

THE Presbyterian Quarterly.

NO. 53--JULY, 1900.

I. RACE PROBLEM IN THE SOUTH.*

It is my purpose to speak dispassionately and for truth sake only. We have for discussion a question of vast importance to the nation, the understanding of which is of great import to a large section of our country, and of even greater consequence to the negro race. I speak as a friend of the negro, provided you let friendship mean a willingness to do for him that which is for his very best interests, and which would not be good if done for an equal number of white men living anywhere in this union. The best friend of the negro is he who recognizes that negroes and whites are not equal, and it is beyond the power of man to make them so. The reason is, a negro is a negro and a white man a white man. This distinction will appear absurd to you here in New England, while it will be satisfactory to any Southern man as intelligent and as kind as any citizen of your great Commonwealth. The failure to accept the dictum of your Southern white brethren has led to, what I consider, the greatest wrong ever perpetrated upon an inferior race, viz: the extension of the franchise to those helpless in the grasp of such a power for evil.

I shall undertake to account for the attitude of the public mind toward slavery that finally gave such a resultant. In doing so, I shall necessarily refer to that which is already familiar, but probably has never been considered by you in relation of cause and effect. Beginning with the Missouri

*An address delivered before the Unity Club of New Bedford, Mass., April 27, 1900.

VI. THE CONDESCENSION OF SOME APOSTLES OF MODERN CULTURE.

We are not likely soon to forget that we are living in the era of modern scientific progress. Upon thousands of commencement platforms this fact is proclaimed annually by thousands of brave young trumpeters to circles of admiring relatives and friends ; and the still better evidence of its truth is seen on land and sea, and in the very air itself, in improved methods of communication and travel, and in the betterment of all the arts of comfortable and luxurious living. From every standpoint we may well rejoice in this brilliant triumph of modern science, contributing so prodigally to the arts and culture of modern life. But at the same time we may condemn certain apostles of the scientific spirit, who commit the fallacy of mistaking their kind of science for omniscience, and who tell us that beyond the boundaries of the natural or physical sciences there is no certain human knowledge. And we may yoke with these representatives of the scientific culture, certain apostles of the more liberal culture, as some economists, sociologists literary critics and others, who, while resenting the claim that there is no assured truth in their respective fields, are at one with these certain scientists in telling us that in the great sphere of religious truth or theological doctrine there is no rock foundation of certainty upon which the feet of the adventurous explorer may be planted. With a lordly condescension as if from some superior height, they seem to call down to us from these complacent summits upon which they fancy they are seated, that we may spare ourselves the effort of trying to reach certain knowledge and assured truth in that great department of theological science where so many of the world's elect and lofty spirits have labored for a life time in the conviction of possessing the infallible truth of God.

Let me first present to you some evidence in confirmation of this article. Let me quote an extract from the

Coryphæus of the modern scientific culture. (Herbert Spencer, *First Principles of Philosophy*, Section 33) He is speaking of the proper attitude of the man of science. He says "It is hard for him to bear the manifestation of that pride of ignorance which so far exceeds the pride of science. Naturally enough such a one will be indignant when charged with irreligion because he declines to accept the carpenter theory of creation as the most worthy one. He may think it needless, as it is difficult, to conceal his repugnance to a creed, which tacitly ascribes to the Unknowable a love of adulation such as would be despised in a human being. Convinced as he is, that all punishment as we see it wrought out in the order of nature, is but a disguised beneficence, there will perhaps escape from him, an angry condemnation of the belief that punishment is a divine vengeance, and that divine vengeance is eternal. He may be tempted to show his contempt, when he is told that actions instigated by an unselfish sympathy or by a pure love of rectitude are intrinsically sinful; and that conduct is truly good, only when it is due to a faith, whose openly, professed motive is other-worldiness. But he must restrain such feelings. Though he may be unable to do this, during the excitement of controversy, or when otherwise brought face to face with current superstition, he must yet qualify his antagonism in calmer moments, so that his mature judgment and resulting conduct may be without bias."

Now I wish to be moderate, but there are three things in reference to the extract I wish to mention; first, its unwarranted dogmatism. If Mr. Spencer knows all that he here assumes to know, he is entitled to the attribute of omniscience. How else could he know that all punishment is beneficent and no punishment is eternal. Second, the wondrous facility of misrepresentation, which marks this extract, is characteristic of this writer whenever he trenches on religious themes. For example, what theologians hold the doctrine that actions instigated by a pure love of rectitude are intrinsically sinful. But, third, the immeasurable and ineffable condescension with which this

apostle of culture climbs to the lofty throne on which he complacently seats himself while he relegates to abysmal depths far beneath his imperial place, the poor votaries of the current superstition, towards which he exhorts himself not to feel too much indignation, repugnance, angry condemnation and contempt. We are obliged to him for this delicate consideration. I charge myself to keep calm and not to seem violent.

But we will employ ourselves with sampling some more of these apostles, and let Mr. Matthew Arnold tell us in his "St. Paul and Protestantism" that "The predestinarian and solifidian dogmas for the very sake of which our Puritan churches came into existence begin to feel the irresistible breath of the zeit-geist. Some of them melt quicker, others slower, but all of them are doomed." Bear with me while I call you to note three things about this accomplished gentleman's prophecy. First, this prophet's unwavering confidence in his own prophecies, he must believe them for he himself has uttered them; a confidence misplaced by the stern comment of event for these very dogmas which he informs us are certainly doomed are more widely taught and believed this very day than ever before in our world's history. Second, the canon of truth which he proposes as the test of these dogmas, namely, the breath of the zeit-geist. Translated into plain, every-day English, what that means is, that at any particular time the truth of doctrines is to be tested by the count of noses, which is just as accurate as to say that the value of articles of merchandise is to be determined by the number of pounds marked on the scale. A tub of lard is worth near three hundred pounds of diamonds. But third and most notably, the unapproachable condescension is well nigh surpassed by the bland and insinuating tones in which this gifted literarian reveals his contempt by the use of barbarous words. "Predestinarian and solifidian" is good. I do not at this stage discuss this condescension; I simply wish you now to observe the air of contemptuous patronage with which our author pities those victimized by a belief in these "predestinarian and solifidian dogmas."

But we will sample another one of these fools and get the task through. Mr. Leslie Steven is kind enough to let us into his secret as follows : "Men of sense I fancy often wish to avoid scandal rather than to conceal their sentiment from their peers. They trust to a free masonry, which exists among themselves and which presents an impenetrable barrier to the sagacity of fools. One may guess that the esoteric creed drops some articles of the orthodox faith, but the man of sense, while he has a contempt for any one who (as M. Renan says of St. Paul) believes heartily or takes all creeds seriously, has a hearty dislike for the man who too openly discards the established tenets. Why drop a veil so easily worn. Religion is after all useful and we are even bound—for the sensible man can take a high moral tone when he pleases—to invent the God who does not exist." Now I charge myself to be calm and refrain from violence and not to express unduly indignation, repugnance, angry condemnation and contempt, but there are four things I must note. First the unconscious dishonesty of this self-revelation. Men of sense, like himself of course, conceal their sentiments in order to avoid scandal. They invent the God, whom they know not to exist, because he is useful. If this is the natural fruit of agnosticism then we know its real intrinsic nature. Second, the unspeakable condescension with which this Mr. Steven arrogates to himself the tickling impertinence for that greatest of all heroes, St. Paul, is too overwhelming for comment. Think of it, Leslie Steven standing there, Apostle Paul standing here, confronting each other, and Mr. Steven smiling a contemptuous smile in the face of Paul. Get that picture into your head if you can. I confess it staggers me to believe in its possibility.

We will hear from just one more of these apostles. This time Prof. Thornstein Veblen of the University of Chicago in his recent work "The Theory of the Leisure Class." (pp 322-4) "As a general rule the classes that are low in economic efficiency or in intelligence or both are peculiarly devout—as for instance the negro population of the

South, most of the lower class foreign population, much of the rural population, especially in those sections which are backward in education in the stage of development of their industry or in respect of their industrial contact with the rest of the community. * * * That is to say the peculiar devoutness of women is a particular expression of that conservatism which the women of civilized communities owe in great measure to their economic position. The logic and the logical processes of her every day domestic life are carried over into the realm of the supernatural and the woman finds herself at home and content in a range of ideas, which to the man are in a great measure alien and imbecile."

I wish to signalize the amazing condescension with which this distinguished professor, wrapped in the complacency and serenity of academic contemplation, classifies the devout into these four great divisions, the negro population of the South, the lower class foreign population, the rural population and the women. I think that is exceedingly cool. Some of us come from the country; all of us had mothers, most of us have wives and all of us ought to have. If there is any sublime excess of loftiness beyond this to be reached by the soaring and the venturesome spirit, ambitious to display a still more amazing condescension, I do not believe that you can find it even in the imperial Capital of the Northwest from which the book issued, able as that great city is to meet almost all the demands upon her resources and ingenuity. In Prof. Veblen's condescension Chicago has already distanced all competitors and surpassed the world, and we would have to emigrate to another world to find it excelled. We have found then these four representative apostles of modern culture, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Steven and Mr. Veblen all absolutely at one in the condescension with which they look upon the benighted votaries of theological science. They differ only in degree and amount of this strange and unwarranted emotion, which they wear. One may have a bigger gun than the other, but in every one of them the gun is loaded to the muzzle.

I. Let us examine this condescension as to its nature and work. First, it is out of place in those who have no title to be regarded as specialists in the field of theological science. I intend to bring no railing accusation against these gentlemen. "Michael, the Archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed with him about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." I intend to follow the example of the Archangel in this respect, but it is a simple statement of fact to say, that none of these gentlemen even claim to be experts in any of the great departments of theological science. Let us see what claims they have to weight as theological authorities. Mr. Spencer evidently regards himself as a specialist in a great many of the most important departments of human knowledge. He has published ponderous volumes which he regards as authoritative, on the First Principles of Philosophy, on the Principles of Biology, on the Principles of Psychology, on the Principles of Sociology, on the Principles of Morality with several volumes of essays and a treatise on Education, Intellectual, Moral and Physical. Now I am willing to admit the remarkable gifts of this worker and writer, but I raise the question whether with the wonderful modern additions to the sum of human knowledge any modern scholar can claim to be a specialist in so many and various fields, and I ask whether the extensiveness of his claims is not in some measure an impeachment of those claims; and I raise the further point that he does not even pretend to be a specialist in the field of theological science, and were he to do so, his works would furnish easy disproof of his claims, and yet he declares himself with the air of infallible assurance upon theological subjects upon which no man is entitled to an opinion except as the result of years of investigation and study.

Mr. Arnold was a poet with a happy turn for a certain kind of cool and easy-flowing verse. He was a literary critic of excellent judgment, he was a consummate verbalist with a taste in coining neat phrases seldom excelled.

But Mr. Arnold as a theologian, is like the fabled animal who attempted to play the lion's part. How could he roar like a lion and how could Mr. Arnold talk like a theologian? "St. Paul and Protestantism" would be exquisite humor, were not the subject too serious for the play of badinage and the sport of fun; but I believe no one but the author himself ever took this volume seriously. And surely it is not reasonable, that because a poet of some pretensions, and a literary critic of exquisite taste, he should settle in *ex cathedra* fashion the deepest problems of theological science.

As for Mr. Stephen, he is the facile composer of attractive magazine articles and the glib manufacturer of startling newspaper leaders. But surely the easy and jaunty omniscience of the magazinist and the unfailing cock-sureness of the imperturbable editor are not the court before which the claims of the spiritual life and destiny can be safely adjudicated. Do audacity, self-assertion, a willingness to decide all questions off-hand, "in the heavens above, in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth," fit one for the role of a calm and judicious investigator, whose opinions are of intrinsic weight and worth?

Professor Veblen is doubtless the accomplished economist and sociologist who, by years of patient study and investigation, has been prepared to formulate judgments entitled to consideration; but there is no evidence that a similar discipline has qualified him to give us theological opinions of similar weight and worth. And yet, along with his economic and sociological conclusions, he gives us theological judgments with the same air of authoritativeness and conviction. Let us reverse the case. Let me make the violent supposition that Jonathan Edwards, who was something of a metaphysician and theologian, should intrude into the sphere of chemistry with the announcement that Dalton's law of chemical combinations was a farrago of nonsense; let me suppose that Dr. Charles Hodge, who has some title to be regarded as a theological expert, should venture into the department of physics with the declara-

tion that the hypothesis of ether as the condition for the diffusion of radiant energy was a vain conceit of shallow sophists ; suppose Bishop Lightfoot, a ripe scholar in the field of Biblical interpretation, should summon a court of judges and of legal voters, and should tell them that the whole structure of the common law, as built up by the best efforts of political expounders of that law for centuries, was a fasciculus of baseless fictions ; suppose Bishop Westcott, a textual critic of the highest repute and skill, should insist in trampling the new science of sociology under his feet on the ground that it was an unworthy and indecent bastard ; why, the hot indignation of the chemists and the physicists and the jurists and the sociologists would warn Edwards and Hodge and Lightfoot and Westcott that they were profane intruders into a field of which they knew nothing. Now I ask by parity of reasoning, may not Spencer and Arnold and Stephen and Veblen have warning to vacate the theological premises upon which they are intruders and "squatters ?"

If the theologians must be careful what they tread under their feet, why not insist on equal care from those learned and gifted gentlemen, who are physicists, economists, sociologists, literarians or what not, but who have no claim as experts in the field of theology.

II. I remark, second, this condescension is out of place when exercised toward those who may justly be regarded as specialists in the theological sciences. I cannot crowd into small space even the most cursory selection of names at which it would be hard for a man of sense to smile a contemptuous smile. From Moses to Paul, the whole Hebrew history and literature is crowded with men of the loftiest genius, who gave all their powers of intellect and heart to religious life and service; and who surely were not the kind of men to build their faith and their hopes upon a foundation which was not laid deep in reason and judgment. And Christian history is bright with other illustrious names, which the world will never allow to die; men of the very first order of intellect and the highest type of character

who gave themselves without reserve to theological study, with an unflinching conviction of the possession of the certain truths of God. Was Augustine an intellectual weakling, likely to be deceived by old wives' fables of childish invention? If you think so, study his *De Civitate Dei*, in which are stored up the results of the ripe reflection of a mind second perhaps to none in the whole history of human thought. Was John Calvin a mental infant, quieted by the cheap nostrums of religious quacks? If you think so, study his "Institutes," and if you can master his mighty system you will certainly have your senses exercised by reason of use, and will be able to distinguish between a "fool" and a genius of the very first order. Was Bishop Butler an ignorant blunderer, embracing mad superstitions out of sheer blindness of intellect? If you think so, study his immortal "Analogy," and if you can appreciate the unanswerable demonstration which silences all reply you will find the invincible logic as finely illustrated as your rational curiosity could well desire. Was Dr. Thos. Chalmers an incompetent driveller, helpless in the art of just thinking before the high problems of thought and destiny? If you think so, study his "Ecclesiastical Economics," and caught by the tide and sweep of his argument you may discover that the "great Scot" has a just place among the very first of the sons of men.

I have recalled these mighty names, that you may imagine Augustine and Calvin and Butler and Chalmers seated there, and Spencer and Arnold and Stephen and Veblen seated here, smiling contemptuous, condescending smiles into the faces of these heroes of faith and character, because, forsooth they are guilty of the sin of believing heartily in certain great spiritual verities, as the result of profound investigation and experience; and I want your verdict as to whether these lordly smiles are not thus somewhat overpassing the tolerance of allowable procedure?

III. I close by remarking third and last, this condescension is misplaced, because the methods of theological science are the same with the methods employed by all the

other sciences or departments of human knowledge. No particular science can claim a monopoly of the scientific method, which is employed by all the sciences as the instrument through which knowledge is ascertained and verified. The scientific method is not peculiar to chemistry or physics, or to economics or history, but wherever logical and rational processes are used in establishing facts and in drawing the necessary influences from those facts, then the scientific method is employed and stands voucher for the results. And in the various theological sciences, the scientific processes have their first illustrations. Where have the laws of evidence, graduating the amount of credence to be attached to testimony, received more careful statement than from the vast array of noble apologists, who have built up the proofs of the supernatural origin of Christ's religion? Where have the laws of rational interpretation had more crystalline statement than in the noble literature of Bible exegesis and theology? Where have the principles of the inductive logic had more luminous examples, than in the sphere of systematic theology itself, where some master mind has gathered a wide range of facts, from every part of Scripture, and has focused them in some great doctrinal generalization of the Atonement, the Trinity, the Divinity of Jesus Christ. There is nothing which chemistry or physics can claim as making them scientific, which Apologetics, Biblical Theology, or Biblical History can not claim in exactly the same sense as making them scientific. The physical scientists employ the laboratory method, as if it were peculiar to them. Why, it is the latest and best educational doctrine that no subject is to be taught except through the laboratory method. The essence of the laboratory method is that the student handles for himself the material of the science, as in chemistry, the student takes water separates it into hydrogen and oxygen and puts them together to make water. But how can a scholar study Latin, Greek or Hebrew without handling the very makeup of this branch of linguistic science. In no reputable University of the day is history

or literature taught except by the laboratory method. The student trained to accept the statement of a text book has to examine the sources for himself, and to draw his own conclusions therefrom. And theology for generations has been taught in this way, the student being led to handle for himself the Word of God and by the activity of his mind and heart made to get out of it the doctrines that it teaches ; and there is no Theological Seminary in our land that is not a laboratory as truly as any chemical or physical workshop in the world. The physical scientists made much of the tests by which physical doctrine can be verified. But the verifiability of Christ's religion is equally in evidence. No physical test can be deemed more scientific than the tests to which our Lord consents to submit his claims. He demands that his claims be put to the test, and multitudes of men have tried him and his claims and found them to stand every test. And this vast host of witnesses who have tried the Son of God, and found him to stand every strain which life's experience may bring can not be "whistled down the wind," by the sneers of those who have never put him to these same tests. These gentlemen, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Veblen, by their own confession stand outside of the circle of Christ's religion; they have never tried him, what therefore is their negative testimony worth? Let me illustrate: In the county in which I live there is a bridge of solid rock, which spans a great chasm at a height of hundreds of feet. No human hand ever built it; and underneath its arch of stone, there are cunning lines which no human hand ever drew. I have seen these things: a man says he never has, he does not believe they are there. I bring him the evidence of Thomas Jefferson in his notes on Virginia, who testifies to these things of his personal knowledge. I bring him the evidence of George Washington, whose published letters tell us that he saw these very sights one hundred and fifty years ago. The man still says he has never been there ; he does not propose to go, but that he does not believe that these

things could be seen. I bring him the evidence of the distinguished President of Washington and Lee University ; of the accomplished Superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute. I bring him the evidence of scores and scores of lawyers and bankers, and merchants and farmers, whose word would carry conviction in any court of justice. He still shakes his stubborn head. Now, would I not be a fool if I were disturbed about the mental attitude of this miracle of obstinate obtuseness ? Would it not be the part of wisdom for me to say : I have the evidence of my own senses, the confirming testimony of scores and hundreds and thousands of observers, and your unbelief, is to me matter of as much indifference as the buzzing of a remote and an unheard insect. Sometimes the complacent and lordly condescension of gentlemen of the stripe of Mr. Spencer, Mr. Arnold, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Veblen and others of that ilk, ripples the serenity of our self-possession and the composure of our buttressed faith ; but in Tennyson's simple phrase we may "be dowered with the scorn of scorn," and we may smile back upon them, while we say, "Gentlemen, we are sorry for you. May the Lord have mercy on you."

There is one impregnable argument which the sneers and scorn of gain-sayers can never disturb, and that is the conscious experience of the saving power of this "Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God." Surrender your life fully to the sway of the forces with which the Spirit of Christ clothes this Gospel, and doubt will be as powerless in disabling you, as storms of sinful passion will ever be to beat into foam that "sea of glass mingled with fire," which mirrors the majesty and stability of the everlasting throne.

Lexington, Va.

THORNTON C. WHALINC.