

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

SECRETARY: E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

VOL. XLVI.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1914.

557TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

HELD (BY KIND PERMISSION) IN THE ROOMS OF THE
ROYAL SOCIETY OF ARTS, ON MONDAY, MAY 18TH, 1914,
AT 4.30 P.M.

MR. E. J. SEWELL TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read and confirmed.

The SECRETARY announced that Dr. J. J. Acworth had been elected a Member, and Mr. Archibald Greenlees an Associate of the Institute.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. Chancellor McCormick to the Meeting, and asked him to deliver his address.

THE COMPOSITE OF RACES AND RELIGIONS IN AMERICA. By the Rev. S. B. McCORMICK, D.D., Chancellor of Pittsburg University, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.

IN this paper the writer purposely omits any mention of the Indian, the Negro and the Oriental in the United States. They present difficulties which must be met; but intermarriage is not one of them. The Indian problem is in process of satisfactory solution. Whatever be the final issue in the case of the Negro, it will not be miscegenation. The Oriental immigration has not yet, in spite of the feeling aroused, assumed serious proportions; nor will it involve either now or later any considerable intermingling by marriage, even though it were possible that such relationship might ultimately be mutually beneficial. We therefore dismiss these, important as they are in their place, from all mention in this paper.

Since the Jew prefers to keep his stock pure and marries almost always within his own people, no special consideration is given here to the large and important Hebrew immigration into America. It is true that the Jew touches life at many points and must inevitably influence racial development. He is crowding our city colleges and universities. He is taking his place in the learned professions. He is coming to dominate in many important financial movements. He enters wholeheartedly and with genuine enthusiasm for humanity into many forms of social uplift. He is a force therefore to be reckoned with. But so far as the racial and religious composite is concerned, he affects it only from without, and therefore indirectly, and relatively ineffectively.

The process of racial and religious change now going on in America—by America in this paper we mean the United States of America—is the most remarkable known to civilization. Breeding and swarming are constantly recurring facts in higher as in lower animal life. Crowding, poverty, condition push; hope, desire, ambition draw—and again and again great hordes of people have gone out to find in other lands better opportunities and in them to establish happier and freer homes. No more cosmopolitan communities ever existed than ancient Athens, Alexandria, Rome. Each was a racial and religious composite. Even whole peoples have been so produced—the Hellenes in Greece, the Pelasgi in Asia, the Romans from Ramnes, Etruscani, Sabines. The Huns came down overwhelmingly upon Rome; later the Turks spread far out into alien territory. So into Great Britain came the Angles, Saxons, Normans. All this is history.

But in modern times, in Australia and in the Americas, migrations are taking place far surpassing anything previously known in history. The thing is gigantic, colossal. It is like earlier movements in origin and motive. It differs only in extent and in far-reaching consequences. The issues now vitally affect the whole human family. There are no more undiscovered continents; no more unoccupied lands. In the United States the original contributory nations were Great Britain, Holland, Sweden, Germany and Protestant France, forming settlements in New England, Maryland, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas. These people came to a land which on the one hand was practically devoid of population and on the other was practically unlimited in natural resources. For a hundred years and more the movement was continuous but relatively small. In 1790, the first year of the new nation's life, with a population of 4,000,000, not many more than 100,000 had come over in ships in the nearly two hundred years from the first settlement in Jamestown. For a century after 1650, immigration into New England was discouraged and practically ceased. It ceased everywhere about 1750, when hostilities were resumed between France and England. From 1776 until 1820—nearly one-half a century—not more than 250,000 persons were added to the population by immigration. Not yet, therefore, had this process, which is so vital a fact to-day, become a problem in America.

We speak of this in order to show that in selecting a date, even if it be done somewhat arbitrarily, when the population of the United States was a homogeneous one, we are fully justified

by the facts. Charles Benedict Davenport, in the interesting chapter of his most valuable work recently published, "Heredity in Relation to Eugenics," in which he deals with migrations and their eugenic significance, selects the year 1820 for this purpose. At this time the population was about 9,000,000, of which not more than 350,000 in a period of over two centuries were foreign-born. It is obvious that no people in Christendom could be more completely homogeneous than were the people of the United States at that time. If any people anywhere could be charged with the responsibility of absorbing into itself and thoroughly assimilating large numbers of immigrants, it would be America at this period.

I venture, however, for our purpose to move forward this date another sixty years to 1880, because until then immigration into America was never either large enough or alien enough to cause any apprehension or raise any serious inquiry as to the final outcome. Except for some social, political, or religious disturbance or other untoward condition in Europe the flow was steady, the quality healthy, and the effect was most beneficial. Not until 1842, did the number reach 100,000 persons in a twelve-month. Three of these *swells* of immigration deserve mention.

In 1846 the famine in Ireland sent to America over 1,000,000 within a period of five years, with the result that from that time on such emigration as went from Ireland naturally came to America.

Again, a social revolt in Germany, about 1850, sent to America some 150,000 Germans each twelve months for a period of several years.

Further, beginning in 1866, at the close of our Civil War, Scandinavian immigration began, reached its maximum in 1880 with about 100,000 persons, and finally settled down to about 50,000 annually, so continuing to this day.

Thus, not only did all immigration practically cease for the seventy years preceding 1820, but in the years following up to 1880, the United Kingdom, Germany and Scandinavia—the United Kingdom providing the greater part—sent to America only some 6,000,000 persons. When we reflect upon the fact that during this period, owing to the continued net fecundity of the native population, the total population in 1880 reached 50,000,000, it is obvious that the people at this time were scarcely less homogeneous than in 1820. We may, therefore, carry forward the date from 1820 to 1880 without seriously affecting the result.

The next important fact is that by this time the country was

well settled from ocean to ocean, and by thoroughly American people. The Irish immigrant had located almost entirely in the city; the German partly in the city and partly on the farm; and the Scandinavian altogether on the farm, chiefly in the North Middle West. But in this period New England and the Middle States had poured out their surplus populations to establish new homes from Ohio to California, forming, in nearly every case, the basic population in rural communities, towns, cities, and states. The exceptions to this were so few, such as the Swede and the Norwegian in Minnesota, as to be disregarded.

We now come to the great outstanding law universally operative,—namely, the power resident in first settlers to determine for all time the character of new communities. Only in such a country as America is it possible to observe and carefully study this law. It is a fact of almost startling significance, the most interesting and enduring phenomenon in the history of a new community. Boston is Boston and New England is New England still, and they will remain fundamentally as they are though farms be abandoned and though they be invaded by myriad races of alien origin and religion. “The men who came to New England included scholars like Pastor Robinson; like Brewster who, while self-exiled at Leyden, instructed students in the University; like John Winthrop of gentle breeding and education; like John Davenport whom the Indians named ‘So-Big-Study-Man.’ Little wonder that the germ plasm of these colonies of men of deep conviction and scholarship should show its traits in the great network of its descendants and establish New England’s reputation for conscientiousness and love of learning and culture. As it was almost the first business of the founders of the colonies of Massachusetts Bay and New Haven to found a college so their descendants—the families of Edwards, Whitney, Dwight, Eliot, Lowell, Woolsey, and the rest—have not only led in literature, philosophy, and science, but have carried the lamps of learning across the continent, lighting educational beacons from Boston to San Francisco.” (Davenport, p. 208.)

Pennsylvania was settled by the followers of George Fox under the leadership of William Penn; by colonies of Germans from certain principalities whose religious life often expressed itself in certain forms of quietism as non-combative as that of Fox; and later by the virile Ulstermen whose Presbyterianism was as rock-ribbed as were the everlasting hills of Scotland

where their faith was bred. All these were intense individualists, and Pennsylvania can continue indefinitely to receive other hundreds of thousands of immigrants from alien shores and remain as it is till the end of the chapter. My own Western Pennsylvania, with Pittsburg as its centre, with German, Italian, Austrian, Hungarian, Pole, Syrian, and what not, thrust by the hundred thousand into her industrial life—I recently attended a public school exercise in which children of thirty different nationalities participated—Western Pennsylvania is as Presbyterian as Ulster, is as homogeneous as France, and will so continue in all essential characteristics as long as time lasts. Most cosmopolitan of all the communities in America, reckoned by the number, variety, dissimilarity of its elements, it is at the same time, basically and essentially, one in its ideals of education, religion, and life.

The newer parts of the country present the same phenomenon. Iowa, for instance, is altogether rural. The farm determines all questions of education, religion, government, standards in Iowa. It is perhaps the most intelligent, moral, religious community in America. And Iowa is exactly what the first settlers made it. In the northern part is the New England, New York, Ohio stock which moved westward along a certain parallel; in the southern part is the Western Pennsylvania stock which moved westward through Ohio along another parallel—these two as easily distinguishable as two colours of the spectrum; each impressing its characteristics of essential worth enduringly upon the commonwealth, giving it permanence and character.

The State of Kansas had only a small population—about 110,000—in 1861 when the Civil War broke out, and to-day it has 1,700,000 people. But the few who settled in Kansas in antebellum days were animated by high humanitarian ideals. They hated slavery intensely, and they went to Kansas, not so much to find a home as to preserve the great Kansas prairies from the degradation of human slavery. They did not know that they were fixing for ever the ideals of a great commonwealth, and that henceforth no theory affecting social wellbeing could fly over Kansas high enough to prevent the people from catching it, experimenting with it, and seeking to make it work for the moral, social and political uplift of the people.

These illustrations sufficiently exhibit the law. It applies to townships, towns, cities, states, and whole sections, as New England. If any part of America could be unaffected by it it would be far away California and the Pacific Coast. Yet these

are the most interesting of all. The northern and southern parts of the magnificent empire of California differ most widely. The first settlers in the north were the adventurous seekers after gold, and their descendants are imbued with the same adventurous enterprise. They are cosmopolitan in taste, habit and religion. The southern part, whose first settlers were health-seekers and home-seekers, are conservative in their progress; lovers of literature as in New England, establishing many schools; orthodox in religion as in Pennsylvania; builders of cities as are the people of Chicago. Oregon and Washington further north, settled by college men, ambitious men, religious men, present the same type of enterprise and solid worth easily seen in every part of the West. The law, therefore, is universally operative—a determining factor in forming the composite which will be the America of to-morrow.

The *second* important fact regarding first settlers is their quality and their character. They are at once the most virile and the most conservative. Statistics confirm observation to the effect that it is the alert, alive, ambitious member of the family and of the community who has initiative and enterprise enough to leave one home and go into a new country to establish another. This fact applies both to the European who came to America and to the American who left the settled East and became a pioneer in the great West. It was not only true in the seventeenth and in the nineteenth century, but it is true in the twentieth century also. In 1909-10, for example, with an immigration of 1,041,000—of whom 738,000 or 71 per cent. were males—83 per cent. were between the ages of 14 and 44. However, these may differ in stock, in tradition, in aspiration, and in religion from the earlier immigrants, they were a selected group of able-bodied men of higher average than any corresponding group of the general population. They were all mentally sound—the insane and feeble of intellect could not enter. They were men of good morals—the criminals could not enter. They were economically solvent and thrifty, bringing with them an average of \$26 per person, or a total of about \$28,000,000—the pauper could not enter. They were ambitious, every man came expecting and purposing to better his condition. Such immigrants are a real and tremendous asset to any nation, not economically only, but in all the possibilities of a splendid citizenship.

With this quality of mental alertness is the fine quality of constructive conservatism. With all their enterprise they wish

to maintain a real connection with the past. This explains the Ulsterman in Ireland whose forms of religion, for instance, as nearly as possible resemble those which prevailed in Scotland at the time he left it. It explains the Boer in South Africa who made a loyal effort to establish and maintain in that country the Holland of 1700. It explains the fact that all over the western part of the United States the settlers at once established the same institutions as prevailed at home, making them better if possible, but as nearly like as they could. Their forms of religious worship and their systems of theology to-day, in their conservatism, resemble the simplicity and orthodoxy which prevailed in the East fifty years ago and have greatly changed in the old home region. The mere mention of this fact is enough. Its value and its significance in the situation in which America finds herself at this time will be altogether obvious. Fortunate, indeed, is America that her own population was fairly homogeneous; that every part of the land was settled by practically native people; that American institutions were everywhere established by those who loved them; and that the first settler has in him such marvellous power to lay hold upon and assimilate to himself all subsequent increments which may come to him.

For in spite of all well-grounded optimism, the fact must be faced that present day immigration differs vastly in character from all that has preceded and has assumed proportions relatively vast. It is substantially one million each year, of whom perhaps 800,000 remain permanently. In 1820 the increment was less than 10,000 to a population of 9,000,000; to-day it is relatively ten times greater. Moreover, then it was Saxon and Celt To-day it is Slavonian, Croatian and Dalmatian, Bohemian, Magyar, Slovak, Ruthenian, Roumanian, Italian, for the most part from South Italy and Sicily, Polish, Portuguese. Germans of course continue to come, and the Scandinavians stand at about 50,000 annually.

Will the nation which has heretofore promptly seized upon what has come, and has thrived and grown immensely richer and finer in the process of assimilating the new elements, be able to continue this process with the stranger and more difficult material which is now presenting itself? This is the question America must answer. The Irish who came in the middle of the last century chose politics as their vocation, and, especially in the cities, thrust themselves into the very heart of the nation's life, and, in spite of some exceptions, became valuable and loyal citizens. Will Slavonians, Croatians and Bohemians make

similar history? The German immigrants of sixty years ago, intelligent, disciplined, courageous, lovers of liberty, became able statesmen—witness Carl Schurz; distinguished officers in the Civil War—witness General Sigal; famous editors of influential papers—witness several such; became servants of the people in bettering social conditions—witness Oscar Straus; they became merchants and musicians and tillers of the soil. Will Magyars and Slovaks and Ruthenians emulate their example? The Scandinavian immigrants, lovers, too, of personal freedom, self-controlled and self-dependent, anxious for acres upon which to build homes for themselves and their children, went into the west and north-west and became citizens, builders of a nation. Witness Governor Lind and Governor Johnson and Governor Eberhart and a countless multitude scarcely less distinguished. Will Italians and Poles and Roumanians make such contribution to American manhood and citizenship? This question presents the problem, and upon the answer will depend the composite which is to be ultimate America. Professor Davenport says that “unless conditions change themselves or are radically changed, the populations of the United States will, on account of the great influx of blood from Southern Europe, rapidly become darker in pigmentation, smaller in stature, more mercurial, more attached to music and art, more given to certain kinds of crime and less to others than were the original English settlers.” This is doubtless true. But will they become American, and will the composite be better or worse than it is to-day? Here is to be found the destiny of America.

We do not feel constrained in this paper to discuss the future of this immigration nor the method by which it may be regulated. Experience will show the way here. The only really essential condition, perhaps, is sound physical health on the part of the immigrant. The economic part of it is self-regulative, for when conditions in America are prosperous and wages high, the flow increases, and when the reverse prevails, it diminishes. Educational and property tests are relatively unimportant, for the children of the immigrant speedily become intelligent and economically wealth-producing. Every race brings elements of genuine worth and contributes to the country of its adoption as much as it receives from it. America is “God’s great stomach,” and is, we are confident, just as fully capable now of assimilating the elements entering into it as at any previous time in the nation’s history. Such methods as are needed will be adopted to keep out the unfit. Biologists like Dr. Davenport will, from time to time, suggest precautions—

such for instance as the careful investigation into the immigrant's personal and family history, his admission depending upon a favourable report. The whole problem will be solved satisfactorily, and without question the United States will continue, not for charity's sake, but for the sake of mutual advantage, to receive the incoming immigrant and to transform him by constantly increased efficiency into the true American citizen.

What kind of composite will he be in race and religion ?

The process of course is only in its beginning. The final product will not appear for a long time to come. Yet it has gone on long enough to permit of observation and rational prediction. The composite will be a genuine composite—remarkably varied in characteristics, remarkably rich and fruitful in its possibilities. This because almost every race on the globe will have contributed something in culture, disposition, interest, aptitude, blood and religion to the product. The composite will be richer and more complete than any one constituent element because the development will be under conditions most favourable for race building and perfecting. As the people of Great Britain, themselves a composite, are to-day perhaps the finest, fairest, most conscientious, altruistic, forceful and tremendously vital race in world affairs, so after a little the sceptre will pass over into America, because that people will not alone possess the idealistic, altruistic, dynamic qualities of the Anglo-Saxon, but in addition the very best of all the other peoples who are to-day contributing so vitally to the production of the new racial and religious composite in America.

1. *The Biological Composite.*

This is perhaps the least important aspect of the problem. We shall be brief in its discussion. The quotation given touched upon certain physical changes which are probable. In this matter the biologist must largely indulge in prophecy. He has had little opportunity for genuinely scientific study of such fusion. Perhaps he would even say that, biologically, fusion seems *contra naturam* ; yet the process is assuredly going on under his eyes in America.

Only in small communities has it proceeded far enough to permit of observation. In the State of Iowa, for instance, in a Bohemian settlement another generation will witness almost complete fusion with the genuine American stock. A complete mixture, however, nowhere exists as yet. Perhaps the nearest

approach to it is the Hollander in New York. The next is doubtless in Pennsylvania in the intermingling by marriage of the German and the Scotch-Irishman, so-called. Yet whole communities of peoples in that State talk nothing but a German patois known as Pennsylvania Dutch. Physique, pigmentation, hair, colour of eyes are less important than the vitality which makes possible mental vigor. In early biologic ages the smaller, nimbler animals with more active brain survived; the slow-witted giant perished. The German army is not less efficient because it may not have a regiment like Frederick the Great's, composed of men seven feet tall. The cast of the extinct *diplococus* is in the British Museum. Perhaps we may be within the limits of ascertained fact if we say that the very first result of mixture of blood strains is variation—the production of new groups of characters, the unlinking of original groups. Biologically this should result in a certain psychology—for a time at least—men of letters, inventors, moralists, social and religious leaders. Indeed, this has been measurably true already.

It must be remembered that no race in modern times is biologically homogeneous. So wide is the variation of components within each race that if we should plot graphically the variation of any trait in different nations, the curves would largely overlap. Eliminating the Oriental, the Negro, and the Indian—as we have agreed to do—and applying the fruit of recently ascertained biological study, we may look with entire complacency upon complete fusion of the several branches of the Aryan and Semitic stocks with almost certain expectancy that the final result will be a superior blend. The modern eugenic movement must issue in practical methods of reducing the production of the unfit and increasing that of the superior blood. An improved race will depend far less upon an adventitious fusion than upon intelligent choice. The responsibility for a better physical man rests upon the will of men themselves. If they want it, it can be produced. Superior mating and families of adequate size will do it. So much is true of eugenics. Studies into inherited traits are becoming more intelligent and more scientific. The results will more and more find application to actual conditions. Meanwhile, the forces going on in America must result in a more complete union of the Saxon and the Latin, the Celt and the Slav. New knowledge will develop safeguards and relieve from all apprehension. We may safely assume the substantial correctness of Burbank's prediction that the United States has "the

greatest opportunity ever presented of developing the finest race the world has ever known out of the vast mingling of races brought here by immigration," just as we may accept the opposite, namely, "the biologic law that when a race lives an isolated life without an infusion of new blood it degenerates."

2. *The Political Composite.*

In America this will be a somewhat complete democracy. This refers not to form of government, but to the conditions out of which government springs. It does not matter whether the government is a limited monarchy as in England, or representative as now in America, or a democracy as many in America wish it to be and are trying to make it, or something else as yet untried. The essential fact is that the people can make it what they please. They ordain constitutions, laws, courts, customs. They choose executives, judges, lawmakers. Historically the political development of the United States is most interesting. The future cannot differ greatly from the past except to evolve into completeness. The seventeen hundred men who formed the constitutions of the original thirteen states, the models of all later constitutions, were all native-born Americans except fifteen, and these fifteen were as essentially American as the others. Of the fifty-five men who formed the constitution of the Federal government in 1787, only four were foreign-born; and who can say that these four—Robert Morris from England, Alexander Hamilton from the West Indies, John Rutledge and Pierce Butler from Ireland were less American than the other fifty-one. The proportion scarcely varied in the conventions which adopted later constitutions. The Maine constitutional convention of 1820 with 293 delegates contained only two foreign-born, one from Ireland and one from Wales. The 125 delegates to the constitutional convention in New York in 1821 were all native-born; and in 1846 all but two. The seventeen states formed since 1850 adopted constitutions framed by conventions composed almost entirely of native-born citizens. Constitution-making in America has therefore been confined to the Teuton and the Celt.

The significance of this tremendous fact in a nation whose diversity of race, interests, occupations, climate, ideals, concepts of life is so great lies in this,—namely, that the America of to-day is the product of the Reformation in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The moral, religious,

educational, social and political ideals—the sovereignty of God and the freedom of man underlying them all—which brought about the Reformation and were for ever confirmed by it, have been wrought into the warp and woof of American fundamental law, and could not be removed except by sweeping the nation into the sea. The infusion of the Latin will not change its essential character. At most it can only modify and make better. The infusion of the Oriental would not change it. It is, humanly speaking, impossible to go backward. The movement must be forward, and this means simply the triumph of democracy. The sixty or more races in America have entered into the common life of the nation because there has been room for all—only in certain large cities, forced by economic pressure, have large numbers of any one nationality congregated together so as to preserve native language, customs, religion, but they would have done so in more difficult conditions because of the completeness of democratic conditions about them. In the American Universities the keenest minds are often the sons and daughters of recent comers to America, and they are most enthusiastically American. When the time comes for them to share in the administration of affairs, they will administer and support the institutions enduringly founded by the Anglo-Saxon, but so as to meet the needs of a composite race. America is not static, but tremendously dynamic, because there is no fear of the outcome. It is ever changing, but always advancing toward a higher ideal. Whatever mistakes may be made in the retranslation of politics are soon corrected and progress is ever toward the goal of a people intelligent enough, patriotic enough, self-controlled enough, to bring into being a democracy from which all elements of peril are eliminated. That political problems of grave character are before the nation—the initiative, referendum and recall; direct nomination of the presidential candidate; the popular election of senators; and many others not less vital and fundamental—is a fact whose only significance is that the people are asserting the right of a more direct and more positive political control. They may or they may not insist upon these specific things, but they do insist upon the right to determine every political question for themselves, from the form of government to the erection of a public school building. The final outcome worked out by an intelligent, patriotic, and self-restrained people will be the triumph of popular rights, the vindication of the liberty of a great people, the demonstration of a victorious and enduring democracy.

3. *The Social Composite.*

It was my thought, in forming the outline of this paper, to discuss the psychologic composite in America. But apart from the extremely difficult nature of this task and my own inability to accomplish it, is the fact that it is inextricably entangled in the social and religious composite which I desire to present as fully as possible. Psychology touches both of these at every turn, and can scarcely be considered apart from them.

The American people in origin, in history, and by the very necessity of their living conditions, have been characteristically individualists. If there is in them one dominant and universal trait, this is it. The unlimited resources and wide-stretching free lands have spelled opportunity, have required industrial initiative, have demanded and developed hardihood and courage, and have produced a type of manhood which thinks, chooses, determines, acts for itself in every emergency and upon every question. Not only have conditions fostered individualism, but the immigrants brought it with them. It was another of the causes and the fruits of the Reformation. Pennsylvania with its Quaker, German, and Ulsterman, all intense individualists, has already been referred to.

This quality will not disappear, but it will manifest itself in new ways. Already the change is rapidly coming about. At this time about one-half of America's population is urban. In the industrial north-eastern part three-fourths of it is so. Here dwells 85 per cent. of the immigrant people. Social maladjustment has been inevitable. The congestion of foreign peoples in sections of large cities has accentuated the situation. Health and housing problems must be solved. Slavic people, for instance, living for centuries in the open country, do not know how to adapt themselves to the city environment. To create an agency wise enough, discreet and skilful enough, to direct the arriving immigrant to the section of country and form of employment best suited to his past tastes and training is most difficult. It is obvious that untoward social conditions have been unavoidable, and equally obvious that a remedy cannot at once be applied. Out of this situation, the social reformer, the wise one and the foolish one, has arisen. Peril is not absent. Multitudes feel that wrong and injustice lurk in conditions, but they do not know how to find or remove them. The good man and the bad man are equally at a loss. All unite in this, however, that organized society must somehow discover the evil and provide the remedy.

This very situation is developing in America a new set of emotions, convictions, responsibilities, and obligations. Out of this, a new and better social order is in process. The frank, naked individualism of the past is feeling the impact of the social idea. The tremendous struggle in which the men of America were compelled to engage in order to overcome nature, to carve farm lands out of the limitless prairies, to open and operate mines, to build cities, to construct railways and telegraph and telephone, to create wealth and surplus capital, to lay strong and deep the foundations of political, social, educational and religious institutions, has been responsible for the fact that one overmastering idea is that of production. This problem *had* to be solved. Mills *had* to be built. Labour *had* to be secured. Capital *had* to be created. It is not strange, therefore, from the standpoint of psychology as from the standpoint of compulsion, that little attention relatively was given to the equally important matter of distribution. This situation is now undergoing rapid change. Men are coming to see that the mere production of wealth, vital as it is to public well-being, is not enough; that its just distribution among those who contributed to its creation is also a sacred obligation which must neither be evaded nor deferred.

The development of the social consciousness of a great nation of individualists is a radical and marvellous process. But it is a process which is going on in America. The final result is not in doubt. Men of wealth all over our land are recognizing the obligation and responsibilities possessions lay upon them. They are giving thought to the best methods of placing accumulated wealth to the public service. Not Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Carnegie only, but most men are working out the problem as conscientiously as they know how. A short while ago New York city gave four million dollars to the work of the Christian Associations. My own city of Pittsburg, in a public movement among the citizens, gave the University of Pittsburg two million dollars. In every way this new social idea is clothing itself in some concrete form of service. City planning; better housing; education more perfectly adapted to the practical needs of the people; legislation on behalf of children and wage-earning women; bureaux to aid the newly-arriving immigrant that he may go where he ought, engage in the work he can do best, be protected from those who would prey upon his ignorance of the customs of the strange land; the Christian Associations doing a work of marvellous importance in surrounding young men and women

with moral and religious safeguards and in providing educational advantages for those who had no opportunities early in life, or who may be compelled to toil during the day; the use of public schools as social and neighbourhood centres out of hours; the establishment of playgrounds and other places of physical enjoyment and recreation; and a multitude of other agencies, all looking to the betterment of social conditions and the perfecting of the social order.

I instance these efforts to lessen, and so far as possible eliminate, social inequalities, injustices, miseries and defects, not for the purpose of calling attention to the efforts themselves, but for the much more important purpose of illustrating the social evolution of a great people. My desire is not to call attention to what is being done to mitigate social inequalities and injustice, but what the doing of these things is accomplishing for society itself. The very fact that millions of people have come to us who need what we can do for them creates an obligation, furnishes an inspiration, and points out the method whereby the people may add to their virtue of individualism the greater virtue of social responsibility, losing not one jot of personal initiative but gaining immensely in sympathy and the consciousness of universal brotherhood.

Such a consummation in some land is the great desire of nations. For it the peoples of the earth are anxiously waiting. The social consciousness in its evolution extends out to include society in its broadest conception and becomes ultimately the fully developed international mind and the international heart. One man thinks in terms of self; another in terms of his own family; another in terms of his city or state or nation. No man has come into his own until he learns to think in terms of nations. Race antipathy is universal. The millennium cannot come till this utterly ceases to exist. The people of one nation belittle the people of another, simply because they are different, not because they are inferior. If this feeling should be non-existent anywhere it should be in America; and if any nation should gather all peoples of all climes within the circle of its sympathy and regard, it should be this same America.

Dr. Edward Alfred Steiner recently wrote: "Can we learn to think and feel in terms of all the races, or must there always be antipathy which grows into prejudice, and prejudice which ripens into hate? Must we be doomed to live looking at one another as problems, meeting one another with fear, and irritating one another with war?"

“Was he a false prophet who cried out in some such perplexity of spirit :

“‘Thou lookest down from heaven ; thou beholdest the children of men ; thou fashionest their hearts alike ?’

“Was he a false Messiah who sent apostles to the other sheep and who will never regard His work as finished until all the sheep are in the fold ? He taught His disciples to pray in terms of the common human needs and common human relationship—‘Our Father.’ He lifted Himself from the narrowest social race views and, with a sublime gesture, pointing to the crowd, spoke majestically :

“‘For whosoever shall do the will of My Father Who is in Heaven he is My brother and My sister and My mother.’”

Professor Steiner is right. Some nation must arise which will for ever put away race feeling and substitute for it the perfect social consciousness, warmed and directed by the spirit of Him Who made all nations one, and all men brothers. What nation so likely as America, to whose sheltering arms all the peoples have come, there to abide until the great inter-racial composite shall be complete ? No matter how far removed we are as yet from this conception the process of assimilation will be finished only when the social composite is made perfect. When that day has come—and God grant that England and Germany and all the others may have reached it also—then war cannot be ; for war springs out of prejudice, and ignorance, and selfishness, and lust of power, and pride of life ; not out of sympathy and friendship, and brotherhood and love ; and *these* are the elements of the Social Composite which some time America will become. Who shall then say that it is far removed from what the Scriptures call “The Kingdom of God” ?

4. *The Religious Composite.*

Sociology has no meaning apart from religion. The social composite and the religious composite are, if not identical, at least intermingled one with the other, as psychology is mingled with both. Strictly, a social composite is impossible save as religion makes it possible.

It is said that the skull of the man who embraced the Reformed Faith in Switzerland, Germany and Holland, has certain readily distinguishable measurements and shapes. Presumably this is fiction ; but if it were fact it would be an interesting inquiry as to whether the head produced the theology

or the theology produced the head. I have no intention of discussing the problem of the origin and development of religion, nor what psychology and environment have to do with it. It is enough in this place to note the fact that the human race, always dynamic, has during all the centuries instinctively, or under the inspiration of a more or less intelligent faith, moved forward toward a higher intelligence and a purer religion; that it has ever sought in the future something better than it had known before, because always it has been endowed with curiosity, energy, endurance, vision and courage. Satisfaction follows achievement. When one task is completed there is readiness for one more difficult still—and power also. Whether the final goal is Heaven or the superman, the fact stands. What effect upon the forms of religion, differences in government, industry, education, language, customs, dress, social conditions and physical environment may have is an interesting inquiry. We do not stop to discuss it here.

The important and basic fact for our purpose is that the American people are profoundly religious. This means substantially the same thing as if we should say, as we well may, that the English people are profoundly religious. Yet it is not exactly the same. If they are equal to the same thing they are not equal to each other. Whatever it be that makes the difference, it still exists.

The faith of the vast majority of American people is Christian; and of the largest part of these, evangelical. Northwestern Europe and Canada have furnished the greater part of the foreign-born and with them their religious faith; and this has also been the religious faith of most of the native-born citizens. This fact has the same significance in the religious development of the nation as the similar fact has in the racial development. The more recent immigration from Southeastern Europe with a variant religious faith must obviously least affect the religious life of the nation. The strong and ever-operating tendency is that the faith of the native people will profoundly affect and modify the faith of these who come—according to a law which cannot be set aside. Roman and Greek Catholicism cannot, for instance, be in America what they are in Spain and in Russia.

The American nation is unique in that it achieved political solidarity without a corresponding solidarity of religious interests. This was inevitable for several reasons. Most of the colonies brought with them from Europe traditions of religious freedom, purchased at the price of bloodshed and persecution,

and hence as dear to them as life itself. Furthermore the movement towards political unity among the colonies was by no means strong enough at first to insist upon religious uniformity had the political leaders felt so inclined. And finally, these religious differences were supported to some extent by the slight differences of racial stock, although all belonged to the same ethnic group. The Presbyterians were mainly Scotch-Irish; the Lutheran and Reformed sects were of Dutch and German extraction; the Congregationalists drew from the Puritan English middle class; and Catholicism from the Irish. Religious solidarity seemed to presuppose to some extent ethnic solidarity.

The ethnic homogeneity which our political institutions presuppose and encourage has, as already shown, increased steadily in spite of the stream of immigrants that come to us yearly from Europe. With increasing ethnic homogeneity has come the triumph of democracy and a decreasing emphasis of sectarian differences. The theological tenets once sharply emphasized by the various Protestant sects have now dropped entirely into the background. Apart from differences of worship and ritual—which, since they are matters of individual taste and preference, in all probability will persist—the content of the religious message as delivered from our leading pulpits to-day is practically the same. It would hardly be possible for the stranger listening to the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, or Episcopalian preacher of to-day to tell from his discourse what his theological affiliations are. Even the great Roman Catholic Church, which through its system of education has carefully safeguarded its sectarianism against the levelling influences of nationalism, is not likely to hold its own in the struggle. In spite of its rock-ribbed institutionalism and its magnificent traditions it must in time bow before the insistent demand of democracy that human life is one and that we cannot separate the citizen from the saint. Theological orthodoxy and unquestioning obedience to authority are not more important than social service and civic righteousness. In fact, authority, whether of theology or ecclesiasticism, is giving way to the insistent and authoritative power of truth in whatever form it may come.

The spirit of democracy, therefore, together with scientific method, are the two forces which are destined to give to the religion of the future in this country its final form. The spirit of democracy will insist upon a modification of institutional forms in religion with reference to modern needs, and an application of the spiritual dynamic, that religion alone can give in the struggle

against social ills. Science will gradually effect, and that in spite of the strenuous resistance of religion itself, a simplification and a purification of our religious faith, without which such a faith cannot hope to gain and hold the loyalty of an intelligent people.

The democratization of religion is even now progressing at a rate undreamed of by the average layman. The test of social efficiency which is being applied with such thoroughness to education, politics and the administration of justice is being extended to religion. Indeed, a conventionalized and institutionalized religion must undergo reconstruction to meet the needs of the changing social order, or it must perish. The perfecting of the means of intercourse has brought with it a widening of our sympathies and quickened sense of social solidarity. This is thoroughly antagonistic to the old selfishly individualistic faith of other days. Increasing industrial development has deepened the feeling of human brotherhood. The pooling of interests and the extensive mutualization of society have forced men in thought and in action to ignore the accidental and the non-essential and to seize upon the things that are of universal and permanent worth. Religious values, since they are the most comprehensive, must be restated so as to fit the new social conditions. This re-evaluation must be from the standpoint of democracy.

The chosen instrument for this rehabilitation of our faith in terms of modern life is science. For science is no longer the goddess worshipped by the esoteric few: she is fast becoming the servant of all, the high priestess of social efficiency. The representatives of religion have too often seen in science religion's bitterest foe. Certainly no two attitudes are apparently more opposed than that of the passionate, heaven-storming religious reformer and the patient, critical, emotionless, scientific investigator. But there is little doubt that the religion of the future will owe its greatest debt to science. In the face of vigorous protests science is applying the methods of modern psychology to religious experience, with the result that the theologies of yesterday must be re-written. Scientific criticism is humanizing and vitalizing the Old Testament, providing us with the true historical perspective and giving us a new Book. Above all, science is teaching the religion of the future to be open-minded and loyal to the truth. The religion of the future is thus returning to the ideal of its Founder, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

What, then, is to be the Religious Composite in America? It will be that which results from the purifying and the

socializing of the faith of to-day. So far as content is concerned it will include the loftiest, the most permanent and the most comprehensive human values. It will provide ultimate sanctions for business integrity, personal purity, patriotism and social righteousness in general. It will not degenerate into the religion of humanity, and it will be more than a religion the content of which is identical with democracy. We have reason to believe that it will still retain for the most part its denominational and institutional forms as the necessary setting for the spiritual ideal. Creeds will exist, but their content will be limited to those ideas which have been found of proven worth as a result of experience and the test of social efficiency. Rituals also will survive. They will not be subordinated, however, to dogmatic prejudices. Through them will be provided a beautiful and effective setting for religious truth.

Central in the religion of the future will be the idea of God. The God as men will come to know Him will not be identical with the external deistic conceptions of the past, nor with the tri-theistic monotheism of the present. The Deity of the democracy of the future will embody the highest spiritual aspirations and provide the ultimate religious and moral sanctions for a progressive and intelligent community. The life of that democracy will be His life. He will share in its triumphs and defeats, in its suffering and sinning. "Society as a federal union, in which each individual and every form of human association shall find free and full scope for a more abundant life, will be the large figure from which is projected the conception of the God in Whom we live and move and have our being."

Finally, the religious faith of America, each race contributing something to it, will be the enthronement of the Gospel of Scripture as the supreme law of life. Religion will more and more become the life of men, not something outside of them. It will be as Micah expresses it, "To do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God." It will be as James expresses it, "To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction and to keep oneself unspotted from the world." It will more and more tend to put emphasis upon what is vital and essential; less and less upon what is formal and ceremonial. The wonderful words of Jesus, setting forth fundamental and universal truth, will become the very heart of the religious faith of the people. Their application to the need of universal mankind will receive more general recognition, and conduct and

character will be influenced and perfected thereby in a measure never before attained.

In this attempt to forecast the future religious faith of America and the religious composite which will some time come into being, one is necessarily handicapped by the fact that so little progress has been made toward the realization of any considerable part of it. Nevertheless it is easy to perceive the growing impatience of the people with theological polemic, with unmeaning ceremonial, with ecclesiastical and dogmatic authority, and with any doctrine or teaching which lightly or ineffectually touches their real life. They are demanding that religion, like everything else, shall submit itself to the test of effectiveness. People are hungry for the truth which touches the heart of their life and are satisfied only when they get it. The Church will more and more heed this cry, becoming as it is increasingly insistent, and will come more perfectly to apprehend and to fulfil its divine mission of mediating between God and man so that the people will come into a larger knowledge of their Sovereign Lord and into fuller participation in the riches of His Grace.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: I have no hesitation in saying on your behalf as well as on my own that Chancellor McCormick has given us the opportunity of listening to a very interesting and suggestive paper on the subject which he has chosen.

The problems of the future in the United States are not different to those which we have to face here in Great Britain, and it is with very great interest that we listen to an authoritative voice explaining to us how they are likely to be dealt with by the Great Republic across the Atlantic.

I think we must all recognize the glorious spirit of optimism and confidence in the future which runs through the paper. Immigrants from some of the most backward races of Europe are pouring in by the hundreds of thousands, but the author feels confident that it is only their best and most valuable qualities which will enter into the composition of the future nation. So confident is the author on this point that he seems rather to take the fact for granted than very definitely to assign reasons for the conclusion.

The most definite reason assigned is the very interesting law which he formulates as the power resident in first settlers to determine for all time the character of new communities.

Now I think the greatest compliment that one can pay such a paper as we have listened to is to give it careful consideration and well-weighed criticism. I will not therefore further apologise for asking for some fuller justification of the existence of a "law" of this kind than the statement that it exists. The author tells us that it is only in such a country as the United States of America that it is possible to observe and carefully study this law. Further, since his historical summary shows us that until 1880 the nation was fairly homogeneous, it is only during the last thirty-four years, and chiefly during the latter part of that period, that any circumstances can have arisen that could test the enduring validity of the law laid down. Stated in this way the "law" described looks rather dangerously like a wide generalisation from a single instance. No doubt the Chancellor will be able to show that this is not really the case.

The author speaks of the conflict between the intense and dominant individualism of the past in the United States and the impact of the social idea of nationality. We, too, are in the midst of that struggle, and it is encouraging to learn that the final result is not in doubt and to gather that that final result will be the cessation of all class and racial hatred and the final extinction of war. It is not wonderful that the author should identify the nation in which all this has taken place with—The Kingdom of God. It is a magnificent and alluring ideal. Let us hope with the author that it is certain to be realised.

I have spoken of the wide sweep of the paper and the multitude of questions discussed in it. Not the least interesting is the author's description and forecast of the future of religious thought in the United States, in which the spirit of democracy together with scientific method is to result in the purifying and socialising of the faith of to-day. However tempting this theme may be I must not occupy more of the time left for discussion. Doubtless other speakers will take this point into consideration.

Lieut.-Col. ALVES noted that the lecturer had omitted to consider the effect of the Indian, Negro and Oriental elements on the population of the United States. In England this was an easy-chair problem; in the States it was serious and very actual. He thought that the lecturer's first law held good, as the original settlers were of the Anglo-Saxon race, which alone showed real genius for self-

government. Racial qualities might be classed as follows :—Saxon, masculine ;—Celtic, feminine ;—Negro, the servant. Under no circumstances should the inferior race govern the superior ; nor should the Negro intermarry with either of the two white races. He could not quite accept the lecturer's final remarks as to the connection between democracy and authority in religion.

Mr. MARTIN L. ROUSE said that such a lecture, as they had listened to that afternoon, warmed their blood and tended to strengthen still further the bonds that united Englishmen and the descendants of England's first colonists in America. The misguided policy of the British Government a hundred and forty years ago had driven those colonies out of political union with ourselves ; but they still inherited the same common language and traditions, and the kinship of the two countries was more treasured than ever. He had observed with delight the children of many different nationalities in a State school in Buffalo, learning to read the Word of God in common ; and he felt that such schools were a great force for welding all the citizens of the country into one compact body imbued with the fear of God. But he was sorry that, through the traditions which had come down from the old slave-holding days, the feelings of brotherhood in Americans seemed blunted when dealing with one large section of their community—the Negroes.

Mr. E. WALTER MAUNDER had been much struck with the masterly way in which the lecturer had arranged his paper and ordered his argument. The problem before the United States was a very difficult one, because both the proportion and the character of the immigration had undergone so great a change in the last generation, and it was natural to suppose that, under such changed conditions, the experience of the past was no sufficient guide as to the future. To meet this objection, the lecturer had formulated two laws, which he had defended with great force. With regard to the first law, many illustrations might be brought from history to support the lecturer's contention. Thus, there had been a long succession of waves of population flowing over Greece, so that some of our best ethnologists claimed that the present Greeks had practically no racial connection with ancient Greece. Yet the Greek peasantry of the present day were very little changed in their characteristics from what the inhabitants of the same regions were three thousand years ago. Similarly the Ulstermen of to-day, in many points resembled

the population of the same province, as described to us by tradition, long before Strongbow landed in Ireland. As to the second law, he doubted whether the present immigrants were all of the same high type as the earliest. Most of those who went to America in the last half century or so went in search of material advantages, because they hoped to make a living there more easily than they could at home. There was no such thought before the Pilgrim Fathers: they gave up all their material advantages for their religious principles. The fundamental question for any nation was not its physical or mental abilities, but its spiritual character: its attitude towards God. For this reason he had not felt quite satisfied with the lecturer's closing words; it did not lie within the province of man to alter religion to suit his convenience: a man-made religion was worthless. If they read the prophets of old, they would see that they always spoke as being directly commissioned from God; it was always "Thus saith the Lord."

The LECTURER in replying, thanked the meeting for the very kind reception they had given to him. He was not hurt by any criticism that had been passed on his paper; he had expected it, and indeed much more. Talking to a theological professor of Harvard College before he left home, he had told him of this paper, and the professor had differed from him entirely. Nevertheless there need be no fear of the future. He fully agreed with the closing words of the Secretary, Mr. Maunder. But the fact remained that, though the bulk of the immigrants at the present time might be of an inferior stock, their children were educated and became filled at once with the genuine American spirit. The whole of the country had been settled by genuine Americans, of the Anglo-Saxon stock, and he believed they would assimilate all the new material, though the Anglo-Saxon was apt not to be too considerate of those whom he considered his inferiors. He, the Lecturer, still maintained both his propositions; he believed in God's over-ruling providence, and that He was not conducting any failure either in England or America. Even in the questions of Mexico and Ulster he remained an optimist.

The Meeting adjourned at 6.5 p.m.