

generate vital force as it does to issue an imperial edict creating a life germ.

We meet the same conflict of doctrine concerning religion. Is religion an inspired (breathed in) force coming down from the Father of Lights as has been so long taught, or is it an emanating force, generated by the proper adjustment of human activities and made possible by the divine essence with which the centres of these human activities are endowed

Huxley's question, applying to life, is a metaphysical one, since we are not concerned with the origin of life, but its cultivation. But the same question applied to religion is a practical one, for if we accept the view that religion is an emanation instead of an inspiration then we are the creators as well as the cultivators of our religious life—individual and universal. Its perfection and value then depend upon the manner in which we adjust the component forces which are to produce it. We thus place it directly upon a physical basis, and may develop, regulate and disseminate it according to physical laws. It has ceased to be an emotion, and has become a motive.

The musician, Gounod, in his *Memoirs*, says: "Morality is the incarnation of the good, science of the true, art of the beautiful," and it seems to me he might have added that the three combined make the incarnation of religion.

It is along these lines that I would proceed to establish a sound physical basis for religion. The old idea of an acquired religion implies an emotion externally produced and in constant antagonism with natural human tendencies. The struggle has always been to overcome the natural man instead of so adjusting his divinely endowed powers that their natural product will be a contribution to morality. This is not a difficult matter, for morality is almost wholly dependent upon physiological and hygienic conditions.

He has always been accounted

greatest in the spiritual kingdom who is most perfectly self-controlled and self-sacrificing. But, would he not be greater still if these qualities cost no effort; if his temper, his appetites, his faculties were so attuned from their inception as to be always in harmony with the good, the beautiful and the true? This may be more or less fanciful idealism, but I believe it has its practical side. We have been working from the wrong end—trying always to foster greater emotional force by which to overcome obstacles instead of reducing the size of the obstacle. If I am tired, nervous and irritable when I enter upon my day's work, it may be something of a virtue that I conceal the fact. That I do not allow my irritability to affect my associates, and that I do my work exactly as well as if my nerves and temper were undisturbed. But if I succeed in doing this, I do it under severe tension and at great loss of nervous vitality. I might have accomplished a far more perfect incarnation of good had I prevented my nerves and temper from getting into this condition. Whether the condition was due to an indigestible breakfast or a midnight revel, whether to watching by a sick bed or to an attack of Grippe; matters not. There is no excuse for wrong-doing. If I am not to-day, and every day, in the best possible condition of mind and body, I am responsible for that fact. I am not incarnating the good and hence not contributing my share to the incarnation of religion. We have long recognized intemperance, war, anger, falsehood, extravagance and the like as evils, but we have attempted to cure them by converting the wrong doer to Christ, (whatever that may mean) and expecting this new light to drive out the evil tendencies. I believe the millenium will come sooner, if we devote less time to reforming drunkards, and more to the observance of such simple laws as will create within ourselves not