

tion, upon which [Christianity] insists, between temporal and spiritual authority, had "the happiest influence upon European civilization"; for that separation "is founded upon the idea that material force has no right over the mind, over conviction, over truth."

Now no one with eyes to see can look around the Western world and doubt that this great doctrine of human personality is everywhere called in question and is widely discredited. Richter, at the beginning of the century, observed that the tendency of our civilization was to make men as so many drops of water for the service of a monstrous steam engine. This is a result, both directly and indirectly, of that absorbing devotion to physical science which so specially characterizes the age. Unquestionable it is that the minute subdivision of labor rendered necessary by the stupendous mechanical improvements of our age, has been in a high degree degrading and damnable to a large portion of mankind. A hundred years ago Adam Smith pointed out that the division of labor, by confining the industry of the masses to mechanical and sedentary operations, tended to render them incapable of any generous and noble sentiments, or of forming a judgment on the great interests of the country, and to corrupt both the courage of their minds and the activity of their bodies. But the indirect results of our worship of physical science have been more disastrous still. What is called "the scientific spirit"—the mode in which physicists pursue their operations being meant—is very often imported into provinces of thought where physics, as such, has nothing whatever to say, and where its methods are wholly inapplicable. Sir William Hamilton observes that "an exclusive devotion to physical pursuits, by exhibiting merely the phenomena of matter and extension, habituates us only to the

contemplation of an order where everything is determined by the laws of a blind or mechanical necessity," the effect of which is "that the student becomes a materialist, if he speculate at all." Now he does speculate in these days a good deal, especially on purely metaphysical questions, and usually without any knowledge of metaphysics, or with that smattering of knowledge which is really worse than total ignorance. And the net result of his speculations is to reduce psychology to molecular physics, to make of ethics mere generalizations from experience, to deny the existence in man of conscience, free will, and moral responsibility, in any real sense; in a word, to depersonalize man.

And the same hostility to human personality which we meet with in popular philosophy is exhibited as markedly in popular politics. The great bulwark of man's freedom is the doctrine that human authority is limited and fiduciary; that it is subject to the eternal, indefeasible and imprescriptible principles of ethics; that the essential rights of man as a person—the claims and prerogatives of conscience—are beyond its jurisdiction. But now on all sides there arises the claim that man belongs wholly to the State; that it should be the one supreme object of his love and reverence and worship. Of all the liberties which are bound up with and flow from human personality, one of the most precious is the father's liberty to educate his children as his conscience dictates. The claim has been made, and has largely prevailed, that the education of children is the immediate concern, not of the father, but of the State.

But we must go further. We do not hesitate to say that the cardinal principle on which modern radicalism rests is absolutely inimical to human personality. We must remember that personality varies almost indefinitely.