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In dealing with a subject so broad as the one at hand, we
are bound to make a study, not an attempt at analysis, of the whole field
of philosophical novelists, but rather to make a study of two
representative men from each of the countries named. The
writers we have selected for this purpose are Winston Churchill
and Robert Service of Britain, J. D. Salinger and John Dos Passos
of America. From the CHAP. T E R I I I , presented in the works
of these men we have INTRODUCED T H E N . However, we have
thought that very largely represents the thinking, not of the
heroes, nor, in return to some points, even of the conservative
philosophers, but at least of the thinking novelists of the
respective countries.

It is, as our intention is, to consider the literary
value of these works of art, the book mentioned. We shall
endeavor to study our books for the sake of finding the
essential plot. Rather, it will be our purpose,
for the time being, rather, rather, and for the more so, to
investigate what the C H A P T E R I I I , is the book itself. We shall
investigate what the C H A P T E R I I I is the novel itself.

First, we shall try to determine his theory of Reality, that

One of the principal, which determines to a large extent every
clear belief, every purpose and every action of his life. He
looks, as all men look, upon a world of strife and confusion.
In dealing with a subject so broad as the one at hand, we have thought best not to attempt an analysis of the whole field of philosophical novelists, but rather to make a study of two representative men from each of the countries named. The writers we have selected for this purpose are Winston Churchill and Robert Herrick of America, H. G. Wells and John Galsworthy of England. From the theories of life presented in the works of these men we believe we will be able to discover a trend of thought that very largely represents the thinking, not of the masses, nor, in regard to some points, even of the conservative philosophers, but at least of the thinking novelists of the respective countries.

It is not our intention at all to consider the literary value or lack of value of any of the books mentioned. Nor shall we endeavor to study any books for the sake of finding the thought of those special books. Rather, it will be our purpose, as our title suggests, after having read the works of each, to gather from them the philosophy of the man himself. So we shall consider each separate author from the following several standpoints:--

First, we shall try to discover his theory of Reality, that phase of his philosophy which determines to a large extent every other belief, every purpose and every action of his life. He looks, as all men look, upon a world of strife and confusion.
He sees before his eyes, men and women, the young, the middle-aged, the old, all that breathe, from every corner of the earth, engaged in the fray. Some struggle because they love the fight, some because necessity because necessity demands, while others unconsciously struggle in the very effort to escape. They are fighting for Reality, for that thing which they believe is the most worth-while thing in life. As the philosopher looks on and as he realizes that he too is part of this writhing mass of humanity, he cries within himself, "What is this thing called Reality, for which we all strive, at the feet of which we humble our every ambition? Is it wealth and power? Is it the ability to rule, is it the satisfaction of our passions, is it freedom from work, or is it far different from any of these?"

When we have found the answer that each author would make to this question, we shall enter with him into the family world and see what steps he takes there to bring about this Highest Value. We are living in an age when many of our homes, so called, think it is a waste of time to raise children, when relations between husband and wife are often greatly strained and when divorce has become not only common but popular. While such conditions exist in the home, does the philosopher of our study believe his ideal can be obtained; or, if there must be chances made with reference to home life, what would he consider advisable?

Having found what the author has to say concerning this phase of his problem we would leave his immediate world and go out into the large field of society. Perchance the vision that has come to h
him has not been seen by others who, as a consequence, continue to struggle for that which is not worth while. Or, if others have arrived at the same conclusion as he, perhaps they are unable to carry out their plans because hindered by the present condition of certain social institutions. For instance, many theories of government are continually being advocated by different types of political leaders; while in the field of theology there are those who would bring about radical changes in our present system of religious worship and Christian work. Are these new views well founded? Would there be anything gained by reconstructing our system of carrying on our government and our Christian service, or must we look for the cause of the world's troubles elsewhere? We will endeavor to see exactly what each writer has to say on that subject.

In such a division as we have made there will of course be some overlapping of material; for instance, it is hard to speak of Christianity and the church without involving social problems and vice versa. It shall be our purpose, however, to draw distinctions as clearly as possible, at the same time being careful not to leave out anything from any part of the outline.
A few years later, at the great prophecy, Isaiah, cried out in his voice to God: "These are the blind men of Israel, "I have led my people out of the wilderness, and the fat of fed beasts, and I clothed them in fine linen, and purple, and carried them in Sodom, and in Egypt, and in Pharaoh's house." If we are blind to these, we must be led in darkness, to blind love to be led in darkness. All this life, Judge the fatherless, Yea, I am the fatherless," so said W. Churchill, who is perhaps the greatest man of our time. He has not been content to play with our countries ceremonies and vain pretensions. If you think you are living when you are blindly and unknowingly, then let your love your every prayer, your every thought be based on the boundaries of reality, for "the strength of life is to find real Gain, to lose and the self in it." Reality is not to be found in him who sits upon "the throne of the dead," but in him who is alive, who is living, who is thinking, who is acting, who is creating, who is loving, who is helping, who is pressing on, with "the spirit of the world, the spirit of the age, the spirit of the light."
thing in life, "personality."

The more one reads of Reality, the more he becomes convinced
that practically this whole philosophy is based upon the three
A few thousand years ago the great prophet, Isaiah, cried
out in the voice of God unto the people of Israel, "I have had
greatly persecuted for progressive, pure
enough of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed
beasts, and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or lambs,
univious for. Then we have discovered that first and have decided
or of he-goats,----Your new moons and your appointed feasts my
"return our lives accordingly, "and we have found "by some
soul hateth." If you would know real life; if you would be
now, and have an individual existence", when we have
pleasing in my sight, you must "cease to do evil; learn to do
also, and we were intended to do for the service of
well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless,
humanity", and have consecrated ourselves to the task, we have
pled for the widow." So to-day Mr. Churchill, who is perhaps
one of the greatest modern Christian prophets, cries out to the
will be happy, for the "joy of service" is "the only happiness
people of Christendom: Away with your countless ceremonies and
vain pretensions. If you think you are living when you are
blindly obeying some creed, or offering your long wordy prayers,
Churchill would answer with force. "Your cause can only be revealed
you have wandered far from the boundary of Reality; for "the
meaning of life is to find one's Cause, to lose one's self
of the spiritual life!----you must find it in human service, not
it". Reality is not to be found by him who sits upon "the
highways of a fancied security" and looks "at the universe thru
2
the colored glasses of an outworn theology". Rather is it for
him who, having "left the highway, the beaten path of salvation",
and having "flung off his spectacles", willingly loses himself in
3
professed to be the faith in you is the faith in
seeking "his God across the rough face of nature, from black,
4
forgotten canyons to the flying peaks in space". Why so? Because,

only when you have forgotten self, "only when," in the words of
Isaiah, you "learn to do well." are you developing the greatest

1. "The Inside of the Cup", 276. 2. Ibid. 3. Ibid. 4. Ibid.
thing in life, "Personality."

Again, we ask: Where can be found the personality that practically his whole philosophy is based upon the three words, "Personality", "Purpose", and "Development". We would agree that all that "works" serviceably for progressive purposes is personality. This is in harmony with the secret of personality is real: all else is vanity and not worth the striving for. When we have discovered that fact and have decided to govern our lives accordingly, when we have found "by some means, the secret of our individual existence", when we have discovered the "work we were intended to do for the service of humanity", and have consecrated ourselves to the task, we have been "reborn". Then we shall have got a taste of Reality and the "joy of service" is "the only happiness worth living for."

How are we, though, to find ourselves, to discover our "cause"? Churchill would answer: "Your cause can only be revealed to you thru some presence that first teaches you to love the unity of the spiritual life: you must find it in human shape," so he has Kate Marcy, when she has been "told of God, answering, "I never could have known what you meant if I hadn't seen Mr. Bentley."

Again, we hear Alison Parr saying to Rev. Hodder: "Do you remember saying to me once that faith comes to us in some human form we love?" You are my faith. "And faith in you is my faith in humanity, and faith in God." Their lives are a grand cause and decided to work it out together, but have joined themselves to:


greater individual happiness. Then after the first thrill of

Again, were we to ask where can be found the personality

that would bring us nearest to Reality, he would point us to the

"Gospels". Then, he says, we have read them and have seen the

great Personality rising up before us, "it may befall—that we

find ourselves exclaiming; 'This is' in harmony with that Per-

sonality! That is not, 'He couldn't have said this, or done

that!' It isn't in character! It isn't his expression!'" he says.

In a word, then, Churchill would say that Reality exists

only for that man, who has discovered the secret of his individ-

dual existence, who has consecrated his life "to a cause—one

2

of God's many causes", and who has begun the development of a

personality that craves spiritual, in preference to material,

things and loses sight of self in an effort to serve others.

It is the master of body and soul--this single word, "Ascend-

4

II. Marriage and Divorce.

Whether or not people live happily after marriage depends to

a large extent on the question as to whether or not they have been

married. And he, Churchill would have us see, is but an

"reborn", according to Churchill. The reason, he declares, that

there are so many unhappy homes is that parents of these homes

fail to look upon life from the "Christian viewpoint". In the

Church, however, is only one life's material life that he has

first place their marriage, although it may be solemnized by the

Church, is really only a legal union, because the candidates

say to that union which takes place between two persons who

are not"reborn". They look upon life from the material standpoint.

They have not consecrated their lives to a great cause and

decided to work it out together, but have joined themselves to

the problem of Reality. They had found their place in life,
each other merely because they expect to gain, by such action.

1. Good Housekeeping M. 57:59. 2. Ibid. 3. Ibid. 4. Ibid.

1. Century M. 87:173. 2. "I. of the G." 276. 3. Good Housekeep-
ing M. 57:59. 4. Ibid.
greater individual happiness. Then after the first thrills of
married life are past and they have become dissatisfied with
their lot they come to the conclusion that happiness can be
gained only thru material possessions.

Instead of viewing married life as an opportunity for service,
"as an effort to achieve spiritual peace", they have looked upon it
as a mighty struggle for "material pleasure". Their vocabulary,
Mr. Churchill might well have said, consists of but a single word,
powerful and ever present before them. Its syllables are torn
apart and readjusted to fit the occasion, but always it is the
same word. It makes up the conversation of the home and the
party, it composes the letters they write, both business and
social, it adorns the speech they use in the service of the
church, it marks the beginning and the end of their daily prayers.

It is the master of body and soul--this single word: "Acquisi-
tion". Because he could speak no other word Eldon Parr, our
author shows, was left alone in a silent home, rejected by wife,
daughter and son. And he, Churchill would have us see, is but an
example of thousands, the world over, who have lost their Life
by trying to guard it with riches.

This, however, is only one side of married life that he has
presented. The other he sees is as bright as this is dark. We
refer to that union which takes place between two persons who
have been "reborn". Such a marriage would be that between
Hodder and Miss Parr. These two had solved, as best they could,
the problem of Reality. They had found their place in life,

1. Good Housekeeping M. 57:59. 2. Ibid. 3. Ibid. 4.
had heard the call of the helpless world and with heart and soul had dedicated their lives to the working out of a plan, their plan and God's plan. As long as they continued "to live in the Spirit", --i.e. as long as they could "remain in what may be called the reborn state", --they would be happy, since "it is by the Spirit alone that true marriage is sanctified". Having been joined together, not by the Church but by the Spirit--their marriage is simply confirmed by the Church--they are free from all material laws and conventions, which are necessary only for those who are still not "reborn", who live not in the Spirit but "in the flesh". Yes, the spiritually joined are happy, for they are developing toward God, they are living in Reality.

As to the question of divorce, Mr. Churchill would affirm, I think, that with the type just mentioned there would be no thought of divorce as long as they continued in the "reborn" state; but, should they drop from that high state, they would really be no longer married. As Hodder says, "When the Spirit is withdrawn, man and woman are indeed divorced". Why? Because it was the Spirit in the first place that joined them together. On the other hand, should any of these "in the flesh" be led, by the trials of their unhappy life, to a rebirth, they would hold the same position as those "reborn" before marriage. They would practically be free from law, since "Divorce laws and all other laws made by man---are for the natural, and not for the spirit-

1. "I. of the G." 509. 2. Ibid. 3. Ibid. 4. Ibid.
ual man." In such a case as the one just mentioned Mr.
Churchill says the "individual conscience—which is the Spirit,
seen by writing in bold capital letters in the view of all
must decide whether, as regards each other, they are bound or
not bound to marry; and this must be done in the words, "We want a religion". Surely
free", and by that decision must they stand or fall.

Now as to those who have never been "reborn" either before
marriage or after marriage, Churchill says they have never been really
married and consequently can never be actually divorced. Their
marriage certificate was at best a "civil permit to live to
gether, for the Spirit can have nothing to do with such a union".

Consequently, he says, "it makes no particular difference, except
according to certain he would say, very few members of the church
to society, whether a particular man and woman in this state be
have actually been "reborn". They have acquired certain legal
or moral rights or duties, divorced or married. It is a matter for society to settle".

It was and will be the conscience of the individuals for
should we ask how he would advise society to settle it? Then he
so as to have their marriage recorded. Would you answer that it should, "like all other problems which
best us, we must leave to the conscience of the individuals for
better or for worse". That will, of course, mean trouble and
and many sad mistakes. It will mean that we must pass through a "period
have learned to discover that "happiness lies alone in
of chaos"; but, when that time is past, he believes, the
judgment of the individual will be so thoroughly developed that
it will be able to choose between right and wrong.

III. Christianity and the Church.

Some hundreds of years ago, it is said, Diogenes, after
having lived with men all of his life, surprised his friends one
day by walking down the streets of a city looking for a "man".

To-day Mr. Churchill, after having been reared in the Church and
that is going to them", and that "religion is gained in the thorough-
1. Good Housekeeping M. 57:59. 2. "I. the O." 509. 3. Good H.M.
57:59. 4. "I. the O." 509. 5. Good H.M. 57:59. 6. Hearst's M.
in the midst of thousands of church people, startles the world again by writing in bold glaring letters before the view of all religious denominations the words, "We want a religion". Surely no more stinging rebuke could be given, yet he could hardly be more lenient so long as he holds to his present theory of Reality as stated above.

Of course, there are many devout followers of Christ to-day; but does the Church as a whole have a really vital and living religion to offer to the world? Mr. Churchill would say no. Why? Because, I am certain he would say, very few members of the church have actually been "reborn". They have accepted certain creeds and gone thru the ceremonies necessary to have their names added to the record, but that is as far as they have gone. They have come little, if any, nearer to Reality than they were before. They have not succeeded in gaining peace for themselves and consequently have been unable to point the way to it for others. And the reason is they have failed to discover that "happiness lies alone in service, in giving to the world that which God gave us." "The mission of the Church is to hold up—the vision of what we may be if we try, the vision of what God wishes and expects us to be"; but many have thought the chief thing is to have interesting services, fine sermons, good music, etc., and to give sums of money now and then for the purpose of establishing settlement houses for the poor. And, what is worse, they seem actually to believe that "the weak and idiotic ought to be absurdly grateful for what is flung to them", and that "heaven is gained in the throwing."

Such people as these—and our author seems to believe they are in the majority in our churches—can never show Christ to the world, for He and His message can be shown only thru "Personality." Religion is "an undertaking, an attempt to find unity and harmony of the soul by adopting, after mature thought, a definite principle in life." When this "principle" has been formed into character men are able to see in that "Personality," God. They see religion incarnate.

Such has always been the case, he contends. "Truth has gradually been revealed to the world by what may be called an Apostolic Succession of Personalities—Augustine, Dante, Francis of Assisi, Luther, Shakespeare, Milton, etc." Because the churches of the present have overlooked that fact and have failed to develop real "Personalities" the condemnation of the outside world is brought upon them. This is illustrated in the words of the poor as they cry out to Rev. Hodder: "Are the Christians of the churches any better than we? Christians own the grim tenements in which we live, the saloons and brothels by which we are surrounded, which devour our children. Christians own the establishments which pay us starvation wages; profit by politics and take toll from our very vice; evade the laws and reap millions, while we are sent to jail. Is their God a God who will lift us out of our misery and distress? Are their churches for the poor? Are not the very pews in which they sit as closed to us as their houses?"

Now, perhaps, by this time we have begun to look upon Mr. Churchill as a pessimist in regard to Christianity. If such be the case, we are wrong, for he is, on the contrary, very optimistic. He believes strongly in the Church, but he thinks it needs to open its eyes. It should do away with all creeds and ceremonies, he thinks, that cannot "be translated into life". It should accept the gift of "salvation": in other words, it should attempt to find its "place in God's plan" and to be "of use". "Of use"--
to hold the reins of government in its own hands; nor would be what? To a God seated off somewhere on a throne apart from the world? No, he would say, but it should know how to be of the most use to society in which dwells God. But how shall we know "reborn" when there are risen out of the "natural" man into the how to be of the most use? He would answer that such a question should be settled as all other questions of religion, not by any
outside authority but by the "individual conscience". We must and do believe that God dwells there. Nay, that God is that Con-
science."

Already, he believes, there is evidence of hope in such a plea. Many who once were skeptics are beginning to admit that there is "an aspect of the extraordinary age which can not be accounted for in their philosophies--an essence which transcends figures and mechanics and sense impressions". It seems, in fact, that a spiritual wave is sweeping the world such as never was known before. Not merely a few, but the masses of mankind, he contends, are searching for a workable religion. What is more, he believes they will get it, and that when it comes it will be the "New

Patriotism. According to his theory, this new religion will be very closely related to the state; so closely related, I see, that it would be impossible to discuss one apart from the other. We will therefore take it up under the next heading.

especially among the poor who are crowded into the unsanitary tenement houses of the city; (3) by giving to the masses the same benefits of medical science, of discoveries, and of inventions; (4) by taking up the union of Church and State? Yes, but union in a peculiar sense. He would not say that the Church as it exists to-day ought to hold the reins of government in its own hands; nor would he contend that the State has a right to legislate concerning our art; and (4) by attempting to keep before the race at all times manner of worship. Rather, he says, that when all men have been properly convinced of reality, "reborn", when they have risen out of the "natural" up into the "spiritual" life by consecrating their efforts to one of God's churches or some national government, would we? He would be merely helpful causes; when, in other words, they have conceived of a "reborn" man, doing the work of a job that lives in the most life in terms of progressive, purposive personality, they will of society. He would look ahead and see that "Generation after have brought the kingdom of God to earth. Then will Church and generation labor with unflagging zeal until the last sculp- State have become "identical, since all the members of the one-ter "be citizens of the other." 1


1."I. the C." 571. 42. Ibid.
a certain act or refuse to behave in a certain way because the principle involved in the specific instance harmonized or failed to harmonize with the basic principle of his "reborn" life. He would serve mankind (1) by bringing about more healthful conditions, especially among the poor who are crowded into the insanitary tenement houses of the city; (2) by giving to the masses the same benefits of medical science, of discoveries, and of inventions that have been enjoyed by the rich alone, (3) by giving to all the privilege of gaining a good education and the opportunity of enjoying the best of life's luxuries in music, literature, and art; and (4) by attempting to keep before the race at all times the proper conception of Reality.

We would not think of such an one representing some special church or some national government, would we? He would be merely a "reborn" man, doing the work of a God that lives in the midst of society. He would look ahead and see that "Generation after generation would labor with unflagging zeal until the last sculptured fragment of the new cathedral--the new cathedral of Democracy--pointed upward toward the blue vault of heaven". Such would be his vision--"God the Spirit, thru man reborn, carrying out his great Design."

From this we can see that Mr. Churchill is a socializer. He is, however, far different in his beliefs from many who call themselves by that name. He would do away with property or would at least make it a subordinate motive; he would have "the least

possible government and a government wherein neither you nor I

5. Century N. 97:172. 4. Ibid. 1."I. the C." 571. 2. Ibid.
or any other man or woman will labor or obey because we have to do universal "spiritual individualism". They go hand in hand he would give the same advantages to all. But he would aim to accomplish all of this, not in order to give the poor a chance to take vengeance on the rich who have robbed them and made them slaves: but he would do it in order that the individual might be developed into the highest type of "autonomous" Personality. He does not want to do away with individualism: he wants a different type from what we have had. Because the main motive of life has been the motive to acquire property, man has developed into a material individualist, he observes. "Now the only check", he continues, "to material individualism is spiritual individualism", since "the reborn man or woman cannot act to the injury of his fellow-creatures."

To sum up, then, Mr. Churchill would say "The religion we choose, therefore, in order to satisfy us must contain a positive, militant righteousness. And it must not be a righteousness which has to do only with the state." This "New Patriotism"-- for so he would term this type of righteousness--will be both social and individualistic. It will represent a Democracy in which all shall have an equal chance and yet in which the goal will be the development of individual Personalities. These two conditions will exist side by side because these real (spiritual) personalities can be developed only thru intelligent purposive service rendered to others. That is to say, without "spiritual individualism" there can not be true democracy, and without true democracy there can not

be universal "spiritual individualism". They go hand in hand. One could not exist without the other.

CHAPTER III.

ROBERT HEPPELL.
CHAPTER III.

ROBERT HERRICK.

"Then are they who thought the care of life, to be of none with self and life", the poet says.

This noble poet has

brought his mind to stand in the way.

"I am not always obey the demands of their will, to mean of a material self.

"I am not the one who seeks, how to

"So let it be, and that is all."
The crippled child may
die of life abundantly, and Alexander Arnold might be dead. Indeed,
the author, believes, because he has gone exactly the opposite
direction from that which leads to life. Instead of using his
work ability to advance society he devotes it all to the biling
"The will to be at peace with self and life", is to me a
significance phrase in the philosophy of Herrick. In his book
he makes of him a servant, says him small wages, and puts him
called "A Life for a Life" he pictures the rich and the poor,
and work under conditions that gap his vitality and often take
the learned and the unlearned, all classes of people, in fact,
are all caught, with all her wealth, beauty and social
as fighting in an eternal struggle. For what are they fighting?
They do not know. Some speak of the goal as "Power", some call
whatever local means can be used to obtain power are just. Not
it "success", others say it is material pleasures, while still
Others think they are fighting merely to sustain earthly existence.
wealth by using Arnold's methods but who had later discovered his
However, were the truth known, they are struggling for none of
mistake in view of his new conception of life. Notice the scene
these things, but rather" to be at peace with self and life"
between him and Alexander Arnold, whom he loves dearly, but whom
They are struggling for Reality. Most people never achieve
this goal because they allow selfish ambition to stand in the way.

Thinking themselves free because they need obey the commands of
brides of gold. It is the tearful Sea! He touched her girlish
no other person, they have become the slaves of a material self.
with his hands, "gold and precious stones. They are the assets",
True freedom, the freedom of Reality comes only to those, who, in
nature and divine in our power to solve each other, "a weal of
forgetfulness of self, try to serve others. "The eternal strife
will lead us to that which is eternal."
"You are the treasure of man" is "the strife of wills--evil and good"

Life lies "not in the senses" ; it will not come at your
will, but in Becker crushed the senses at her breast. "Even the
command. It is hid away in some "silent place within each". It
and of the heart be stained with blood--I see the tears
is "a flame of will, a vision of the spirit: And that is all."

Consequently, men may fight "like beasts for life", but it only
true defeated desires in the light of your own. You are the
escapes in the struggle. "Neither food nor drink, neither pride
sacrifice of the many--I am not touch."

4. Ibid. 291. 5. Ibid. 292. 6. Ibid. 291.
nor possession" can give life. "The crippled child might have life abundantly, and Alexander Arnold might be dead". Dead, our author, believes, because he has gone exactly the opposite direction from that which leads to life. Instead of using his great ability to advance society he devotes it all to the piling up of material goods; and instead of serving his weaker brother he makes of him a servant, pays him small wages, and puts him to work under conditions that sap his vitality and often take his life. Arnold's daughter, with all her wealth, beauty and social standing, also misses life for she agrees with her father that whatever legal means can be used to obtain power are just. Not so, with Hugh Grant, who having once had promise of gaining wealth by using Arnold's methods but who had later discovered his mistake in view of his new conception of life. Notice the scene between him and Aledandra Arnold, whom he loves dearly, but whom he will not marry because of her beliefs:

"See!" He crushed the soft fabric in his hand. "Silk with threads of gold. It is the tears! See!" He touched her girdle with his hands. "Gold and precious stones. They are the groans. "See!" He put his fingers upon the golden hair. "A wreath of pure gold! Tears and groans and bloody sweat! You are a tissue of the lives of others, from feet to the crown upon your hair---See!" His hot hands crushed the orchids at her breast. "Even the flower at your heart is stained with blood---I see the tears of others on your robe. I hear their sighs in your voice. I see defeated desires in the light of your eyes. You are the sacrifice of the many---I can not touch."

1. "L for L." 291. 2. Ibid. 3. Ibid 318.
The author does not add here, but he might have stated it, since he believes it strongly; that as the rich ornaments of the body in this case represented the "sacrifice of the many", they also stood for the sacrifice of her own life. In taking from others she had in the very act deprived herself of Reality.

So Herrick contends that Reality is known only to that one who has been able to gain peace, "peace with self and life". And how is that to be gained? When shall all fear be driven from our hearts? When shall harmony prevail in our lives? Only, he would say, when, in our earnestness to serve others, "we forget to see ourselves."

II. Marriage and Divorce.

In his book called "Together" Mr. Herrick presents several different stages of marriage. First, he says, there are the "Pioneers", who go into the new country to battle against nature. There both husband and wife toil together for a common purpose and are happy. It is the case of "a body-wracking struggle of two against all, a perfect type, elemental but whole". Not only was it good then but, likewise, to-day it remains the pattern of marriage wherever sound, "Two bodies, two souls are united for the life struggle to wring order out of chaos--physical and spiritual."

The second type is that in which the husband leaves the wife in the home with the children to protect and nurse while he goes out alone to fight for the "unseen--the Idea that is in him, that
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is stronger than woman or child, greater than life itself".

But she, too, must fight, only in a different way. She shapes his impulses—"the stuff of his soul that sends him into the battle." He has become her weapon to fight for the "ideals which she has given him with her embraces". In such a type of married life there is the same "companionship, togetherness" as before only it is of greater significance, since the two share "sacrifice, sorrow and truth, things of the spirit"—in waging war for others.

Later, when the wilderness has been cleared and when the husband must go each day to his office to make money, the wife stays at home to help. The two have become "partners in living" and the fruit of their bodies is but another proof of their partnership. As social and economic conditions become more complex the relations of husband and wife are often changed. While he still fights to provide, she, no longer the Pioneer, no longer the defender of the house, no longer the economist, blossoms—

What? The Spender!" She has become the Queen of the household and must be obeyed. She will not soil her hands with work nor take the trouble to rear children. Her position is represented in the following words, which she speaks to her husband: "Come bring me money and I will kiss you, make me a name before the world and I will noise it abroad, Build me a house more splendid than other houses, set me above my sisters, and I will reflect honor on you for the clothes I wear and the excellent shape of my figure".
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her, she thinks she has a perfect right to put him aside and take another.

From this analysis Herrick expects us to see at least two faults in many of the homes of today. First, the wife instead of helping the husband by saving and raising children, spends his money and her time either in idleness or in trying to attain and hold a position of prominence in society. In the second place she fails to understand what real love is. Herrick, however, does not think the woman is always to blame. The man often does not take any more interest in the woman's world than she does in his. Where that is so, he is just as much to blame as she. The trouble in either case would be the same, namely, that there is not enough interest between them to develop and sustain real love and happiness. John Lane and Isabel Price (in "Together") were both good people and were at first true to each other. There seemed to be no reason why they should not be perfectly happy; but as the years went by they grew further and further apart until she was on the verge of leaving him, to go off with another man. The trouble was that he had spent too much time and thought in business, and she had been too anxious to win a place of distinction in society. They had little interest in common, consequently they had no chance to develop real love. Later, however, they both saw their mistake. He gave up his position with the railroad company by which he was employed, the two of them went into a new country, built a new railroad and started over again with promise of a happy life. They learned to love each other because they had become "partners".
From the part of the story which deals with Mr. Falkner and Mrs. Margaret Pole, we find that Mr. Herrick sees very little in the laws concerning marriage. Mr. Falkner's wife and Mrs. Pole's husband are both living; yet Mr. Falkner and Mrs. Pole go off to a lonely place and live together for several days. What is more, the woman asserts that she is not committing any sin at all and that she would be willing to marry him were it not for the pain such action would bring to her relatives and friends. Is this to be?

Now, just how would Herrick have us settle the marriage question? He is criticised by some because he offers no real solution to the problem. Summing up a few points, we see, however, many valuable suggestions in his work if not any real solution. Before people are married, especially in the case of young people, what they call love is merely a sort of infatuation. Then after two are married if they work with a common sympathetic interest, if they rear children and if they give of their lives to others, they will be pretty sure to develop real love and will be happy. If they refuse to do these things they will probably never know what genuine love is and as a result they will be dissatisfied with the bargain they have made. In our modern life, this is in a sense of it, and I will catch right continually in almost the good.

III. Christianity and the Church.

Sloth and greed cannot control this will, but it can be conquered only. Herrick does not think very favorably of religion as it is taught in our churches today. He believes that many of the stories of the Bible are merely "impossible myths that come to us out of the pessimistic East", and consequently can be of little, if any


use to us today. They may be interesting to read but they do
not lift us up toward Reality, they do not compel us to go out
and labor for the uplifting and development of mankind.

He also finds fault with the theory of abnegation, evidently
believing that such a doctrine, if carried out by all, would
keep men from progressing and would hinder the development of
positive active personality. That does not mean he would wish
people to be selfish; rather, as stated above under the topic of
Reality, he believes one can only gain life by forgetting self.
The point he would have us to see, it seems to me, is, that in
practicing the doctrine of self negation we are to a certain extent
becoming passive, we are halting, giving up, in the hope of some
future reward; whereas, when we forget self, we ought to do so
merely because we are so busy carrying out the positive helpful
program that we don't have the time to think of self at all.

He would, therefore, advise that we have another religion, a
religion that compels us to listen to "the voice of the spirit
within", that which lies beyond desire, beyond self, that which
uplifts man, an inner hope, that which ever lives; a "faith" in
life apart from our own personal fate." There is in each of us,
he says, an evil will which fights continually against the good.
Myths and creeds cannot control this will, but it can be conquered
only when we have heard the voice of our inner spirit and obeyed
the message it speaks. Such a conception of a positive religion
will appeal to the strong men of the world far more than the doc-

trines that are preached at present, he believes, for all who hear it will know that when carried into effect, the condition of all men, high and low will be bettered, and the race as a whole will have drawn nearer than ever before to the realities of life.

IV. Government and Society.

Mr. Herrick believes that the world is in a deplorable condition when viewed from a social and economic standpoint. The rich of the land practically own the poorer class as much as if they were their slaves. In consequence of this fact they take every advantage of them that is possible, regardless of what it may mean to the poor; while the poor, because they must live, voluntarily obey their commands and pay the penalty of their labor, which is a loss of vitality in many instances and often a loss of life.

This stronger power which slays and devours the life of the weaker, our author calls, the "Evil Will," the "Spirit of Greed," and suggests its chief aim in life is to get all the wealth and power that can be obtained and to get it by any methods within the reach of man. If it can gain possession by perfectly fair means, well and good; but on the other hand, if it can satisfy its desires only by breaking up homes, blighting ambition and retarding the progress of the whole world, it will take what it wants just the same.

Such conditions are bad enough in themselves but they appear still worse, declares our author, when we discover the fact that most of those who represent this "Spirit of Greed" seem to think they

have a perfect right to behave as they do. Note, for instance, such characters as Alexander Arnold and other capitalists in "A Life for a Life". These men have grown up in the midst of wealthy men who have taught them by word and example that each person in the world must fight his own battle and live or die as a result of his victory or failure. The world is so constituted that some must always rule and others as a consequence must be servants. Since such conditions always exist, why should not one be in the higher class, if it is possible for him to get there?

If you don't conquer your adversary, he will defeat and rule over you. Such a doctrine as this has been drilled into them and been lived concretely around them until it has practically hushed forever the voice of the inner spirit, the better will of man.

1. "Power!" "Success!" Acquisition of "Property". These help to make up "Life"—nay, these are "Life" to such men.

Such a belief, and perhaps does, help to some extent to ease the consciences of those in power, but it makes the social problem all the harder to solve. If such men could be made to realize that their fundamental principle of life was wrong, that when they are destroying the physical energy and the ambition of the weaker class, they are committing a crime more disastrous in its final results than murder itself, the problem could be more easily solved.

As it is, Mr. Herrick believes, there is no direct way of quickly doing away with such conditions, since the upper class has been led to believe they are in the right and since they have the
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wealth and enormous power to stop all movements against them. He illustrates this very graphically in "A Life for a Life". Hugh Grant gathers plenty of evidence to convict Arnold and his crowd before any reasonable jury of men. He then goes to Arnold and speaks to him in regard to the matter. Achieving nothing there, he goes to the government. Later, he endeavors to create a sentiment against them by publishing his discoveries in a newspaper. He tries every way he can think of to bring punishment upon the capitalists. He is doing what many others have done and ever are doing, but with what results? About as much as would be produced in throwing a handful of pebbles against a stone wall. The great wealth and influence of the magnates have created a defense about them that can not be shaken by any number of little reformers.

There is a way, however, by which Herrick believes these conditions can be changed. He looks down deep into the nature of human life and finds, as he believes, the one thing that causes all social and economic disorder. Man is not "right with himself." The representatives of the "Evil Will" do not have the proper conception of Reality. "If man were right with himself, square with his own soul, each of the millions, there would be no wrong to right by machinery, by laws, by discussion, by agitation, by theories or beliefs." Since that is true and since it is also true that the right view can not be forced upon them from without, we can expect to bring about the reform only when each person starts with himself, finds "peace with self and life", and helps others to find the.
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To sum up, then, his theory in a few words is as follows: Reform must be brought about "Simply, individually, each with himself, and those nearest his influence. The great end cannot come through political action by theory or program, by any division of the spoils, any readjustments of laws, but only by will—the individual goodwill to renounce, working against the evil-will-to-possess."

1. Reality.

One of the old things that Mr. Wells is constantly declaring
is that life is not "being by" becoming. This is not at all different today from yesterday, and further,
the idea that each individual thing in the present moment, either
in the way in which we call one matter or another, is an individual life,
is distinctly different from every other individual thing at the
time before.

It is stated that "as a rule, "life, as we say, has always

CHAPTER IV.

H. G. WELLS.

the method of his reasoning

Apologies in the form of "being by" becoming. "It is very probably not certain,
very probably not certain.

Applying his illustration, no instance of the comparison of
different states be rare. "If you look into well enough, you will

the whole system of human life is very similar to P

as the various elements of well life are life,

"very probably" the "very probably" at all.

This is nothing to do with the "very probably" at all.

the natural state of things. The more absolute, the more sufficient, the more

and, according to all natural laws, the more sufficient, the more absolute. "Very probably," he says "very probably in its

very
In his works is the fact that Life is not "being but becoming".

Everything is slightly different today from yesterday, and further, he says that each individual thing in the present moment, whether it be what we call mere matter or whether it be an individual life, is slightly different from every other individual thing of the same moment.

He illustrates this as follows: "While he says, he was always taught to think in this form, the method of his reasoning was rather in the form,

\[ M \text{ is } P \]
\[ S \text{ is } M \]
\[ S \text{ is } P \]

Applying his illustration for instance to the comparison of different chairs he says, "If you know them well enough, you will find an individual difference even in a set of machine-made chairs-"; and then he intimates that if we had minds of unlimited capacity, we would see that there is no such thing as "charishness" at all.

In other words, he affirms that for purpose of accurate reasoning it is folly to make use of the rules of formal logic, because life is arranged, not according to well defined classes, but according to individuals. "Every species", he says "waggles about in its hand, every tool is a little loose in its handle,"
scale has its individual error. So long as you are reasoning for practical purposes about finite things of experience you can every now and then check your process and correct your adjustments. But not when you make what are called philosophical and geological inquiries, when you turn your implements towards the final absolute truth of things."

Now, the real significance of such a belief as it is applied in the different phases of his reasoning, we will notice under the different topics to be taken up later. For the present though, let us merely ask this one question. Since life is so diversified in its many aspects, since each person is slightly different from everybody else, just where and how in all of this confusion are we going to find Reality? In answer to that question Mr. Wells would say that it is out of and by means of all this varied confusion that Reality is produced. Through all the confusion of life he says "something drives, something that is at once human achievement and most inhuman of all existing things. Something comes out of it—, Sometimes I call— this reality Science, sometimes I call it Truth, but it is something we draw by pain and effort out of the heart of life, that we disentangle and make clear". This "human--inhuman" Something Mr. Wells seems to identify with his idea of God, since he goes on to say "others serve it, I know in art, in literature, in social inventions, and see it in a thousand different figures under a hundred names. I see it always in austerity as beauty. This thing we make clear is the heart of life. It is the one thing we would have us know."

enduring thing. Men and nations, epochs and civilization pass, each making its contribution."

Further, he would say, we are each a part of this great "Physical being that strains--and grows toward Beauty". We are a part of this great "mental Being that strains and--grows toward knowledge and power". As individuals, he would have us see that we are worthless in and of ourselves. We become valuable merely because we become gatherers of experience, tentacles that arrange "thought side by side for this being of the Species, this being that grows beautiful and powerful". Again he intimates that we are the "momentary hand and eyes" of this "Life of the World" and that through us "the spirit looks and yearns. -- Tomorrow whether we live or die growth will conquer through us. That is the law of the spirit forevermore-- to grow and again to grow".

He would contend, I think, that all things in life that help this Spirit to grow are of the essence of Reality. All else is utter waste. At present, he believes, the world with all its "advertisement - inflated spending", and "aimless building up and pulling down", with its crowds of people wasting their time in "chattering dinner parties", with its men seeking property and its women social position, and with its philosophers dealing in "poor battered words, metaphors, analogies and abstractions"---such a world he believes, knows little of Reality.

What then does the world need to do in order that it might draw nearer to Reality? It needs, he says, to seek "Understanding". Life, he would have us know is gained only "by the perpetual finding
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of thought and the means of expression, by perpetual extension
and refinement of science, by the research that every artist
makes for beauty and significance in his art, by the perpetual
testing and destruction and rebirth under criticism of all these
things, and by a perpetual extension of this intensified wisdom
to more minds and more, till all men share in it, and share in
the making of it."

II. Marriage and Divorce.

In his book called "Marriage" Mr. Wells brings about a union
between Mr. Trafford, a noble type of man and a scientist, and
Marjory Pope, a girl of good qualities but one who has never taken
an especially serious outlook upon life. At first they seem to
love each other dearly, but as the years pass and they become
deeply interested in their different pursuits of life, he is
plunging deeper into science and she in gaining and holding a
position in society, they seem to lose their deep affection for each
other. While neither understands the cause of the change, they are
conscious nevertheless, that they are continually drifting further
and further apart. Conditions are bettered somewhat when children
are born into the family, but soon it is discovered that even the
influence of these fails to solve the real difficulty. In order
to meet expenses, he gives up his studies in scientific research
and goes into the rubber business. He makes plenty of money at
this, but still they are not happy. At last, after husband and
wife have studied in vain for several years to find the cause of
"dissatisfaction" and put "clashes", he would hardly be expected to
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they leave their children at home and go off together to Labrador to think. There he is wounded by a wild animal and as a consequence is compelled to remain quiet for weeks. While she takes care of him. In such a condition he thinks out his problem; while she, through her new responsibility and her place in life. They both decide that the cause of their difficulty has been first of all that their separate purposes in life have been too divergent; and secondly, that in trying to find peace under the aid of his philosophy, she brought to see herself and her partners in a common cause--they would together seek and try to get others to seek--understanding--He believes that such underlying things of life that count. So they decide to go back home as partners in the existing methods of formulation, as a preliminary to the wider and freer discussion of those religious and social issues which his generation was continually shrinking from. Hence the standing would come only through a "true understanding which leads to Reality. He was to blaze the way and bear the brunt of the battle; two of them would seek together to understand which leads to write; she would read and assist him. He would work and she was to be his "squeak and body servant." Now, we are not to believe that "Mr. Wells would attempt to bring peace to all married couples in this way; but, evidently more he thinks that such a principle, if applied, would meet the needs of the majority. Believing as he does, though, in the existence of "individuals and not 'classes,' he would hardly be expected to
govern all people by the same rule. Young people often make mistakes in their choice of a life companion, he says, that can hardly be remedied at all so long as they have to live together. Should either or both be punished for life because of a single mistake? Not only would he say no to that, but he would also advocate other views regarding questions of marriage, some of which to the conservative thinker appear not only radical but pernicious.

We will note a few of them: (1) He believes that there should be some kind of marriage but that it need be only an open "declaration of the existence of sexual relations between man and woman". (2) Such a marriage however, he claims, need not mean cohabitation. Some women would like to have children, yet would not care to be entrusted with their upbringing; while there are others who would enjoy rearing children which they themselves have not borne. The former are "sexual and philoprogenitive without being sedulously maternal"; while the latter are maternal without much or any sexual passion. Then there are both men and women who are "fond and passionate lovers" but who do not care to live constantly together. "I submit", he says, "there temperaments exist and have a right to exist in their own way". Furthermore, he intimates that the above mentioned people should be allowed to carry out their desires. Precisely, he says, "I do not see why in these matters there should not be much ampler freedom than there is, and this being so I can hardly be expected to condemn with any moral fervor or exclude from my society those who have seen fit to behave by what I believe may be the standard of A.D. 2000 beliefs in a great world "scheme" - not necessarily a "Schemer".
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instead of by the standard of 1850."

(3) Again, he says, that while "it is difficult to imagine a second woman in a home, who would not be and feel herself to be a rather excluded and inferior person," yet if three people of their own free will should desire to form a "triangular mutuality" he does not see any reason to "forbid or treat with bitterness or hostility" such a grouping.

(4) He would be even as lenient in allowing people to discontinue their married relations as he is in joining them together. It should be made easier to gain a divorce. It should be granted, he asserts, "on the score of mutual consent, of faithlessness, of simple cruelty, or insanity, habitual vice, or the prolonged imprisonment of either party."

In a word, he declares that two persons who wish to have a sexual relationship should be allowed to do so upon the statement of this intention; that, should they not care to cohabit, it would be all right for them to have children and turn them over to someone else to rear; that should they decide to live together, they would in all probability be happy if they would strive for realities instead of trivialities and work with a common purpose in view; and that should they find it impossible to live happily together, they should by mutual consent be considered free from marriage relationships.

1. (For further articles on this subject see: 1. "First and Last Things", 86. 2. Ibid. 89. 3. Ibid. 110. 5. Ibid.)

III. Christianity and the Church.

As we have already seen in our study of Reality, Mr. Wells always assumed that "God" is the "real being" who believes in a great world "scheme" - not necessarily a "Schemer".

1. "First and Last Things", 275. 2. Ibid. 272. 3. Ibid. 270.
but merely "order and coordination was distinguished from haphazard". We have also learned his view concerning the part played in this scheme by the individual. May we now view some points in his belief that have to do specifically with Christianity."

First, as might have already been guessed from some of the preceding statements, the God he worships is this great "striving", "yearning" Spirit that dwells in the midst of all life. At times it seems to him that this inner life, this universal scheme becomes not only personal but sympathetic. Then it is that he communes with and worships "fearlessly" what he calls this "something great that is not myself". Then it is that he meets the supreme facts in his religious life, the crown of his religious experience. Then it is that he comes face to face with Reality.

Second, he does not believe in any personal immortality. He declares that he is "part of an immortality", but that he is not "the continuing thing". He is merely "experimental, incidental." Knowing his theory of Reality, we could hardly expect him to say anything else. Nor are we surprised when he continues, "I believe in the great and growing Being of the Species from which I rise and to which I return. Believing that, I cannot also believe that my peculiar little thread will not undergo a synthesis and vanish as a separate thing".

Third, he is not attracted by the definite personality of Jesus that is presented by the modern Christian world. Jesus has been pictured as perfect, sinless, a being who "had no petty weaknesses", and because of that very fact Wells cannot find in "First and Last Things" 110. 2. "Marriage" 691. 3. Ibid. 5. Ibid 116.
him a personal Saviour. What he seeks as an example is one who is more human, who has had some of the same faults to conquer as others have had. So he thinks that while "Christianity has been true and is for countless people practically true", that it is not true for him, and, furthermore, that for the majority of spirit people in the world today it is "true only with modification".

Fourth, because of such views concerning the authority of the present Christian faith and because also of his belief in the Individual as differing in some respects from every other person, he says that each person has a right to formulate his own beliefs regardless of any outside facts.

Fifth, he does not believe "Salvation" is gained especially by adopting the creed of some church, but rather by devoting one's self heart and soul to some worthy purpose in life. Consequently, he believes salvation is gained in different ways; e.g. he says, by some it would be gained through research and thought, by others in the expression of art, and by another in taking care of the sick. However, he does not contradict his theory of reality by declaring this Salvation to be a protection of the individual after death, from eternal punishment. Rather, he would say that Salvation in the end is a collective thing. "Fancy the Almighty and me", says Trafford, "sitting up and keeping Eternity together! God and R.A.C. Trafford, F.R.S. -- that's silly. Fancy a man in number seven boots, and a tailor made suit in the 1914 fashion, sitting before God! -- that's caricature. But God and Man! that's sense, Marjory."
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In a word then, Mr. Wells would claim that the individual, since he must some day go back into the inner Spirit of life, from which he has sprung, wins salvation momentarily for self but ultimately for the inner Spirit, only when he is devoting himself to some purpose that will bring about development for this Spirit.

Sixth, he believes there ought to be a universal Church in which there will be a "conscious illuminated expression of Catholic brotherhood". Such a church he says ought to develop out of the "existing medley of Church fragments" which we have today, and "out of all that is worthy in our poetry and literature. It will be one that is free to all regardless of belief, and one that will have as its aim the development of the race and not the observance of creeds." However, he advises that no one leave the church to which he belongs today, nor refuse to enter merely because he cannot accept the doctrines to which it holds. Rather, would he have him to remain in the church and try from within to bring about reform. Concluding, he would say; "We Socialists want a Church through which we can feel and think collectively, - Whether as members of external critics, we have to do our best to get rid of obsolete doctrinal and ceremonial barriers so that the churches may merge again in a universal church and that church comprehend again the whole growing and amplifying spiritual life of the race."

Through it all, we see his fundamental idea of life - the inner Spirit, the social race composed of and developed by a myriad of individuals, individuals that form part of the great "scheme" and
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yet at the same time have the freedom of pursuing whatever course in life appears to them to cause progress for the mass.

IV. Government and Society.

"I see humanity scattered over the world, dispersed, conflicting, unawakened. I see human life as avoidable waste and curable confusion. I see peasants living in wretched huts, knee-deep in manure, mere parasites on their own pigs and cows; I see shy hunters wandering in primeval forests; I see the grimy millions who slave for industrial production; I see some who are extravagant and yet contemptible creatures of luxury, and some leading lives of shame and indignity, tens of thousands of wealthy people wasting lives in vulgar and unsatisfying triviality. Hundreds of thousands meanly chaffering themselves, rich and poor in the wasteful byways of trade; I see gamblers, fools, brutes, toilers, martyrs. Their disorder of effort, the spectacle of futility fills me with a passionate desire to end waste, to create order, to develop understanding."

Such is the world upon which Mr. Wells looks and such are his feelings concerning that world. He does not find fault with it because it is a bad world; he pities it because it is unfortunate. Well might he have said that while the inner Spirit of life yearns for food, men, in a disorderly fashion, because they do not understand, gather nothing but stones. Will such conditions never be changed? Will man never gain "Understanding"? Will they never of

(1) For one thing he believes war will soon be a thing of the past. He doesn’t think, however, that peace will come of its own accord; rather, he says it will come only after science has invented such powerful implements of warfare, that the whole world will shudder in the face of the horrors that must necessarily follow. When that time comes he feels confident that the different Nations will all see the fallacy of competitive government and will join as one great Republic, guided, but not unjustly ruled, by a group of representatives from the different countries.

(2) In such a universal State, or even in a single nation, he contends that individual property ownership should be done away with. Society, he holds, ought not to be divided into families striving to gain existence and even needless property, but it should consist of one large family of which all individuals are members. In such a group women should be equal citizens with, and should be economically independent of the men; while the children should be supported, protected and educated by the State.

(3) In order to bring about such a condition of affairs he contends of course that individual property ownership should be done away with. Yet he declares that that should not be done in order to secure the present profits and hinder the development of such owners, but merely "in order to rearrange these things in a

---
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saner and finer fashion." What the true Socialist wants, he says, is unlimited right to make this a more beautiful and con-
veniently equipped land in which to dwell and a world in which all effort at understanding might be fostered and not hindered.

(4) In defining socialism he says it is nothing more or less than "the awakening of an active consciousness in humanity, a collective will and a collective mind out of which finer individualities may arise forever in a perpetual series of fresh endeavors and fresh achievements for the race". It is a "slowly elaborating conception of a sane and organized state and moral culture" to take the place of our modern "chaotic" system of living.

(5) Now as to just what plan should be carried out year by year in the New Republic, Mr. Wells does not say. In fact, he declares that no one can know at present just what things it will be necessary to do in the future. However, he is sure of this one fact, that there is value in whatever helps in any way to increase thought and knowledge for society at large.

So we find that Mr. Wells is far different from many so called Socialists. While they believe in having a State in which there will be a sort of leveling up of personalities and a rest from labor, he sees in the new state an opportunity for service and even greater individual progress. Furthermore, because there is in the midst of life, a Spirit that yearns to grow, a Spirit of which we are a part, he believes that in the process of development somewhere along the line, we will begin to "understand";

will see that war, that competition in all material things,
that disorder and waste are of the essence of folly; that peace,
universal brotherhood, order and economy of purpose are the
things that lead to Reality.
CHAPTER V.

JOHN GALSWORTHY.

On a bright September day the sun was very strong and
the air was warm. A girl was walking on the
beach, a distant figure, but she dis-
appeared in the sun, "faint", to the eye. The relation with the
sufferer now, he declared, presented itself.

Then it was, he said, that it would be wrong for
the man to carry her. In that, but in name, he had come
judgment.

The girl, however, was quite ill. In the swimmer's silence, he
was, now quite ill. In the swimmer's silence, the
sufferer, now quite ill, said, "yes, with a crest
of white water, he could see that he was some distance from
the shore. To swim at this time was impossible. It was true
that the water was very cold. In the water, he was quite ill, for

reality.

reality.

reality.

reality only

reality only

reality only
In "The Eldest Son" Sir William Cheshire is very pronounced in his opinion that his servant should marry a girl with whom he has had improper relations; while, on the other hand, when he dictates in the second instance, he declares emphatically that it would be wrong for the son to marry her. In the first instance he had cast judgment from an unprejudiced standpoint. He saw that a man had committed a sin against a woman, that he had placed upon her name a stigma that would remain before the eyes of society forever. In the light of justice, he knew that the very least the servant could do was to marry and protect her. In the second instance conditions, he believes, were quite different. He, Sir William, placed great value in his heritage, in the family name that had come down from his ancestors. That name had never been disgraced. It is true his son had made a mistake but it would be better, he thought, for
the girl to suffer the awful results of that sin than for the son to suffer the awful results of her sin. If the girl was allowed to marry the man to whom she was betrothed, he would marry her and cast shame upon the heritage of the past.

In "The Mob", Stephen More was forsaken by friends and the family from whom he was born, that hold in their crazy family, scorned by society, and finally killed, merely because he dared to raise his voice against an unjust war that was being waged by his country. People judged him a traitor not because of any harm he had done his nation, but because he stood contrary to custom. Do you see hundreds of years of custom that the voice of a long established custom-- he spoke for justice and stood upon the judgment of really intelligent people and keep against a national heritage.

Again, in the story called "Justice", William Palder, a young man who has raised a check and stolen part of the money is put in prison for perceptible convictions. Man, a young man is in prison. After being placed on parole he is about to be taken again for the whole crime. A young man can in the absence of the officer when he jumps from a window and breaks his neck.

"Well, life?" Yes, society does exist there. There was a man young and inexperienced. He had made a mistake and repeated it. It was further he has been made to see that society exists in a case of his crime. Had he been given another chance, warned and helped aid where the individual is allowed the necessary freedom for his life, he might have developed into a worthy citizen; but his personal development, where such number of society, has a reverence for the heritage of every other nation; in a world where many laws, written laws, demanded that he be punished. So, while no one will ever escape the law of God and the belief in "mercy", doubt a judgment of an unprejudiced, sympathetic conscience would have spared him, society desired practically to slay him rather than run counter to custom.

In view of such stories as these and others of a like nature that Mr. Galsworthy has written, what would we conclude his idea of "Reality" to be? It is said that a German when asked where a certain man lived, replied, "Do you see that big white house just's around the corner?" Well, he doesn't live there." So: In think...
big senior. One time after they have expressed their feeling for
might well speak for Mr. Galsworthy in such terms as follows:-

Do you see the many long established customs that prevent a large
majority from ever thinking anything new, that hold in their grasp
the lives of others who can think and who dare to express their
thoughts? Do you see the innumerable laws that, created for a
specific case, are now applied without mercy to all cases regardless
of circumstances? Do you see hundreds of years of heritage that
weigh down upon the judgment of really intelligent people and keep
them from seeing a-right? I say, do you see these and all other
conditions that "leave no scope for individual liberty, that grant
no pardon for personal eccentricities, that make men and women so
nervous? When they have arrived at about middle age, Lennan, still
many helpless, docile, self-complacently cogs in the big machine of
their life as much as ever, is very much fascinated with "all,
modern life?" Well, Reality does not exist therein. Were we to
compare younger than himself. In order that he might remain true
press him further he no doubt would say that Reality exists in a
world where the individual is allowed the necessary freedom for his
personal development, where each member of society has a reverence
for the beliefs of every other member; in a world where men love
and serve each other; in a world where the Ruler is "Harmony",
"Love", "Unity", "Utter Justice".

In his story called "The Dark Flower", Mr. Galsworthy presents
what evidently is his idea concerning the secret of a happy married
life and concerning divorce. The story runs as follows:-

Lennan, a young student at Oxford, falls in love with his tutor's
wife. She also loves him, although she is perhaps seventeen years

his senior. One time after they have expressed their feeling for each other, Lennan goes home on a visit and while there meets a girl chum of his. Later, he is visited by his tutor and his wife; but by this time Lennan has formed quite an attachment for Sylvia, this girl chum of about his own age. The tutor’s wife soon discovers this fact after her arrival and before long departs, broken-hearted. Later Lennan falls in love with a Mrs. Olive Cramier who is also of about his own age but the wife of an older man. She returns his love and the two of them start to elope. The husband discovers the fact, follows them and in an effort to kill Lennan accidentally kills his wife. Sometime after this, Lennan marries Sylvia. When they have arrived at about middle age, Lennan, still loving his wife as much as ever, is very much fascinated with Nell, a lady much younger than himself. In order that he might remain true to his wife and not be carried away by his devotion to Nell, he takes his wife and moves to another place.

Now there are two points that I think Mr. Galsworthy would have us get from this story. First, in order for married life to be happy there must be, he believes, a natural "fitness" between husband and wife. The tutor in the story was much older than his wife. He found the greatest delight in life in the study of books. Consequently he was not in a position to make his young wife happy. Mr. Cramier was also much older than Olive. His interest was all absorbed in Parliament. So he, too, was not a fit partner for the young girl he had married. Then in the case of a union between Lennan and young Nell, our author gives us grounds to infer that
there would also have been later dissatisfaction. In order for
people to have been happy are, for the sake of a belief in
harmony to prevail in married life, he seems to say the husband
and wife should both be in the same cycle of life. So all life
was in "circuits", we find practically the same things
of harmony has been regulated, "youth with youth; summer to summer;
wind was in England to life until Honeywell tells of falling
leaves to falling leaf." There are, of course, other things
in life besides the difference in ages which cause misfits, he
believes. Just what these things are would be hard to say, but
that they do exist is shown in the fact that even Lenman Sylvia
were not so happy as they should have been.

The second point that is found in the story is that where two
people know for a certainty that there exists between them this
natural fitness, even though they be already married they have a
right to leave whatever affiliation they have and/join themselves
to each other. This is shown in the last of the book where we are
told that Lenman leaves for Italy, having decided that there is no
natural fitness between himself and Nell "such as once had justified
passion for him against the world."

The same thing is shown, I think, in "The Patrician". Milton,
a young man who has lately been elected to Parliament, falls deeply
in love with Audrey Noel, the wife of a minister. She, being un-
happy in her married relationship, also loves Milton. However,
although the young couple realize that there exists between them
that same fitness that would make them happy together, they refuse
to get married as he does not believe that she and her present
husband have a right to be divorced. As a result, two lives that
1. Scribners 54:605, 2. Ibid.
might otherwise have been happy are, for the sake of a belief in
custom, made miserable.

Then again in "Justice", we find practically the same thing. The
divorce laws of England would not allow Ruth Honeywell to get
a divorce from her drunken husband that she could marry Falder, a
man whom she really loved. When Falder raised the amount on the
check and stole the money he did so in order that he might get
enough to run off to another country with Ruth and her children.
Had the divorce been allowed in the first place the two people,
between whom apparently there existed that "natural fitness",
would have married and would no doubt have been happy and helpful
members of society. Because the law forbade such a proceeding,
the two lives were ruined and one was entirely destroyed.

In another book, "The Man of Property", we notice still another
point, this time concerning one of the reasons for unhappy married
life. Soames Forsyte is the man after whom the book is named. His
greatest ambition in life is to collect wealth, to have what the
author terms "Property". He is, in fact, so absorbed in that one
thought that he allows it to take complete possession of him both
in business and in his social life. Consequently, in time he comes
to look upon even his wife as "Property". She belongs to him.
Instead of being a partner with whom he should deal justly, instead
of being a real companion whom he should endeavor to make happy,
he considers that she is a piece of humanity put into his hands,
body and soul, merely for the purpose of advancing his own selfish
interests.
After viewing all of the above suggestions gathered here and there from the writings of Mr. Galsworthy, I think we might safely formulate his idea of the question about as follows: When people make a failure of married life, it is because there does not exist a condition of "natural fitness" between them. They may lack this fitness for many reasons some of which are: (1) considerable difference in ages, (2) a difference in interests that each takes in life, (3) failure on the part of one or probably each to recognize the place in their lives that the other ought to hold, and as a consequence (4) the failure on their part to deal justly with each other. Now where such conditions exist and where either can discover a sense of fitness in the company of another, he or she should have the privilege of getting a divorce and marrying the person they love.

III. Christianity and the Church.

This then, O God! is all my creed:
In the beginning there was still
What there is now, no less no more;
And at the end of all there will
Be just as much. There is no score
Of final judgment. Wonder's tale
Will never, never all be told.
There will be none without the pale,
No saint elect, within the fold.

If then this mighty magic world
Has always been, will ever be,
There must be laws within it curbed
That spin it through eternity.
I see two equal laws, obey
One sovereign, never captured Law —
For all this world would melt away
If heart of mystery we saw.
And first of these twin equal laws
In every birth the cause
Is that dynamic force which flows
In life -- of every birth the cause,
Replumes the trees, and swells the rose;
Inflames and clouds the violet Spring;
Inhabits all the mighty flood
The breezes' lightest whispering,
The every impulse of our blood.

The second law is this:
Implicit deep in all increase
And stir of living things, there is
A nothingness, a fate of peace,
A night, a death, and ebbing down,
A fading out of life. The hush
That burgeons, dawns a funeral gown;
And every tune contains its hush.

Yet those two laws, we find apart,
As day and night, are brought to fold
Within that one and Sovran Heart
Whose secret never shall behold,
Yet shall thro' time, and thro' all spaces
With mystery pervade the world,
And make it holier then face.
Of dawn that sun and mist have reared.

That Sovran Heart is Harmony!
Its eyes unseen, its ways unknown.
'Tis utter Justice, boundless Sea
Of Unity; and Secret Throne
Of Love; a spirit Meeting Place
Of vital dust and mortal breath,
That needs no point of time or space,
To bind together life and death.

When we read these words, and also when we recall Sir, Calsworthy's theory of Reality we are not at all surprised when we find him condemning much of the preaching of the modern day.

Yet the fault, he would say, is not to be found in the fact that preachers are not sincere, but in the fact that they are spending their enthusiasm in trying to revive a set of dead issues that have
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little to do with real life of today. This is an age, he claims, of "struggle to reach stability between a dying faith and a coming faith", between a faith that clings to an outward authority and one that is interested above all in kindly service to mankind and in the real worth of a man rather than in the religious doctrine he accepts. There was a time when the stern authority of the church played an important part in swinging men away from the Pagan belief. There was also a day when "Pagan philosophy, reasserted itself", proved a value in fertilizing "again an already too inbred Christian creed". But today we are living in an entirely different age, a "Third Renaissance", so to speak. We are living in a day when Science is playing a very important part in our lives. It is showing us that the world is not static, that the facts of one year may change in the next. Through the progress it has made and the help it has rendered in practically every sphere of life science has caused us to stop and think; it has given us a desire to progress. We want "Perfection" in the physical world; we want it too in the spiritual. We have a longing for an abundant life, a full life, and that longing is produced not by "hope of reward, not by fear of punishment, but by a love of Perfection -- for Perfection's sake."

"For the sake of Perfection". Such a phrase means little to us at first, but when we have studied between the lines in Mr. Galsworthy's books and have got hold of the trend of his philosophy we find indeed, that these words mean a great deal. He would have a world in which there is perfect unity, perfect harmony, perfect love and perfect justice. Such is the vision that his philosophy,

taken as a whole, would place before the life of our day. In order that the world might draw near to such an ideal State the Church must do its part; and its part will be not to teach a theology that is tied up in long established theories, but to love all men, to comfort and help them in time of need and to teach them such lessons as will help them to live happier and more fruitful lives here upon earth.

IV. Government and Society.

In dealing with social problems, Mr. Galsworthy has shown an interest, not in the individual man or woman but in humanity at large. Ethics and sociology, manners and customs are all in his mind. The whole of his work is to ask how can men be helped to carry "the system". That, then he has cast any special crimes but, as one has said, "the system with a capital S"

In his "Justice", he does not see a single man and a single jury. It is not Fader but the whole of the weaker class that is in the dock. It is not that a man allowed to be cast into prison, slowly to wear away their lives and finally to end their existence upon the altar of a national law. In the "Man of Property", it is not the Forsyte family, but all of the upper middle class that has lost sight of Reality in the mad rush for "Property". Neither is it, in "The Eldest Son" that large class of people in the world today who are mentally so crippled by an extensive heritage that they hardly know how to live their lives or how to think. Consequently everything cast, under challenging conditions, a sentence of justice.

The "System," Mr. Galsworthy believes, is opposed to the
welfare of the masses. They suffer above all things the evils of injustice. Now this injustice is brought about, he contends, in different ways:

First, customs, as has already been stated, keep men from making use of their common sense. After Falder, having made perhaps the first great mistake of his life, openly confessed, repented of his sin and resolved to do better, why did men send him to prison where he would be denied the privileges and the uplifting influence of his friends? Was it because they were mean, hard hearted men who delighted in bringing suffering upon others? No, it was because the voice of law, law which had grown out of ancient customs, had commanded it. Why, in the first place, had Falder not been allowed to marry Ruth Honeywell? Later, when he was cast into prison, why was he not put in the proper environment and given the proper kind of work to do that he might develop a stronger character? To these questions, Mr. Galsworthy would give the same answer -- Custom had spoken. Again, why did the mob kill Stephen More when he spoke against war? It was because Custom, long established, had said that he who speaks against his nation, no matter whether the nation be in the right or in the wrong, -- that man is a traitor and must be punished.

Second, children that are born into the family of the wealthy become by nature seekers after "Property". They see value in nothing else because they have never had any other ideal held up before them, by either parents or friends. Consequently everything that tends to hinder them, or that does not directly aid them, in
the pursuit of their chief aim in life, becomes a secondary affair.

Third, large enterprises are conducted by a Board of Directors instead of by a single person, these men being responsible not only for their own share, but also for the shares of the other stockholders. While the individual men, if working alone and for their own interests, might pursue a generous policy when guardians of the children, save when under pressure as will save the interests of others they would hardly follow out such liberal tactics.

Fourth, a government is not careful enough in putting down evil practices, Mr. Galsworthy declares. For instance, in England (1) women are worked too hard by employers, (2) children in many instances are not properly fed, (3) boys are employed at work that ruins their chances in after life, and (4) paupers are consigned to lunatic asylums on certificate of one doctor. These are but a few of the conditions that exist in England, according to our author and yet, he contends, Parliament for some reason or other will not take steps to better such conditions.

Now, without mentioning further causes, let us ask how Mr. Galsworthy would bring about the needed reforms in our social world. In answer to this question he says very little. In fact he has been named by some, especially the socialists, as a 'straddler', a 'middle-roader whose mind is a source of light, not of heat'. In regard to this accusation we would suggest that perhaps as a philosopher he is not compelled to solve these problems or even to attempt a solution. He is primarily an "interpreter of modernity". His purpose has been to show the inner soul of the

modern world in all its parts, that men might see the darkness therein and be brought to a desire for a new life. When he has successfully done that, he probably thinks he has done his share as a philosopher. He does, however, make one statement that is worthy of our attention at this point. He says, there is "no means of counteracting the secret, dangerous, and irritating effect on the mind of labor, save by such process of education as shall soak the spirit of the prosperous classes with an altogether larger and saner feeling of the fundamental unity and interdependence of society" Evidently he believes that when all the men have been properly educated in regard to the "unity and interdependence of society" they will, regardless of the voice of custom, be able and willing to meet out to all classes of people "utter justice".

To the reader, we have spent our time in discussing the distribution of different men of letters, and we have taken little notice of the names of the writers.  We have):

CHAPTER VI.

CONCLUSION.
So far in this thesis, we have spent our time in discussing the individual philosophies of different men of letters. May we now make a summary of our whole study and endeavor to find the trend of thought common to all four writers.

I. Reality.

Before a person can begin to attain reality, he must, according to Mr. Churchill, be "reborn". That is to say, he must have thought out the problem of life to such an extent that he has been able to find his real place in the world and has made it possible to properly adjust himself with reverent purpose to the work he feels it his duty to perform for the good of mankind. When he has reached such a stage he will have become a spiritual being, whereas, before he had been living entirely in the material world. He is no longer merely an individual seeking after his own welfare; he finds himself a part of a great society of human beings upon whom he depends and who in turn depend upon him. If he would attain the highest values of life, he realizes now that he must gain them not at the expense of others but with their profit in view. So, Mr. Churchill contends, only that man can attain reality who, having entered the spiritual sphere of life, spends his time in the pursuit of such work as will uplift society and as a consequence develop a strong personality.

Following this we have found Mr. Herrick expressing practically the same thought when he tells us that life lies "not in the senses" but in "some silent place within each" and further when he
contends that reality is to be attained only when, in our earnestness to serve others, "we forget to see ourselves." The condition of reality, he believes, is one in which the individual is inwardly at peace. He may or may not have plenty of this world's material possessions. He may or may not have achieved honor and success in the eyes of men. The question of importance is; has he carefully studied the life of the world, has he heard the call of humanity and, as a consequence, has he so completely attempted to respond that he has gained true peace, real harmony of the inner life? If so he has tasted of reality.

Now this same call of Society comes to us perhaps even a little more forcibly in Mr. Wells' theory than in either of the above mentioned, because it is more concrete. It is the cry of a great spirit that dwells in the midst of all life, a "physical being that strains -- and grows toward Beauty", a "mental Being that strains and -- grows toward knowledge and power". Furthermore, it is a Something that becomes at times almost personal, a Being with which the human soul delights to commune. It is a Something of which we are a part, from which we came, and to which we return. When we grow, this inner Spirit naturally grows toward perfection, and when it develops, we also develop. Therefore, since we are so closely connected with this inner Spirit of nature and since the fate of each is only as we promote the cause not of material life but of the one great Spirit. But others are a part of this Spirit the same as myself. Therefore, to develop my own personality to attain reality for myself, I must help
It has been suggested that we must start out with a desire to
others to gain it. However, before I can help efficiently, I
must have, and this, we have found, is a very important word
with Mr. Wells—"Understanding". When I have studied the
mysteries of life as carefully as possible, I must try to extend
my knowledge to others and help them in every way I can, to attain
a highly developed spiritual life, a life that seeks "Understanding"
and the universal service that results therefrom.

Mr. Galsworthy's main words are "Justice", "Harmony", "Love",
"Unity". The world is not happy, he believes, because individuals
on the whole are not treated fairly by the stronger powers. They
are not allowed the privilege of exercising their personal eccen-
tricities, and as a consequence are discouraged and retarded in
their development. The main reason for such injustice, he holds,
is that men are eager for material gain. Instead of finding real
life in inner development, they seek it in perishable goods. In
our age he believes that the spirit of "the new world"
view of these facts he concludes that the world will have attained
"harmony" only when conditions have been so arranged that "utter
Justice" will prevail, when individuals will be more readily per-
doncd for their personal eccentricities and when all, with a
reverence for each other, will, through service, unconsciously
develop strong personalities.

After such a summary we find, do we not, that the reality
with which all these men are dealing is practically the same in
every case, only approached from different angles. All agree
that the first thing necessary to the attainment of our goal is
an attempt at an understanding of our relations to life in general.
After that they agree that we must start out with a desire to
uplift our fellow man. As we render what service we can we will,
according to Churchill develop a purposeful, progressive, personal-
lity; according to Herrick we will be gaining peace with self and
life; according to Wells we will be growing with the inner Spirit;
and with Galsworthy we will have attained a condition of harmony.
But after all are not these conditions practically the same? The
soul that knows harmony is at peace with self and life; to be at
peace with self and life demands personal growth; and personal
growth depends on the growth of the inner Spirit of which Mr.
Wells speaks.

Having found the theory of reality common to these men, may
we see how it is worked out with reference to the other phases of
our study.

II. Marriage and Divorce.

Mr. Churchill believes that the reason that so many married
couples are unhappy is that they have not taken the first steps
necessary to the attainment of reality, i.e. they have not studied
out their places in life and decided to consecrate their lives to
a worthy purpose that involves service to mankind. They have felt
affection toward each other for a while, have gone through legal
ceremonies that have given them the privilege of living together
and raising a family, but they have not really been married in the
spirit. Now since they have never been actually married, and since
they are just wandering aimlessly about in a world where reality
is not known, he thinks it would make little difference whether
they remain together or whether they separate. Consequently, he says the question of divorce should not be governed by law but should be settled by the individual. At first that will cause some trouble for society, but after a while, he believes, men will gain understanding sufficient to help them make proper decisions. As regards those who have been reborn and, consequently, who have been truly married, he maintains the question of divorce need not even be considered.

Mr. Herrick's main word in regard to marriage is "Togetherness." Husband and wife will be happy, he believes, when each loves and serves the other and when the two of them work "together," i.e., as sympathetic partners, in a common cause that benefits mankind. When such a condition does not exist, our author believes that there can be no such thing as love and true happiness, for, according to his fundamental theory, love can only be developed between two persons who have attained reality. What, then, about those between whom such love does not exist; should they be divorced? Mr. Herrick is not emphatic on that point but he would have us see that, since proper relationship is brought about by inner motives and not outer laws, marriage vows in themselves are not at all binding and can in many instances be broken without sin.

Mr. Wells is far more outspoken in regard to this question and leaves no room for any doubt as to his position. He holds, as do the others, that in order as do the others, that in order for a married couple to be happy
they must be in the path of reality; that is, they must be continually seeking "Understanding" and endeavoring to give the benefits of their study to others, and that the two must seek it together with a common purpose between them. In regard to divorce, however, he goes further than any of the other three and says emphatically that marriage vows in themselves, being material, are nothing and that anyone should be allowed to get married or be divorced whenever he chooses without regard to the wishes of society. The fact is he thinks Society would not be at all concerned, if it is living in the world of reality where the material sex distinctions are not considered.

Mr. Galsworthy believes that married people in order to be happy should be of about the same age, should have about the same purposes to work out, and should deal justly with each other and with society at large. However, he affirms, where there does not exist between them a sense of fitness that nourishes love, they should have the right to separate from each other and join themselves to others, regardless of what society has to say.

In a word then, we find that all agree in regard to one point, namely, that for married life to be happy there must exist between husband and wife a common purpose and a desire to study and labor in some field that will uplift humanity. As regards the question of marriage vows we find that, while they differ somewhat as to their views on divorce, all agree that marriage vows in themselves should not be considered absolutely binding.
III. Christianity and the Church.

Does the Church of the modern day carry out fully the doctrine of Christianity; does it do all it should to develop real personalities, to bring about justice and harmony; does it teach and render in the highest degree true service to mankind? Mr. Churchill, Mr. Herrick, Mr. Wells and Mr. Galsworthy answer all of these questions in the negative. The trouble with the church today, they all agree, is that it thinks more of ceremony and custom than it does of the actual benefit it ought to render to Society. How then would they make the Church more efficient in carrying out their doctrine of reality? In the first place, I think they would all say, it ought to preach a different kind of God. It should not point men off somewhere away from this earth, but should present to them a God who lives in the midst of all life, inspiring, uplifting and ever drawing men on to a higher conception of reality. In the second place, they would keep no one out of the Church merely because he could not accept certain views. And in the third place, they would make the Church an institution whose main purpose would be to render service by teaching men how to live in the present rather than by getting them ready to die.

IV. Government and Society.

The trouble with Society today and with the existing form of government, all four of our authors would say, is that men are not given equal chances. The rich are more powerful than the poor and as a result hold them down and make of them physical and mental
slaves. Such a condition is bad enough in itself, but it appears still worse when we learn that the members of this powerful class that cause so much misery are not entirely to blame. They have been educated to believe that life is merely a question of the survival of the fittest, and, never learning anything else, they feel justified in holding the upper hand wherever it is possible for them to do so. Now how is this condition to be remedied. How can society and government be arranged so that equal opportunities will be given to each person? Mr. Churchill would say, in answer to such a question, that we should pay less attention to customs and laws, that we should develop a more democratic feeling in our churches and that we should have just as little government as is possible for us to get along with. Mr. Herrick believes the only way to settle the difficulty is for each person to study the conditions that lead to a better life, then to get right with himself and afterward, gradually, by instruction and personal example, to help others to find the same peace. Mr. Wells advocates more of a change and yet he tells us he would not have us to upset present conditions too quickly. Mr. Galsworthy would also agree with the others in the belief that the conditions cannot be bettered by violent attacks on the present system. The only way to counteract the dangerous tendencies of the day is to educate and soak the spirit of the prosperous classes with a "saner feeling of the fundamental unity and interdependence of society as a whole". Should we ask now what the ideal State should be like, Mr. Churchill would answer that it would be a great democracy in which all the members would be born people seeking reality through service to
mankind; Mr. Herrick would call it a State where the Good-will rules supreme over Evil-will, or "Spirit of Creed"; Mr. Wells would characterize it as a great world State not governed by specific laws but guided by wise counsellors, a State where all men seek understanding and serve each other; Mr. Galsworthy would name it a condition of "Utter Justice", "Harmony", "Love", Service; and all would further characterize it as a State in which the desire to attain property ownership, if existing at all, would be subordinate to higher spiritual motives.

In a word then I think we might sum up the trend of philosophy of these four men in some such terms as follows: Life consists not in material being but in mental and moral development. All things that hinder the progress in these two fields are worthless and should be forgotten; all things that in any way aid in developing understanding and morality are of value and should be sought, because such things lead to Reality—-Yea, more, they are Reality—-they are the very essence of Life itself. That being true, all material things are of secondary value. For instance, the desire to gain riches and power, marriage vows and laws concerning them, creeds and ceremonies of the Church, customs and laws of a nation—-all such are valuable only in so far as they tend to bring about better understanding of life and more efficient and loving service to mankind.
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