

yond all and transcends all, and in that respect this doctrine of dualistic monism cuts at the root of pantheism and declares it to be infinitely absurd. And yet, while psychological dualism is a true system, and an important system, a system to which we must hold if we expect ever to maintain the postulates of Paul, the gospel of sin and atonement and retribution,—yet dualism is not the whole truth; it is a half of the truth; it is a very important part of the truth; it is an indispensable part of the truth; but it is not the whole truth. Dualistic monism aims to bring out the other part, which has been comparatively neglected and ignored, but which yet is found in the scriptures, declared by Paul and John, and has its basis and foundation in the hourly presence and omnipotence of Jesus Christ—the Eternal Word of God.

Monism then, as well as dualism, has its element of truth and to the monistic doctrine properly explained and expounded, so far as I am able to do it at this time, I will call your attention for a moment. And in order to do this, I think I may refer in a colloquial way to a conversation which took place in one of my classes. I had before me a class of inquiring minds,—theological students, as instructors know, generally do have inquiring minds,—and I was speaking of the absolute impossibility of fully knowing any particular thing even the most minute, in the universe, without knowing the whole universe. My statement was questioned and I was asked why it was not possible to know one thing without knowing all things? Could we not know a blade of grass without knowing the sun, the moon and stars? “No,” I said, “for gravity has something to do with that blade of grass, the influence of sunshine has something to do with that blade of grass, and in order to fully understand its growth it would be necessary to understand the whole system of which it forms a part. In other words, this is a universe, and not a series of detached fragments. You cannot understand one truth without understanding all truth.”

I said then to the student with whom I had my little controversy, “Mr. Smith, the attraction of gravitation—is that an attraction of great masses for great masses?”

“Yes, sir,” he says, “it is.”

“But is it an attraction of great masses for small masses also?”

“O yes, sir, it is.”

“And is an attraction of small masses for great masses as well?”