciprocal relationship subsisting; in this life at least the body as a fundamental condition is quite as important as the soul.

To disregard body for a supposed higher spiritual interest is subversive of individual and racial welfare. The church need not include efforts for shaping racial ideals among its confirmation interests, but in neglecting to do so, it is surely losing one of its greatest opportunities for social good and for its own usefulness.

As concerns the use of confirmation in the interests of eugenics, one cardinal difficulty presents itself. This difficulty must be satisfactorily, that is rationally, disposed of before other steps can be effectually taken. The candidate for confirmation is asked or presumed to accept the Apostles' Creed. Every normal child finds here a stumbling-block in the statement that Jesus "was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." Personally, I could accept the statement interpreted in terms of reverent folk-lore; but literally, that is in a strictly biological sense, I cannot believe it. I am convinced that every normal thoughtful child has this same

difficulty. To say publicly that one believes what one privately doubts is subversive of good morals. The trouble is not with the possibility of the fact. Christ had power, perhaps, to come into the flesh in an infinite variety of ways. And the organic world offers numerous examples of parthenogenesis, or conception without direct male intervention. But to teach that Jesus literally had no human father at once brands sex and sex-relationship as things beneath the divine dignity of the human Jesus, and leaves the impression that sex impulse is impure. On the contrary, man has perhaps no higher or more sacred gift than sex, in the proper exercise of which function he approaches most closely to God in his supreme act, that of creation. Sex in life is at the root of much that is pure and noble and sacred. It is the inspiration of the bulk of art and music and literature and idealism and pure family life. To leave the slightest intimation as touched by religion that it is inherently tainted with "sin" is individually and racially hurtful.

In eugenics we must start with the idea of the purity of sex. To teach that Jesus, the ideal of the world, lived outside its necessity and influence at birth, makes such stand impossible. The idea will sooner or later enter the mind of youth that if Christ did not come in the natural human way, just as every human being comes into the world, he missed the supreme opportunity of his sacred mission, namely, to hallow and bless also the very source and fountain of life, the instinct of sex. When the church takes a right attitude to the use and abuse of sex and sex relationship it will no longer be asked so often to bless with its benediction what should be most foreign to its purpose, namely, voluntary sterility. The agreement between a man and a woman to live together for any purpose is of the nature of a legal contract. The church should be brave enough in this present crisis of an appalling decrease in the birth rate among the better stocks and an appalling increase of defectives, to withhold its blessing and sanction except to healthy unions formed with avowed intent of an economically reasonable procreation. Just as the church is largely responsible for the continuance of more or less open vice, so it is perhaps still more largely responsible for a critical social condition, the result of a recreancy to its eugenic opportunity, in that it has apparently failed in the matter of proper instruction at confirmation respecting racial responsibility.

There is no human interest that should be foreign to the church. It is one of the most encouraging signs of a better time when our large cities, e. g., Chicago, could recently form a Vice Commission with a personnel of its best Christian citizens. The church claims

for its peculiar right the administration of the marriage sacrament, and then largely refuses to interest itself in the vices which despoil it. Vice flourishes as it does largely because the church continues to regard itself as too good to attack it at the source, or because it is actually too indifferent to take an interest in matters which call for real courage and sacrifice. St. Paul tells us, "To the pure all things are pure." Shakespeare said, "Nothing is good or bad but thinking makes it so." Vice may be ignorance, or even innocence, but it is always racially destructive.

There is a class of diseases than which none is more inimical to the marriage sacrament or so disastrous to the race, which the church persists in regarding as shameful and refuses to countenance. Science calls from the bottom of its heart, if I may so speak, that the church give it help in its great battle upon this enemy of individual and racial health. Science knows very well that this class of diseases should be treated as are small-pox, diphtheria, and other infectious diseases. Strict isolation and marriage disqualification until pronounced permanently cured by competent authorities are the only effective means of combatting the "social diseases." These safeguards must be coupled with a crusade for the eradication of the social vice from which they perennially take source.

Such measures wait upon adequate legislation, which further waits upon public opinion. In the formation of the latter, the church again has peculiar opportunities which a true Christ-like spirit should not permit it to neglect. It is not sufficient to mean well. Emotional misguided activity frequently does more harm than inaction. Promiscuous and misguided charity largely defeats higher ends.

"If God created man in his own image, is it not the duty of the church to keep that creation as free from pollution as possible? Are we to think less of human beings than we do of our own live stock, to protect the pure strain of which we have laws, written and unwritten, laws based upon medical science?" (Dr. J. N. Hurty.)

This is nowhere more clear, or productive of more pernicious results, than in our treatment of the criminal and mentally defective. The fetish that "all men are born free and equal" is no part of a scientific or effective religion, or of rational patriotism. Fortunately we now have a measure in the Binet-Simon test of innate mental capacity. We are just beginning to see that criminals and anti-socials of various sorts are simply forms physically mature, but mentally in various stages of infancy and childhood. A child, whether four or forty years of age, must be treated as a child, not

as a "criminal." And the only rational method for permanent eradication is the same a farmer would pursue in eliminating from a herd of cattle an inferior or vicious strain, i. e., prevent breeding from that strain.

Sir Francis Galton, the founder of eugenics, speaks thus on these points: "Eugenic belief extends the function of philanthropy to future generations. It renders its actions more prevailing than heretofore by dealing with families and societies in their entirety, and it enforces the importance of the marriage covenant by directing serious attention to the probable quality of future offspring. It strongly forbids all forms of sentimental charity that are baneful to the race, while it greatly seeks opportunity for acts of personal kindness as some equivalent to the loss of what it forbids. It brings the tie of kinship into prominence and strongly encourages love in family and race. In brief, eugenics is a virile creed, full of hope, and appealing to many of the noblest feelings of our nature."

I am informed that at the time of the Civil War only one colored insane person was known in Virginia. The asylum at Petersburg now has 1500 inmates. When one takes the trouble to learn the names and look into the family histories of the inmates, one soon finds that there are frequently from four to twelve of the same family, and that their entire pedigree is characterized by like traits in varying degrees.

It is true of all our asylums for mental defectives, that when a certain degree of improvement is shown, the inmate is given his freedom, only too often to return a year or two after, meanwhile having brought into the world for a too-long suffering already over-taxed people to support, one or several like himself. It is no rare occurrence to have an entire childship feeble-minded and confined at the same time in the same institution.

When will we begin to show common sense in the solution of such problems? When will we ever awaken to the injustice and the folly of our institutional methods? How long will the people refuse to learn the truth that "like produces like"?

At Williamsburg recently, where 900 whites are confined, I was shown what was the merest wreck of a human form with less mind than a two-year old baby. It was a "star case." The idiot had been kept alive for three months by feeding with a stomach tube; he could now be fed by spoon. To what end, my friends, to what end! I have never seen a more pathetic sight! If tradition and sentiment forbid alteration of our methods respecting present treatment of these mental and physical wrecks, a physical and moral burden to

themselves, and an economic burden to a toiling common people, what law of God or man stands in the way of at least forbidding reproduction of type of serious defectives. The problem demands the charity, but also the wisdom and courage, of a Christ. It is the work of his true disciples.

"We have had almost two thousand years of Christianity, and in that time there has been ceaseless inculcation of religion and morals, and still the scarlet woman, social diseases, imbecility, insanity, and crime exist. Wars are still going on, in which young, healthy, normal men are slaughtered. The monastery and the nunnery still claim a no insignificant number of the healthy and the gifted, and the cripples, the imbeciles, the diseased, the vicious are left free to multiply." (Dr. J. N. Hurty.)

Scientific knowledge, effective propaganda and wisdom in the application of ascertained remedies are what the times demand. Honesty and consistency of ideals are the fundamentals of Christian as well as of scientific conduct. Acts and motives must be measured by the foot-rule of the character of Christ. The individual that can decorate its hat with the white breeding plumage of the blue-heron—ignoring the fact that the mother heron must cruelly die and its new-born perish from starvation—and yet wax emotional over vivisection conducted under the most humane conditions, and for the purpose of health to mankind, forgets the first principle of Christianity and civilized conduct, namely that theory and practice must harmonize.

More pathetic still is the not uncommon attitude which condemns scientific men because they cannot honestly accept certain tenets of so-called orthodox belief, and ignores the fact that the very life of these same scientists is a faithful fulfilment of Christ's highest requirement of men in his service, namely, that one lay down his life for His cause. Christ's cause is the cause of toiling mankind. Many are the scientific men who have surrendered life, as for example the beloved Dr. Walter Reed in his work on yellow fever, young Dr. Ricketts of Chicago University in his work on typhus fever, and young Dr. McClintock of Washington in his work on Rocky Mountain spotted fever, for the demonstration of a scientific fact, which meant life and life more abundant to their fellow-men; or who in laboratory or in hospital are literally laying down their lives for the same cause. Christian martyrs did no more than this. Martyrdom for sincerity of conviction becomes the more noble as the conviction is honestly founded and according as it achieves for worthy causes. These young scientists laid down their lives

that we might live. Lord Lister by applying the knowledge of infection and asepsis to the practice of surgery, was instrumental even in his own lifetime, in saving more lives than were destroyed in all the bloody wars of the nineteenth century.

Jesus said, "I am come that they (my brethren) might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." Oscar E. McCulloch reminds us that he said "life" not "salvation"; "and then salvation is a word that Jesus never used." He says further, "I understand God's business in this world is not salvation alone; that is a little part of it. It is not restoration alone; that is but a phase of it. It is not repair; that is a small portion of it. But it is utilizing all the forces that are as yet unlimited and unexhausted that children shall be born to happy homes and joyful parents; shall be surrounded by education and by the conditions of a happier and purer society, that they shall not go astray, that they shall not fall into evil, that they shall have no taint of sin upon them. There shall be no need of their being born twice, since God's first birth is good enough for all and suffices for all, if nothing come to prevent the perfect development of his plan."