

psychologist of the world. He is a perfect master of zoology, anatomy, and physiology. It is tremendously significant that he abandoned the Monistic view and became a pure Dualist. That he should ever have lent the influence of his great name to the heresy of Monism he publicly confessed to have been a "crime and a sin."

The last word of science, with few exceptions,—our enemies themselves being judges—is out and out in favor of orthodoxy and the Church.

No man can fail to admire the candor and enthusiasm in the search for truth characteristic of Haeckel, but throughout Europe he is *not* regarded as a safe man. His posing as a true and strict disciple of Spinoza, while ignoring the cardinal principle of the Spinozistic philosophy which makes the attributes of thought and extension independent, co-ordinate and mutually op-pugnant—this disregard of what may be called the very citadel of Spinoza's marvelous speculation is an illustration of Haeckel's lack of caution. The great Darwin, you remember, had to utter a silent prayer, to be delivered from his own disciple.

If any word in this communication can bear the remotest shade of discourtesy, the writer begs to withdraw it. He is most grateful for the privilege of stating his views before a "court" of such culture, offering meanwhile with best wishes for its Editor the sentiment: "*Me Socium Summis Ad-jungere Rebus.*"

WM. FROST BISHOP.

[The application which Mr. Bishop makes of a passage in my article is *his*, not *ours*. We know very well that a man may be very scholarly, and yet have remained untouched by the spirit of modern science, which can be acquired only through a familiarity with the natural sciences.

As to the problem of personal immortality, we should first settle the question as to the nature of personality. What is the person of a man? Does or does not his body form part of it, and if so is a resurrection of the corpse necessary for the preservation of a personality?

It goes without saying that we are not responsible for Mr. Bishop's statements concerning Kant, Du Bois-Reymond, Wundt, and others.]

"HOW FAR HAVE WE STRAYED FROM CHRISTIANITY?"

To the Editor of The Open Court:

I was very much interested in your article in the October number of *The Open Court* entitled "How Far Have We Strayed from Christianity?" for the reason that you voice my own experience to a remarkable degree with regard to the development of my present religious convictions.

A person can not advance very far in the study of science before he discovers that the point of view and the conceptions of science are at variance with those held by the writers of the Bible, and expressed by the average orthodox minister of to-day. He soon becomes impressed with the thought that if God is the ruler of the universe He must rule and manifest Himself through the forces of nature which orthodox churchmen affect to disregard as important avenues through which we may increase our knowledge of God; that if God is present in the cosmos it must be in the order and orderly unfolding or evolution of the same.

It seems to me, too, that even a superficial study of comparative religion and religious literature profoundly impresses the unprejudiced mind with the thought that God's revelations and inspirations are universal, and that in any age the crude and imperfect character of the inspired messages are the measure of the ignorance that darkened the intellect of the religious teachers. Such literature testifies to the fact that God has never left Himself without a witness to the one who has earnestly sought for Him, and that the similarity in essence of the highest ideals and moral conceptions found in all the great religions of the past and present attest the universal character of those principles that the orthodox Christians are wont to regard as peculiarly Christian.

I believe that the truths and methods of science are the leaven whose slow working in the minds of men will eventually bring about a more reasonable attitude towards the Bible and towards scientific instruction. I believe that the principles of science will gradually give rise to a Christianity that furnishes a broader outlook; that contains a more grand conception of God, of His ways of working in the world and of manifesting Himself to mankind; that owns a wider brotherhood and extends a warmer sympathy to humanity. It seems to me that the general diffusion of the facts of science must surely bring about this larger Christianity that is founded upon truth, as nearly as truth can be discovered by the reason of man,—necessarily scientific truth attained by the most rigid scientific methods. This Christianity will consist much less of creeds and much more of deeds; much less of assenting to statements about the Christ and much more in exemplifying the spirit that characterized not only the Christ but also all of the great moral and religious teachers of the world. This Christianity will lead its adherents to seek above all things else to know and conform to the world order which is the manifestation of the divine.

This larger and better Christianity is more and more gaining the assent and approval of the better informed and more progressive minds, and, it seems to me, it will necessarily grow up out of the old faith as the knowledge of the facts and principles and methods of science become more and more disseminated among the people.

Your publications are accomplishing a very important and much needed work towards this end and I wish you God speed in your labors.

T. E. SAVAGE.

When the Editor of *The Open Court* made the remark in the October number (p. 583) that "as to my declaration that I am 'no Christian' I have simply to say that it depends entirely on the Christians whether or not they would still recognize me as such," he had no thought that men and women known to be prominent in Christian circles would take this opportunity to express their assurance that no line of demarcation exists between their position and his own. This, however, has already been done in the case of a few, among others Madame Hyacinthe Loyson, wife of Father Hyacinthe, who tersely writes, "*You are a Christian!*" while the following letters come from R. J. Campbell, the well-known English Congregational preacher and minister of City Temple, London, and John Harrington Edwards, a Presbyterian divine of Brooklyn:

To the Editor of The Open Court.

"I have just read your *apologia* in reply to the *Expository Times*. If the title Christian does not describe you then I have no right to it, for I not only take what is in the main your view of the truth, but I preach it. I often tell my people that even Jesus did not speak of Christianity, but of the truth.

R. J. CAMPBELL.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

Your personal *Apologia pro fide sua* in the October *Open Court*, gives opportunity which perhaps others as well as myself will embrace, to express interest in what you have so frankly said, whether friendly or adverse. I have only this excuse, as a monthly reader of your valuable magazine, and as a seeker for the same ends which you seek with such evident sincerity and ability, for retouching the personal note sounded in your article.

Probably there are other Presbyterian ministers besides myself who have read with mingled approval and criticism your very interesting account of your changes of thought, and therefore, of faith. We children of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries must be stolid indeed not to have heard the voice of the *Zeitgeist*. Unless pledged and bound to tradition, who of us but has moved on in the direction you have gone, though it may be to find a resting-place for faith much nearer the old hearthstone?

With most of your philosophical positions, I am in full agreement. As to your ethical sympathy with essential Christianity, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, I am also in accord with you. Only it seems to me that it is not necessary to give up the personal Divine of Christ especially as manifest in the consummation of vicarious love on Calvary. On the whole I can echo word for word the sentiments of Père Loyson, quoted in your notice of Madame Loyson's book.

I have noted in the margin of your article some points of your philosophical creed which I perhaps do not fully comprehend, about which I would like to talk with you. But as to the spirit of your theological assertions, I fancy even my friend Dr. Minton must be in responsive sympathy with that.

JOHN H. EDWARDS.

"STATE AND CHURCH."

To the Editor of The Open Court.

I do not write to engage you in a controversy but to thank you for the number of *The Open Court* for October, 1905, which contains my letter on "State and Church." Nevertheless, you will permit me to say that your answer does not invalidate my proposition in any particular.

It is not my idea that the Catholic Church cannot brook either the competition of other religions or the independence of philosophical thought; this statement was merely borrowed from a religious work published with the approbation of Leo XIII. I simply told you that in France, religion was an insignificant factor because to the great majority of the French it means nothing but some outward and occasional ceremonies. The ballot on the separation of Church and State has verified this assertion.

The partisans of the Church prophesied that this measure would cause