

so systematically taught. In the interests of religion there is needed a protest against this peculiar method of eviscerating faith of its meaning. Faith, which is so carefully opposed to "works," is in reality itself a work, both on man's part and on God's part—a co-operation of work. A passive faith is a round square. The life of active faith (a tautology) is a life of faithful work (not "works").

The inadequate effort of the morality that excluded religion failed, not because it was too moral, but because it was not moral enough. When it became truly moral, it abandoned the ingathering selfishness at the root of its movement for an outgiving unselfishness that recognized and adopted the highest duty—the duty of being true to Truth—and apprehended that this highest truth was the true life of perfect goodness and perfect love and perfect self-sacrifice in the Perfect God-man—the Way, the Truth, the Life.

We must eat and drink the flesh and blood of this life, make it our own life, our flesh and blood. At the very moment that the moral effort became truly moral, it became truly religious.

For the inception of the religious life a moral effort of faith on man's part is demanded to faithfully accept and adopt as his own what is freely offered. If this truth were clearly grasped and explicitly taught, many who are sitting waiting to "get religion" as children catch the measles, would see that the responsibility rested entirely on themselves for their failure. Morality is needed for the inception of the religious life; morality is needed at each stage in the religious life.

But the inveterate determination to absolutely separate, to have *either* morality *or* religion will make some reader exclaim: "Away with such rubbish; it is an attempt to put morality in place of religion." By no means, my indignant friend; it is an attempt to prevent the mutilation of religion; an attempt to allow religion to be rounded, adequate, complete. What right have you to take the moral element out of the religious life? Granting that the religious life must receive, it still remains true that there must be a right attitude before the soul can receive. It is admitted that this right attitude is faith, but my claim is that faith is not idleness or indifference or ignorance or mechanical passivity, but activity and earnestness and fidelity. "He that hath ears to hear, *let him hear*," said Christ. "To him that hath (an ear that hears) shall be given."

Prohibition is, in part, a matter of "individual reform." It is evident that any attempt to explain "individual reform" takes us at once into the storm-centre of all the controversies that have ever waged about the nature of man, the world, and God, and their proper relation.