

Much less is modern science a sect, a close corporation, a machine, for the perpetuation of a prescribed and formulated set of opinions. Is it not rather a third step in the process of our self orientation in the universe, Quakerism being the initial step and Unitarianism the middle step in the process of orientation?

While, from the individual standpoint, Science, Unitarianism and Quakerism are, in many respects, distinct, yet do they not each seek *Truth* from the same universe? If so, and if we can generalize the three, Science, Unitarianism and Quakerism, so as to develop a sure relationship and connection between them shall we not certainly and necessarily widen our view in each of the three methods of orientation?

That generalization which in science aims to connect Nebulæ with man is called the *Theory of Evolution*.

Now, is there any point of view from which we can see a relation between Evolution, Unitarianism and Quakerism?

Again, and again, among Friends, do we meet the assertion, that "*the*" basic axiom of the Society is the affirmation of the individual personal experience of Divine Immanence. That is, that "Divine Immanence" may be "felt out" by each individual.

On the other hand, the Unitarian's characteristic method is intellectual. He thinks his way up to a realizing sense of "Divine Immanence." Not asserting that he is without his inspirations, not asserting that he is not led of them, it yet seems fair to say, that his characteristic processes are those of the intellect.

The scientist, generalizing the observations of his senses, exclaims, "I think the thoughts of God." To him, his theory of evolution, is a statement, and showing of the palpable, visible movement of the Creator through the Universe. He too, realizes, in another phase, "Divine Immanence." The Scientist, observes his way to a realizing sense of "Divine Immanence."

Then, to generalize the "feeling" of the Quaker, the "thinking" of the Unitarian and the "observing" of the Scientist, we would say, "Quakerism, is Divine Immanence *felt out*,—Unitarianism is Divine Immanence *thought out*,—while both are mutually verifiable in Evolution, which is Divine Immanence *seen out*, (observed in nature)."

Now, of course, it is not here asserted, that Quakerism has "felt it all"—nor that Unitarianism has "thought it all"—neither that Evolution has "observed it all"—but rather that in the process of our self orientation the method of "Quakerism" feeling out, is of necessity ever the initial step, that the next step is "Unitarianism", or thinking it out, while the results are ever further tested and purified, by the scientific process of "seeing it out", observing and generalizing the phenomena of the Universe.

Viewed as something isolated and unique, Quakerism seems to dwindle into a quaint fanaticism. To the world in the main, incomprehensible, to the individual, mainly a delusion. Viewed as one step, and the initial step, in our great orientation, does not its reasonableness and its usefulness come out in strong relief?

Do we fear for the future of that which is proved and demonstrated to be useful?

LOWNDES TAYLOR.

[To those who feel, at first reading, disposed to take exceptions to portions of the article, "Quakerism—the first step in the Process of Orientation," we would say, study it and endeavor to get the writer's meaning, to view the subject from the writer's standpoint. A few thoughts from other letters on the same subject may aid the reader to the writer's position.

"I most surely feel that there is enough truth in my idea to make 'Quakerism' reasonable, understandable, un-mysterious and attractive to many, who to-day think that it is only a quaint, harmless compound of drab and bad grammar. By the full and