

teach the proletariat their proper place in the world, but that beyond this, it had no special significance, and that a man who was merely regardful of self would find it to his interest to observe it, altogether aside from the element of superstition which had clung to it from olden times. Indeed, they were willing to go further than this and to grant that Moses did know something after all, that there must have been some great wisdom possessed by him which was lost to us, and that to observe this morality, founded by the Hebrew prophets, developed in Jewish history and vivified by the life and example of Jesus, was in itself an object worthy of our most earnest endeavors, forgetting that the veriest selfishness would lead to the same conclusions. This thought, as I understand it, is the underlying principle of the so-called ethical school, a school which has existed in all countries, in some form or other, under a great variety of names, and whose adherents have been able to point with considerable satisfaction to some texts in the Christian and Hebrew scriptures for much of their authority. Aphorisms without number have been invented by this school; such, for instance, as:

"The world is my country, to do right, my religion."

"There is no religion so great as the truth."

"Count me as one who loves his fellow-men."

and a host of others.

The new unbelief, if I may call it such, the form of unbelief which calls itself 'ethical' culture or something of that sort is not, therefore, that of the last century, which rudely thrusts aside the whole Christian canon and scriptures, because they have been misunderstood and therefore wrongly taught by the organizations of the Christian church; it is not the unbelief, the immediate successor of this cut-and-slash school, which, a little more learned than its predecessor, sought to deny all that was not proven, the "demonstrationist"

school, as I might call it; it is not the vaguely styled "agnostic" school of still a later time, which, realizing the very narrow limits of what they have chosen to call "demonstration," and knowing the utter hopelessness of denying all that was not proven according to this theory, have contented themselves with the more modest declaration that they "do not know" that which lies beyond the borders of the "demonstrable." No; the "ethical" school is content to take the mere morality which may be proven to be but another name for a portion of the culture of the race, and, erecting it into an object of veneration, declare that they are satisfied with that as the ultimate good, that that is a sufficient ambition, that to live uprightly is to fulfill the whole law of the development of the race, and that all that lies beyond can and may "take care of itself"—In short, "ethical" culture, as I understand it, is the attempt to make a religion of the human part of faith only, the part which can be perceived to be good and of uplifting tendency; or as some one has said, "ethical culture is religion with the spirit left out of it." To recapitulate, therefore, we would have something like this:

The unbelief of the last century was merely iconoclasm, a reckless denial, a destruction without the substitution of anything whatsoever in its place, a "denial" which, according to Leibnitz, is "wrong."

The so-called "scientific" unbelief of the next age was a denial merely, like the preceding, but rendered more strong by its appearance of greater learning.

The next to be considered was the "agnostic" form, which less bold than the last, but equally a contradiction or denial, rested upon the "demonstration" theory, and whilst not in form denying, was in reality still only a negation. . . . This might be called religion with heart and spirit left out

Last, we have the case under con-