

(A short time ago, while looking over the many newspaper sermons that we have in our files, we found a most interesting article entitled BLASTING AT THE ROCK OF AGES. It was printed in THE CINCINNATI WEEKLY ENQUIRER on Thursday, April 29, 1909. It is a most resounding confirmation of our Pastor's contention that the Religious Seminaries were hotbeds of infidelity. The writer of the article touched upon the injurious and alarming effects of the teachings in the Religious Seminaries; and today we have these effects multiplied many times. Some shallow thinkers in religious high circles have accused the Pastor of destroying faith in the Bible. But such accusers should turn around and see that the trouble was from their own Religious Seminaries. The Pastor was calling attention to the Scriptures. This of course revealed the confusion of the creeds which are not Scriptural to any great extent. We hope this article will be a special blessing to all who read this item.)

BLASTING AT THE ROCK OF AGES

Out of the Curricula of American Colleges a Dynamite Movement Is Upheaving Ancient Foundations and Promising a Way For Revolutionary Thought and Life—
In Hundreds of Classrooms It Is Being Taught Daily That the Decalogue Is No more Sacred Than a Syllabus; That the Home as an Institution Is Doomed; That There Are No Absolute Evils; That Immorality Is Simply an Act in Contravention of Society's Accepted Standards; That Democracy Is a Failure and the Declaration of Independence Only Spectacular Rhetoric; That the Change From One Religion To Another Is Like Getting a New Hat; That Conceptions of Right and Wrong Are as Unstable as Styles of Dress; That Wide Stairways Are Open Between Social Levels, But That To the Climber Children Are Encumbrances; That the Sole Effect of Prolificacy Is To Fill Tiny Graves, and That There Can Be and Are Holier Alliances Without the Marriage Bond Than Within It.

New York, April 28.—As the first of a series of three installments the May Cosmopolitan publishes an article of the most astounding character. The author of the series, Mr. Harold Bolce, after completing a study of American colleges extending over two years, now lays the result of his studies and observations before the public. Undoubtedly his revelations will create a wide stir in university and collegiate circles, and, in fact, in all educational centers. Mr. Bolce says in part:

“To discover the scope and daring of college teaching in the United States today I have undertaken an itinerary of classrooms from Cambridge to California. Some of the institutions I have entered as a special student. In others I have attended lectures as a visitor, or interviewed members of the faculty, or consulted the typewritten or printed records of what they teach. In these ways my course has included Harvard, Yale, Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, George Washington University, William and Mary College (where Thomas Jefferson and other founders of the Republic studied), the

University of Chicago, Columbia University, Syracuse University and the University of California. What I have come upon in the teachings of these universities, with what I have obtained additionally from Presidents, Deans and professors of Northern University, New York University, the University of Iowa, the University of Wisconsin, the University of Nebraska, Union College, Cornell, Brown University and Leland Stanford, Jr., University, constitute a profound surprise—a series, in fact, of increasing surprises, absorbing and sensational.

“There is scholarly repudiation of all solemn authority. The Decalogue is no more sacred than a syllabus. Everything is subjected to searching analysis. The past has lost its grip on the professor. The ancient prophet is less potent than the new political economy.

“They teach young men and women, plainly, that an immoral act is merely one contrary to the prevailing conceptions of society; and that the daring who defy the code do not offend any Deity, but simply arouse the venom of the majority—the majority that has not yet grasped the new idea. Out of Harvard comes the teaching that ‘there are no absolute evils,’ and that the ‘highest ethical life consists at all times in the breaking of rules which have grown too narrow for the actual case.’”

I wanted to know what this capable sociologist, who had obviously thought himself out from the old-time tradition, would say in reply to a direct question. So from my seat in the classroom I addressed him: “Do you not believe, professor,” I asked, “that Moses got the ten commandments in the way the Scriptures tell?” The professor smiled. “I do not,” said he. “It is unscientific and absurd to imagine that God ever turned stonemason and chiseled commandments on a rock.”

What gives piquant emphasis to Prof. Earp’s scholastic denial of the divine origin of the Decalogue is that even now, in addition to his busy and successful labors in Syracuse University among many classes of young men and women, he frequently speaks from the orthodox pulpit.

Prof. Earp’s course embraces many topics. His survey of contemporary affairs is unique. He is a man of liberal outlook. “Out in Milwaukee,” said he one day to his class, “the leading citizens are brewers because that city has the right kind of beer.”

In discussing plural marriages he arrayed himself against polygamy, but explained that under certain economic conditions it would be easily accepted by society. “When there is an unequal division of the sexes,” said he, “monogamy is not consistent. It is a scientific truth that in cold climates there are more men than women, and so, as among the Eskimos, polyandry exists.”

This earnest thinker takes sharp issue with Mr. Roosevelt regarding the alarm about race suicide. Frequently in his lectures he dwelt upon the fearful mortality among infants, and said that what society needs to preserve itself is not more births but fewer deaths. And he endorsed a doctrine set forth in the *American Journal of Sociology* that if the world could discourage or prevent the breeding of the unfit it would result in diminishing the temptation to drunkenness and betting. In treating of marriage he said, "*Prolong celibacy and you increase immorality, and yet many men by marriage involve themselves in debt and never get out except through the poorhouse or the grave!*"

The professor delivered some interesting lectures in regard to the home. "The servant problem," said he, "is every year growing more difficult to solve. The modern home is in myriads of instances inefficiently run. Unless, some great change come to solve the question of obtaining expert and earnest domestic labor, society must inevitably turn to the central kitchen and the institutional home. It would be far better for the people of one block to share a common cuisine, conflicted scientifically, than to struggle along as at present contracting debts and dyspepsia. An expert French cook today gets infinitely more wages than a teacher of romance French. It is impossible for an ordinary family to secure the services of such a chef, but it would be easy enough for the people of a block, where everyone is now spending money on an inefficient cook, to combine and get the services of a master of the culinary art."

Poverty in the rural family, he says, is not the degrading thing that the lack of money produces in the city home. So long as the homes of the poor were set down in fields and at the edge of forests the battle with fate was picturesque and even glorious. It developed strong and splendid traits of character. And while there was much poverty, it was intermittent; there was times when every one enjoyed plenty.

Necessity For The Home No Longer Exists

In pointing out what he believes to be the doom of the home as a civilized unit, Prof. Patten shows that the growth of great cities has transplanted the poor into the midst of a doleful poverty that is perpetual. There is a deadly round of monotony in the daily work. And the professor dwells upon the fact that the poor in cities are segregated, because of high rents and the limit of space, with the criminal and depraved classes. Formerly the poorer a family the farther it went into the frontier, but today, in the great cities, the poorer a family the more crowded the quarter in which it has to live. Millions of worthy working people have to live amid a disreputable environment because they cannot pay rent in better sections. Under such conditions the home as the unit and, source of society, Prof. Patten insists, is an unfortunate survival which cannot last.

In summing up what he believes to be a menace to society growing out of the modern city homes of the poor, Prof. Patten teaches that "the ideals of a personal morality may be

no loftier in the agricultural districts of England or in the hamlets of Scotland than they are in the slums of New York,” but “the vital point of difference is that living under the old regime does not interrupt physical continuity, while the newer transgressions bring sterility with them.” “The difficulties of those who do not give way to vicious associations are equally serious. The factory system, displacing home industries, takes the woman out of the house, where formerly she could be both a mother and a maker of commodities, and postpones marriage to a later and later period of the woman’s youth.”

Edward A. Ross, professor of sociology in the University of Wisconsin, approaches this subject from another angle. “Wide stairways,” he says, “are opened between the social levels, and men are expected to climb, if they can. But to the climber children are encumbrances.”

Children are Encumbrances

To gratify newly awakened wants, men learn, Prof. Ross points out, “to economize in offspring, as the little strangers trench on raiment, bric-a-brac, upholstery, travel and entertainment.” Another factor making the home unproductive of children is the “moral emancipation of women.” Every child “taxes the father’s purse, but the mother’s body.” The decay of religious beliefs he cites as another secret of childless hearths yet he does not lament the passing of these beliefs. He quotes Luther’s sermon saying, “God makes children and he will provide for them,” as a sentiment rightly repudiated by contemporary wives, and fortifies his position with a quotation from Matthew Arnold that “a man’s children are not ‘sent’ any more than the paintings on his wall or the horses in his stable are sent!” Moreover, the struggle of women to realize an individuality “has obliged her to rebel against the Bible status of woman,” with the result that many American women “have broken the scepter of Ishtar.”

“The sole effect of prolificacy is to fill the cemeteries with tiny graves—sacrifices of the innocents to the Moloch of immoderate maternity,” insists Prof. Ross, and he protests against the “dwarfing of women and the cheapening of men” and regards the restriction of the birth rate as a “movement at bottom salutary, and its evils minor, transient and curable.”

This is virile gossip, and particularly significant coming from the teacher who invented the term “race suicide,” which many have erroneously attributed to Mr. Roosevelt.

Strange Views of Marriage

It is taught by many college sociologists that marriage, under conceivable conditions, will pass away, like medieval institutions. Prof. William Graham Sumner, of Yale, teaches that “both pair, marriage and democracy are produced by the conditions of society, and

both are transitory;” and that “when life becomes harder it will become aristocratic, and concubinage may be expected to rise again.” Moreover, this professor joins with a number of his colleagues in maintaining that marriage as now contracted and protected is a form of monopoly, interwoven with capital, conducive to exclusive families and the culture ground of family pride and ambition.

Prof. Frank A. Fetter, of Cornell, does not hold a high opinion of modern marriage. “In barbaric times,” he teaches, “the stronger and swifter conquered and survived; and the early social institutions of polygamy, patriarchal concubinage, war and the capture of women favored the survival of ability. But today intellectual and economic power contributes not to offspring, but to sterilized scholarship, barren selfishness and social display.” And he calls attention to the epigrammatic fact, as pointed out originally by a visiting economist from France, that “all the big families live in little houses, and all the little families live in big houses.”

Prof. Shailer Mathews declares that society is abandoning many of its old standards. This is the way he sums up the tendency of the age: “Much of our current literature shows a certain deterioration of the Christian idea of the family. Our literature is becoming anti-family, it minimizes its sanctity. We go into family relations with the same sang-froid that we go on a picnic.”

Prof. William Graham Sumner, of Yale, makes the daring statement that anything tolerated by the world in general is right. He has devoted a large part of his university career to proving that there is no such thing as God-given and unchanging morality. “The crimes of Clapham,” Kipling says, “are chaste in Martaban,” and this Yale professor cites numberless things to emphasize that philosophy. He says, for instance, that “the line of decency in dress is always paradoxical:” “No matter where it may be drawn, decency is close to it on one side and indecency on the other. A Moslem woman on the street looks like a bundle of bed clothes. Where all women look so, one woman who left off her mantle would seem indecent, and the comparative display of the outline of the figure would seem shameless. Where men and women wear only a string around the waist, their dress is decent, but it is indecent to leave off the string. A Moslem woman with her veil, a Spanish woman with her mantilla or fan, a Quakeress with her neckerchief, can be as indecent as a barbarian with her petticoat of dried grass.”

These and other racial differences in dress are used by the professor to demonstrate that no human standards of propriety are fixed or universal. “It would be difficult,” he says, “to mention anything in oriental ‘mores’ which we regard with such horror as Orientals feel for low-necked dresses and round dances. Orientals use dress to conceal the contour of the form. The waist of a woman is made to disappear by a girdle. To an Oriental a corset which reveals the waist line and the plasticity of the figure is the extreme of indecency.” Among some native tribes the people who paint the body are ashamed to be

seen unpainted, and among tribes who practiced tattooing, any individual who might appear without the tattoo marks would be disgraced. Thus it is not modesty that makes men and women wear clothes; the basis of the custom is vanity. It is not a question of morality at all; purely a matter of custom.

The college teaching that all our standards of right and wrong are derived from experience leads to startling conclusions. We have not yet approved trial marriages, but trial morality, these professors say, is the only kind the world has known. Morals, like all methods of living, merely fit the times. Believing this, they claim that many of our institutions and standards (such as the conventional home) have outlived their service of civilization and are scheduled to disappear.

These professors, in justifying the new morality, the new ideas regarding marriage, the insistence upon a scientific or possibly a communal home, and the daring teachings in regard to the substitutions in store for democracy, agree with Prof. James Qualey Dealey, who, from Brown University, has taught that “race morality and individual morality are both exclusively human attributes, having their strict analogues in the animal world.” It is all a matter of evolution; heaven has nothing to do with humanity. “As the passage from animality to humanity,” it is taught, “was wholly the result of brain development and consequent dawn of intelligence, so both kinds of morality have been the products of the rational faculty.” Religion, as explained by Lester Frank Ward, merely invents supernatural penalties to dragoon men into following the adopted plan.

The new morality based only upon what is expedient has its parallel, so some teach, in the transformations wrought in every phase of material advance. The whole tangible world has broken ancient fetters and is utilizing methods up to date. And morality should be at least as modern as machinery! The reformer no longer shouts from the housetops; he gives his message to the Associated Press. And now, discarding copper wire as a track, we are sending dispatches across the void. So, too, aeronauts are sailing the empyrean in ships much heavier than the air, and the schoolmen produce with relish a thesis by Sir Isaac Newton “proving” that aerial flight is beyond the possibilities of the race.

Similarly it is taught that antique authority can no longer hold in the fields of economics, religion and philosophy. The old ideas, Dr. Samuel M. Crothers, preacher to Harvard University, teaches, have “held their own squatters,” but now the new science is evicting them. Some people will see in the scholastic repudiation of former gospels and dogmas a surrender of their dearest hopes, but why cling to the oar, the schoolmen ask, when the turbine will take you to your port in another world?