

# The Chicago Theological Seminary REGISTER

Volume XIX

NOVEMBER 1929

Number 4

## *Our New President—An Announcement*

By JOHN R. MONTGOMERY, *Chairman of the Board of Directors*

*In June of this year Dr. Ozora S. Davis resigned the presidency of the Seminary because of ill health. The Directors had no choice but to accept his resignation. They then turned to the task of finding a new president. The following statement announces the happy result.*

THE Directors announce with deep satisfaction the election of Albert Wentworth Palmer as President of the Chicago Theological Seminary. Dr. Palmer will begin his administration January 1, 1930.

It is the purpose of the Seminary to keep in vital union with the churches of its constituency, and it seems peculiarly appropriate that a man of Dr. Palmer's rich experience in pastoral work and wide acquaintance among the churches should be chosen for this office.

Dr. Palmer is a graduate of the University of California, 1901, and of Yale Divinity School, 1904. He began his ministry at Redlands, California. He was pastor of Plymouth Church, Oakland, 1907-17, and of Central Union Church in Honolulu from 1917 to 1924. In the latter year he accepted a call to the First Congregational Church of Oak Park, Illinois, from which he comes to the Seminary. From 1911 to 1917 he was an instructor in Pacific Theological Seminary, dealing with the subject of pastoral and social problems. He has long been recognized as an author and preacher of distinction. Pacific Seminary conferred upon him the

degree of Doctor of Divinity. During the World War he served with the Young Men's Christian Association in California and in Siberia.

The most important function of a theological seminary is to fit men for the largest influence in preaching and caring for pastorates. For leadership in this work Dr. Palmer is peculiarly well fitted by his broad outlook and his practical experience with the problems of the active minister, as well as by his scholarship and his administrative ability. He has been especially interested in young men and women and exceptionally fortunate in his contacts with them.

In view of the intimate relations between the Chicago Theological Seminary and the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, which are working together along parallel lines, each striving to supplement the work of the other, it is gratifying that the choice of Dr. Palmer as President of the Seminary has been heartily welcomed by the Divinity School Faculty.

During the interim between the close of President Davis' administration and

land once resolved, first, to build a new jail; second, to use the materials of the old jail to build the new one; and, third, to keep the old one going until the new one was ready.

No creation, nothing at all, indeed, is possible by using such a method. But the paradox is resolved and the figure becomes an adequate symbol if we think in terms of engineering rather than of architecture. The creative minister has been likened to an engineer charged with the construction of a new railroad terminal station. While he is building new tracks on new levels, he must keep the existing traffic in full operation and have the trains arriving and leaving on schedule. So the minister has to be a loyal and enthusiastic supporter of the particular organizations of his institution and of the particular group of Christians to which he belongs, while he lives in feeling and in constructive planning in the more flexible and serviceable and inclusive church of tomorrow.

The third field of creative opportunity is that of community or national or international life. If amusements are un-

healthy, a minister's people, yes and those outside the scope of his official ministry, become dissipated. If civic practices thwart, intimidate, and impoverish his people, he is concerned. If racial prejudices stir up enmity; if educational facilities are inadequate or unfairly distributed; if industrial enterprises under-reward those at the bottom and over-reward those at the top, with equally tragic but anti-theoretical consequences; if the peace of the world is disturbed, his people suffer. The minister is bound to turn his thought and action to the creation of environmental creators of individual well-being.

Why the ministry? If I were to say, "Why, just for fun," I might seem to speak too light-heartedly. Yet something of the sort I mean. The minister is one of the most selfish creatures in the world. He is doing what he most wants to do. His is a delicious life, an electric life, a life of alternate despair and satisfaction as he exercises his imagination and power to create new individuals, more serviceable churches, a more just, friendly, and honest social order.

## *A Daring "Preface to Morals"*

*Reviewed by* FRED EASTMAN

MR. WALTER LIPPMANN, the forceful and brilliant editor of the *New York World*, probably wrote his new book<sup>1</sup> in a steam-heated flat in New York. I read it and reread it on the Atlantic Ocean during eight days of tempest and high seas. The bow of the ship pointed now toward heaven and now toward hell, and it seemed to me that the book did the same.

The heavenward part is the author's terrific earnestness and sincerity in the whole and the results he achieves in the third section dealing with business, government, and sexual relations in modern society. The hellward part is the middle section on humanism and pointing directly away from God. Halfway between these two is a more or less level discussion of the dissolution of the ancestral order, the decline of authority in the church and

<sup>1</sup> *A Preface to Morals*. By Walter Lippmann. Macmillan Co., 1929. Pp. 348. \$2.50.

traditional religion, and the present spiritual crisis faced by modern men.

He sets himself the task of discovering the foundations for morals for men and women who no longer believe in the religion of their fathers. These are the legions who have turned to a non-theistic liberalism in which man is supposed to be free from the restraints of superstition and external authority. They have found freedom of a sort, but they have not found peace. Rather, he says, they have found the truth of Huxley's remark that a man's worst difficulties begin when he is able to do as he likes. The evidence of these greater difficulties Mr. Lippmann sees all about us:

in the brave and brilliant atheists who have defied the Methodist God, and have become very nervous; in the women who have emancipated themselves from the tyranny of fathers, husbands, and homes, and with the intermittent but expensive help of a psychoanalyst, are now enduring liberty as interior decorators; in the young men and women who are world-weary at twenty-two; in the multitudes who drug themselves with pleasure; in the crowds enfranchised by the blood of heroes who cannot be persuaded to take an interest in their destiny; in the millions, at last free to think without fear of priest or policeman, who have made the moving pictures and the popular newspapers what they are.

These are the prisoners who have been released. They ought to be very happy. They ought to be serene and composed. They are free to make their own lives. There are no conventions, no tabus, no gods, priests, princes, fathers, or revelations which they must accept. Yet the result is not so good as they thought it would be. The prison door is wide open. They stagger out into trackless space under a blinding sun. They find it nerve-wracking [pp. 6, 7].

He identifies himself with these disillusioned souls and throughout the book his sympathies with them, his knowledge of their struggles, and his incisive analysis of their background and environment constitute the unclaimed credentials of leadership. He is a true leader, for he knows where he wants to go and he stands among those who do not. He has courage among

a group who fear. He would be the last to wish to be called their prophet. I suspect he would insist that the term prophet is applied to one who proclaims some supernatural revelation. But he is their prophet for all that, for he reveals his own sensitive insight and speaks his own considered judgment on contemporary spiritual problems without fear or favor of the traditional and orthodox institutions of religion. This is, and always has been, the essence of prophecy.

His thesis he states in these words:

It is my thesis that because the acids of modernity have dissolved the adjustments of the ancestral order, there exists to-day on a scale never before experienced by mankind and of an urgency without a parallel, the need for that philosophy of life of which the insight of high religion is a prophecy. For it is immature and unregenerate desire which creates the disorders and the frustrations that confound us. The preoccupation of the popular religion has been to find a way of governing these disorders and of compensating for their frustrations. The preoccupation of high religion is with the regeneration of the passions that create the disorders and the frustrations. Insofar as modernity has dissolved the power of the popular religion to govern and to compensate, the need for a high religion which regenerates becomes imperative, and what was once a kind of spiritual luxury of the few has, under modern conditions, become an urgent necessity of the many. The insight of high religion which has hitherto indicated a kind of bypath into rare experiences is now a trail which the leaders of mankind are compelled to take.

To support this thesis he presents, first, a picture of the modern world, urban, industrialized, depersonalized, and disillusioned concerning the authority of an infallible church and an infallible Bible. Then on the assumption that the old moral standards were all based on Roman Catholic or Fundamentalist conceptions of an external, supernatural, and divine kingdom "from which ultimately all laws, all judgments, all rewards, all punishments, and all compensations are derived," he argues that, since these conceptions have broken down, the foundations of morality have also broken down.

The modern man must consequently make new ones if he is to have any, and this time he would be wise to base them on human experience rather than superstition about an external divine authority. This new morality must have its religion, but it will be religion "conceived as the art and theory of the internal life of man" rather than "religion conceived as cosmic government." The latter he thinks is characteristic of all popular religion and the former the characteristic of the religion of the sages.

This "art and theory of the internal life" is to him the essence of humanism and he thinks it diametrically opposed to a theistic conception of life. Quite honestly and candidly he classes himself with the humanists and admits that his book will seem nothing short of treason to God to those who hold that the universe is a theocracy. The chief principle of theocratic religion he holds is dependence, obedience, and conformity to the will of God; the chief principle of humanism, he says, is detachment, understanding, and disinterestedness. This principle is at the heart of such virtues as courage, honor, faithfulness, veracity, justice, temperance, magnanimity, and love. Since these are the virtues necessary as ideals for modern man's morality, it follows that he needs humanism.

Next come three great chapters in which he shows how the principle of disinterestedness must lie at the basis of any successful solution of the problems of business, government, and sexual relations. To the mind of this reviewer his conclusions here are not at all dependent upon his preceding sections. They might have been reached by a great economist or sociologist whose theological concepts were entirely different. For humanism, as he admits, has no monopoly on the doctrine of disinterestedness. Two thousand years ago Jesus said, "He who would

come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me," and over and over again that call to deny one's own selfish interest and take up a cross and live life dangerously sounds through the gospels. But we will not quarrel over who first proclaimed the principle. It is a valid principle, and the more religions that make it central the better. Mr. Lippmann applies it in these three chapters.

He traces the history and evolution of business from the days when it depended upon the muscle of ignorant and subjugated men to the present when it depends upon power-driven machinery and has within itself the "seeds of constant reconstruction." Along with this evolution there has come a corresponding evolution in business ideals and morals. He shows the weakness of socialism, fascism, and bolshevism as attempts to cure the evils "resulting from the breakdown of a somewhat primitive form of capitalism." He sees advanced industrial organization "too complex to be directed by democratic politicians," and believes that the leaders of industry are being "forced to evolve forms of self-control." He says,

It is my impression that when machine industry reaches a certain scale of complexity it exerts such pressure upon the men who run it that they cannot help socializing it. They are subject to a kind of economic selection under which only those men survive who are capable of taking a somewhat disinterested view of their work. A mature industry, because it is too subtly organized to be run by naively passionate men, puts a premium upon men whose characters are sufficiently matured to make them respect reality and to discount their own prejudices [p. 257].

In like manner he traces the history and evolution of government and of the enlarging and confusing demands of political loyalties from loyalty to individual leaders, to loyalty to political institutions, to loyalty to political ideals and patterns of conduct. We no longer live in times when government rules men. All

government can do is to provide legal sanctions for groups to rule their own affairs.

Effective laws may be said to register an understanding among those concerned by which the law-abiding know what to expect and what is expected of them; they are insured with all the force that the state commands against the disruption of this understanding by the recalcitrant minority. In the modern state a law which does not register the inward assent of most of those who are affected will have very little force as against the breakers of that law [p. 279].

The only groups likely to secure laws for their protection and advance are the groups which can first so organize themselves as to know what they want and then exert sufficient pressure on the law-makers to get it. And once they have the laws they will be effective only so long as they (the groups) are able to enforce them. All this means that the rôle of the statesman of the future is to guide groups into wanting such laws as will be for the ultimate good of all, and once they get them remember that their enforcement rests forever, not with the police, but with educated public opinion.

His chapter on sex relations is probably the most significant of all. He summarizes the changes which have come in woman's status, especially in the breakdown of the external control of her chastity. He deals frankly, searchingly, and above all dispassionately with birth control and its camp-followers, free love, trial marriage, and companionate marriage. His argument might be roughly epitomized thus: Now that the conditions of urban living make modern women comparatively free from external supervision of their sex life, and wide knowledge of methods of contraception has removed the fear of pregnancy, they need to think through the question of what their attitude shall be toward the sex relationship. Shall it be that the sexual act is as inconsequential as a handshake? Or shall it be the other

extreme that it is a sacrament, a physical symbol of an inner and spiritual union? By a process of close and inductive reasoning he comes to a position much nearer to the latter extreme. He sees no good in promiscuous sex relationships or in divorcing the sex life from home-making.

Lovers who have nothing to do but love each other are not really to be envied; love and nothing else very soon is nothing else. The emotion of love, in spite of the romanticists, is not self-sustaining; it endures only when the lovers love many things together, and not merely each other. It is this understanding that love cannot be successfully isolated from the business of living which is the enduring wisdom of the institution of marriage.

He has little patience with the sentimentalist views of marriage and believes that "given an initial attraction, a common social background, common responsibilities, and the conviction that the relationship is permanent, compatibility in marriage can be achieved." And the principle by which it can be achieved is, of course, the principle of disinterestedness in the sense of schooling one's own desires, and in adopting what a Christian would call a golden-rule attitude.

Finally, he brings his book to an end by a chapter on the place and function of a scientific moralist in the modern world. This is a sort of 1929 model of the "call-of-the-ministry" chapters which used to conclude more orthodox books on religion and morals. Once again he insists that we must choose between religion as a system of cosmic government and religion as "insight into a cleansed and matured personality: between God conceived as the master of fate, creator, providence, and king, and God conceived as the highest good to which they (men) might aim." He wants no authority except the authority of tested human experience, but he wants that authority sincerely and he wants mankind in general, and moralists in particular, to set about the task of building up such a body of experience

without reference to churches, creeds, or theocratic religions of any sort.

The strength of Mr. Lippmann's book lies in his analysis of the present crisis in our individual and social morality, in his masterly presentation of the foundation factors of better morals in the future, and in his freedom from cant—the cant of the pious and of the impious. The weakness of the book lies, it seems to me, in his insistence that the new moral standards be divorced from historic religion, in his treatment of liberal Christianity and humanism, and in his "treason" to God. This review has already dealt with the elements of strength; let it conclude with an estimate of the weakness.

Why divorce the new moral standards from historic religion? Is Mr. Lippmann so sure that his reasoning and his own attitudes are not rooted in that religion? Can he be unaware that the currents of historic Christianity are sweeping on toward the very goals he visions, and have been doing so with increasing force since Rauschenbusch? What service does he do his cause when he prefers to float it away from these currents and to propel it by the winds of its own logic? He may attract a few, but he will frighten away the many. And new moral standards require the many to make them effective.

He may answer that he does not see the currents of historic Christianity sweeping that way. His treatment of Dr. Fosdick and the liberals in Christianity indicates as complete a misunderstanding of the heart of modern Christianity as it is conceivable for an intelligent man to have. For he sees them as weasels sucking the real meaning out of the traditional Christian doctrines and substituting new meanings in harmony with modern thought. What they are actually doing, however, is getting at the real meaning of Jesus and the prophets and the gospel writers by removing from them the theological bar-

nacles that have crusted them over during the last twenty centuries. If he does not believe this, let him read with an unbiased mind the writings not only of Dr. Fosdick but of such others as Bishop Francis McConnell, Harry Ward, Dean Sperry, Rufus Jones, and Arthur Holt. Better yet, let him read again the Sermon on the Mount and ask himself if he is sure he wants to cut loose from a religion which in spite of all its mistakes and accretions of human weakness has yet kept this sermon a living power in the world.

The nub of the matter is evident in his discussion of humanism and God. He seems here to be guilty of a curious non sequitur. For he says in substance, since we cannot believe in the authority of an infallible church or of an infallible Bible as the Fundamentalists view it, and since we cannot accept the idea of an anthropomorphic creator, therefore there is no God. It does not follow. Not once in all the first two sections of the book does he consider such an immanent Creator God as the Quakers and liberal Christians generally worship. That idea of God might be described as that creative power inside and outside a man which helps him transform his own life and the life about him from chaos to order, from stagnation to growth, from selfishness to good will, from ugliness to beauty. Not once does Mr. Lippmann show any appreciation of the fact that the Bible is, among other things, the record of man's gradually enlarging conceptions of God until they reach a climax in Jesus' simple statements, "God is spirit," "God is love." Not once does he give any recognition to the fact that the kingdom of heaven, according to Jesus, is not an objective kingdom of things, but an inner life: "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you."

It is entirely understandable why a sincere moralist should wish to be candid about his lack of belief in a bearded old

gentleman sitting on a throne above the clouds. It is not so clear why that moralist should ignore the God who is spirit and love. To ignore him is not "treason." It is ingratitude. Would Mr. Lippmann say that his career as a brilliant journalist is one entirely self-made? Or have there been in it the unmistakable evidences of a beneficent Power who whispered through conscience in times of temptation, who strengthened in times of weariness, who lifted up the heart in times of inspiration, who gave him now and then at least a sense of unity with the cosmos? Only Mr. Lippmann can say. If he thinks he has

done it all himself—well, let him. But if he thinks that Power is in his life and in the lives of his fellow-men, and that its sway may extend beyond the measure of men's minds, why not have the courage to say so in a skeptical age? After all, the only standards of morality worth following are those in the hands of men who themselves set the example. A fine example of moral courage for this world just now would be for some outstanding humanists to bow their stiff necks and bend their stubborn knees and say very humbly, "Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name."

## *What the Seminary Did for Me*

By RALPH R. SHRADER

[*This letter is in reply to one that Dr. Davis wrote to Mr. Shrader asking what the Seminary had given him for his work in China.—EDITOR.*]

FOOCHOW, CHINA, January 16, 1929

DEAR DR. DAVIS:

I'm sorry that I'm so late in answering your fine letter of last fall. I was away from home several weeks before and after Christmas and since that time have been trying to catch up with back work. We are planning to open Foochow College next term and as it is under Chinese leadership and as we must work everything out on a new basis there is more than enough to do. Just this afternoon the new regulations for middle schools came from the commissioner of education's office and our whole curriculum was thrown out of balance. The government is emphasizing two things especially—mathematics and history. Mathematics to produce technical leaders for the new China, history to show how the western nations have exploited China. That is

putting it bluntly but it seems to be the underlying idea.

It is interesting to notice how things have changed during the short time we have been out here. For instance, two years ago when the mid-term commencement programs were held the foreigners were in charge, did most of the speaking, presented the diplomas or degrees, all the teachers sat on the platform. We have just completed the commencement round and in our girls' school there was not a single foreigner on the platform, at the Normal school one foreigner, at the University one foreigner but he would not have been there if he had not been the first president of the institution and if he had not just announced a gift of one-fourth million dollars for the University from the Hall estate.

Another indication of how rapidly we are changing out here. A little over a year