



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
149

Box
53

Folder
228

Why the believer is afraid of evolution, 1925.

"WHY THE BELIEVER IS AFRAID OF EVOLUTION."

RABBI ABBA H. SILVER.

THE TEMPLE, SUNDAY MORNING

OCTOBER 25, 1925, CLEVELAND, O.



JOSEPH T. KRAUS
Shorthand
Reporter
CLEVELAND

Why are believers afraid of evolution? That believers are afraid of evolution was, of course, evidenced this summer in the dramatic trial at Dayton, which trial was the direct outcome of the anti-evolution legislation enacted by the legislators of Kentucky, who undoubtedly are sincere, well-meaning believers. I make bold to say that there are in these United States tens of thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands of men and women who would vote, if given a chance, for the absolute suppression of the teachings of the doctrine of evolution in our public schools and in our colleges and universities; and all these people would be very sincere. If they were not sincere the situation would not be so serious.

The Kentucky legislators were sincere; Mr. Bryan was a sincere man. The most harmful people in the world are not the insincere people--the hypocrites, but the sincere people who happen to be wrong. A charlatan is an easier foe to vanquish than a fanatic. I venture to say that the people who erected the Inquisition and kindled the torch for the stake upon which the heretic was burnt,--I venture to say that the people who devastated Europe in a century of bloody religious warfare, were honest, guileless, sincere believers.

You see, sincerity is not a virtue in itself. It is not enough to be sincere. A man must find out whether the cause which he espouses is a true cause; else his loyalty

to it is distinctly malevolent and hurtful. Sincerity is no test of truth, just as it is no exoneration for mischief perpetrated in the pursuit of a wrongful cause or policy. These believers, therefore, we may assume are sincere.

Now why are they afraid of evolution? I believe that they are afraid of evolution because they do not understand, first, the true nature of belief, and, secondly, the true meaning of evolution; and when men do not understand they are most furious in the espousal of their cause. Conflict--all sorts of conflict--requires the dank gloom of misunderstanding and confused and muddled thinking for its very life and sustenance. These believers assume, without making the necessary effort to verify their assumption, that religion stands or falls by certain dogmas and creeds, which dogmas and creeds seem to be threatened by the implications of evolution. These believers assume that evolution presents a mechanistic conception of the universe from which God is outlawed. These believers assume that evolution makes for agnosticism and for atheism, and they therefore placed upon the shoulders of evolution a large measure of the evils and peccancies of our day.

A friend of mine the other day presented me with this clipping from a newspaper on the Pacific coast. This is written in the form of a letter by a disturbed parent to this newspaper. "My daughter Mirabel until a year ago was attending a private school where the Biblical explanation of Creation was taught. She was then a righteous and

Christian maiden who had the highest ideals. She never smoked or swore. Then I sent Mirabel to one of our so-called Christian colleges, where she was compelled to study biology and its attending theory of evolution. I should have known better than to send her to these iniquitous colleges. After Mirabel had been taught evolution she no longer had the ideals that were hers before. Her self-respect is shattered; she has bobbed her hair; she uses cosmetics; she smokes and she swears. So Mr. Editor, can you not help in the spreading crusade to stamp out evolution forever, and guide the Southwest in a return to a God-fearing righteousness?"

Crudely, this is what is in the mind of a goodly number of earnest, honest, sincere believers. Now it is true that evolution does destroy certain dogmas which were dear to the hearts of people in the past, and which still seem to appeal to myriads in the present. Evolution, for example,--and for that matter, science in general--seems to deny the plenary inspiration of the Bible, the literal and complete inspiration of the Bible, especially in its historic and so-called scientific chapters.

Geology, which was the first to accept the theory of evolution, discredits the whole cosmogony. Biology seems to deny the origin of species as described in the first chapters of Genesis, and the many historical narratives of the earlier books of the Bible have been established as altogether unhistorical by comparative study. So that one of the great dogmas of orthodox religion, Jewish or Christian,

seems to be endangered by this doctrine of evolution.

Again, evolution seems to rule out of court miracles--miracles which are so dear to the hearts of the believer. Evolution, and for that matter, science in general, posits in the universe certain fixed, immutable laws which operate today as they operated millions of years gone by, which will continue to operate in the endless future; evolution posits certain definite laws which run through the whole of the organic and the inorganic world, while the religious man heretofore assumed that every species was the result of a special act of creation, and every change in the mutation of the species was the result of an orderly intervention of some deity. And so God seems to be crowded out of the picture if one thinks in terms of evolution.

Now in a way the early evolutionists were themselves responsible for this fear which now obsesses the mind of the believer. They drew entirely too hasty and unwarranted conclusions when the theory of evolution was first propounded. You remember, of course, that the theory of evolution is as old as the Greeks--the theory that new species derive from older, pre-existent species. It was already known to the ancient Greeks, who seemed to know most everything about most everything that matters in life. At least, they were in a position to present the problems of most everything which perplexes the mind of man today. What they did not know, what they could not account for, was the natural agency which was responsible for the mutations and

changes from one species to another. It remained for the nineteenth century, it remained for Weismann, and for Darwin to present a theory or a hypothesis which would account for these changes which go on in the universe ceaselessly. The theory which Darwin presented was the theory of the hypothesis of natural selection; that is to say, there is in nature an endless, relentless, ceaseless struggle for survival, due to over-population, and due also to limited food supply; there is a ceaseless struggle among plants and among animals for self-preservation. Now inasmuch as no two animals, even if they are of the same parents, are born alike, inasmuch as there is a slight variation in any two animals upon the face of the earth, one may have a certain variation which will give it an advantage over the other in this bitter struggle for existence, and this advantage will enable it to rise above the weaker one who is not favored with this variation.

Now this favorable variation will be transmitted through inheritance to the next generation and the next, and in the process of transmission intensified, so that in the course of time these variations will produce a new and distinctive type of species. That, crudely stated, simply stated, is the hypothesis of natural selection which was popularized in Europe during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Now I say that the early propounders of evolution, without warrant or justification, drew from this

doctrine certain conclusions which have frightened the believer to this day. They said: "Behold, in the world there is no active Intelligence which controls the destiny; there is just a blind, stupid, murderous force." God has no place in this scheme of murder, of progress by slaughter, which natural selection seems to imply. And so men became cynics; men became materialists, and some even committed suicide when the hasty implications of this doctrine were brought home to them. And this theory of the survival of the fittest, the struggle for existence, immoral, impersonal, blind and cruel, obsessed the mind of Europe, not only in matters of biology, but in matters of morals, in matters of international relationships, in matters of business; it was a justification and an excuse for every act of brutality and exploitation and oppression that any man cared to exercise at the expense of his fellowman. And that frightened the true believer--and justly so; and it made the theory of evolution abhorrent in his eyes.

But the theory of natural selection has been much modified and supplemented since the days of Darwin. It is now believed by scientists that species change not only because they have to on account of external pressure, but because they want to on account of internal desire. It is now believed by many scientists that mutations and variations in species may be the experiments of these species in self-expression. There is in every species a restless tidal wave of energy, a surge, as it were, a will to be more, to be

different, and that will, if strong enough and persistent enough, will ultimately translate itself in new faculties, in new qualities, in new species. In other words, species can transfigure themselves by force of will, and these inner compulsions are the more significant in determining a species than the outer compulsion of environment, of climate, of the struggle for existence.

Now in this reinterpretation of evolution there is great room left for the play of free will, for purposefulness, for God. But it is the older interpretation of evolution which still frightens the true believer. The true believer also sees in evolution a menace to his other dogmas, such as the fall of man, from which is derived the great Christian dogma of atonement through the sacrifice of the stoning Christ. Evolution, far from positing the fall of man from the heights of perfection, posits the doctrine of the slow rise of man from the lowest level of the jungle life up, up upon the rungs of self-translation to the higher perfection and the higher life.

And so because of these dangers to his dogmas the believer is afraid of evolution; but evolution, my friends, while it does endanger certain dogmas, does not at all endanger faith, religion; and this is what the believer seemingly fails to realize. Science destroys not faith but superstition; not prophecy but idolatry; not hope but fear. The faith that speaks in the name of God, omniscient and one, the source and sanction of all morality; the faith that speaks

of man's exalted destiny, of his endless striving through the endless cycle of time; the faith that speaks in the name of brotherhood and peace and comity; the faith that speaks of the sanctity of human life and the reality of human ideals; the faith that posits hope in life,--that faith has nothing to fear from the discoveries of science, which aims to find the true technique, the wherewithal by which these essential ideals of the human heart may be established.

Men mistake the whole purpose and function of religion. The function of religion is not to throw the mantle of sanctity over antiquated pseudo-scientific notions about the creation of the world, or the origin of man, or the workings of natural law; the function of religion is not to be a camp follower of science. The function of religion is to welcome all truth which comes out of the sweating and the labor of the mind of man; to welcome all knowledge, and then to translate that knowledge into spiritual truth; to elevate facts--to elevate facts into ethical value; to translate knowledge into wisdom.

What matters it to religion how the world was created? What matters it to religion how life came to man? What matters it to religion what the origin of life was? What is the destiny of life--that is the chief concern of religion! What shall man do with this gift of life which is his--this precious life! Shall he wing it to the high summits and the strange tumults of creative ecstasy, or shall he remain chained to his past, kin of the beast and the brute?

That is the problem of religion. What matters it to him how the world was formed? How shall he reform his own world so that he shall have a fit habitation for his adventuring and inspiring soul--that is the chief concern of religion!

And science is no menace and holds no danger to a religion which limits itself to this, its legitimate and imperial sphere of usefulness. Science and religion have two distinctive hemispheres, two continents of work. Their origin is one, their destiny is one. Both science and religion spring from the tremendous and the desperate needs of human life; they both come into life in order to augment human life, to give it mastery over the world, to adjust him to the world in which he lives. Their source is one, their ultimate goal is one, but their roads are different distinctly. The road of science is one of observation, of analysis, of description; the road of religion is one of contemplation, one of interpretation. Science defines process; science describes facts. Religion gropes for causes and for purposes. Science asks how; religion asks why. Neither has priority over the other and neither can justly claim supremacy over the other. None is in position of absolute truth and absolute reality. Absolute reality is beyond the ken of man.

Science labors under just as many limitations and restrictions as faith does, because science, too, is a human product. It suffers from all the limitations of finite man, from his faulty senses, from his constricted

intellect. It, too, assumes, it, too, bases itself on axioms and assumptions and hypotheses; it does not know the real thought of reality. Science with all its knowledge and with all its discoveries cannot in any one instance account for the meaning of a thing. How was life created? How was the first atom fashioned? How did the first urge or dyne of energy come into being? Before these tremendous mysteries of the human race science is helpless as faith is.

Science with all its knowledge, with all its discoveries, cannot create one grain of sand, one ray of light, one thought. The scientist may know the values and the properties of pigments and paints; he may know everything about the relations of color, and yet with all his knowledge and with all his scientific discoveries he cannot paint as an Angelo or a Raphael, painters who knew nothing about the science of color. The scientist may know everything about the physics of sound, about vibrations and tones and over-tones, and yet he cannot create one symphonic poem of Beethoven, who perhaps knew nothing of physics of sound. A scientist may know all the signs of syntax and grammar and origin of words and tell you all about their historic developments, but he will not create a Lear or a Hamlet.

Real creation in life comes not from the knowledge about things but from the very heart of things themselves, from the very heart of the universe; just as life, human life, for example, is not created by man, but passes like a current from one germ to another germ through

the medium of man, so spirituality and so intellect and so esthetics and so the longings of the human race are uncreated by man, to pass as a current from germ to germ, from mind to mind, through the organism of man. Their source? Why, their source is the great unknown source, the great unknown Mind of the Infinite which we call God.

And so science, evolution, far from having outlawed religion, have revealed by their very limitations the great continents wherein faith may reign supreme and science rise to triumphant ascendancy.

I should like to leave this word with all my fellow believers: faith does not require the clay buttresses and the pillars of sand of superstition or scientific fictions to support it, and I would not for the world build my faith or the faith of my fellowmen upon the shifting sands of any scientific doctrine which may be discredited and disproved tomorrow.

Faith is autonomous; faith is of its own right and speaks in its own name. What if my Bible has been found to be imperfect in some regard? - what if the historical and the scientific narratives of my holy book --for unto me it still remains the holy book, the most stupendous and marvelous creation of the human mind and soul--what if these narratives have been found to be, by later scientific discovery, inaccurate? I will discover these inaccuracies. My faith demands it of me that I discover it. "The soul of God is truth!" --and truth only.

I do not go to my Bible as to a scientific text book, or as to an historical document; the writers of the Bible did not mean to have their books looked upon as scientific texts or as historical documents. They had a moral purpose, a supreme moral interest in writing those books. Even that marvelous chapter of the creation of the world which I read to you this morning was written not primarily to give an account of the actual processes of creation, but to emphasize the sanctity of the Sabbath, because the world was created in six days and God rested on the seventh day and hallowed it.

There is in all the history and the so-called science of the Bible an ethical and moral objective, and it is these ethical and moral objectives which remain as pertinent, as real, as true today as they were in the days when they were written. Why Shakespeare is full of anachronisms, even more so than the Bible. Does that in any way destroy the grandeur of Macbeth or King Lear? The painters of the Renaissance were fond of presenting Biblical characters in the garb of fifteenth century Italy or Holland. An anachronism. Does that in the least affect the value, the greatness, the artistry of their painting? These men were not archaeologists; they were artists.

The Biblical writers placed fundamental truths in the garb of their day; they placed their spiritual gems in the settings borrowed from their time. The settings can be thrown aside; they can be replaced; the gems remain

as radiant, as lusterful, as beautiful today as they were when first they broke upon the mind of thinking man millennia ago.

Some have said the theory of evolution robs man of his high estate; it makes him a kin of the beast. Is it more noble, friends, really, is it more noble to have fallen from the heights than to have risen from the depths? How depressing to life will it be if, in the midst of our sins and our crime and our misery, we are constantly to be reminded that once upon a time we were perfect, Godlike. But how inspiriting is to remember, in the midst of our failing, in the midst of our sins, in the midst of our blunders and stupidities, that we have risen from still lower depths of shame and infamy and brutality; that by dint of courage and adventure and enterprise we have risen, and that by that same token we can still rise higher above the limitations of the imperfection of our present life.

What comforts it a man who lies bruised and broken at the foot of the mountain, to realize that once upon a time he was on the top of the mountain; but how much of cheer and inspiration there is to a man who finds himself half way up the mountain and looks back and sees the pitfalls and the dangers and the hard road which he has already traversed, only to resume with increased energy and hope the climb that still remains.

When I think of the ape in the jungle who may have been kin of my forefathers, and when I think of Plato

and Spinoza and Einstein and Beethoven; when I survey the road which my race has already traversed with bleeding hands and torn feet--the hard, hard road from the jungle world of pains and dreads and brutalities to the stage in which a Beethoven and an Angelo and a Wilson can be borne, I draw inspiration and spiritual sustenance for the hard, bitter road that lies ahead of me. What they did I can do; what was done can yet be exceeded a thousandfold in the future.

Evolution is the most optimistic creed which has ever come to the mind of man; evolution places man not in a world of anarchy and chaos, ruled over by an unlawful tyrant who cannot make up his own mind; evolution places man in the midst of a universe organized by purpose, unified and directed by wise intelligence, in which laws immutable and infinite are operative; evolution posits man not in a ready-made finished mould from which he cannot escape except in death, but evolution places man on the crest of a moving tide of aspiring life, in the midst of a creative will which ceaselessly experiments and ceaselessly seeks new avenues, new roads, new adventures in the midst of a creative purpose in which man himself is a creative agent.

Evolution places the Golden Age of the human race not in some distant past, some Garden of Eden from which he has been expelled forever, but evolution places the Golden Age, the Garden of Peace, of Happiness, in the great, far-distant future; and evolution sets no limits to the road which man can traverse, and evolution sets no limits to the

glories which may yet come to man and to the heights which man may yet reach. Evolution is the scientific translation of true faith, which is that God, life--intelligent, purposeful, constantly creative, is in the world, and that man is made in the image of that God.

--o--



Conclusion of the prayer a chorus
of "Amen" rang out.

MARYLAND

FINAL collapse of Fundamentalism in Baltimore, as revealed by a handbill distributed upon the public streets of that godless city:

EVOLUTIONARY CARNIVAL

300 block S. Payson street

SOUTHWESTERN ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

DANCING

Direction of Wm. H. Ryan

CHRISTIAN words from the Hon. Richard H. Edmunds, editor of the *Manufacturers' Record*, organ of the Christian cotton-mill owners of the Fundamentalist States:

Old-time religion, the religion of the prayer-meeting, the religion which accepts Christ as the Son of God—this is the foundation, and the only sure foundation, on which to build business and civilization.

MASSACHUSETTS

FINAL explosion of the famous Puritan love of human liberty:

BITTER protest from a Bryanite reader of the intellectual Los Angeles *Times*:

My daughter, Myrabel, until a year ago, was attending a private school where the biblical explanation of creation was taught. She was then a righteous and Christian maiden who had the highest ideals. She never smoked or swore.

Then I sent Myrabel to one of our so-called "Christian colleges" where she was compelled to study biology and its attending theory of evolution. I should have known better than to send her to these iniquitous colleges. After Myrabel had been taught evolution she no longer had the ideals that were hers before. Her self-respect is shattered. She has bobbed her hair; she uses cosmetics; she smokes and swears. Yesterday she fell so completely into the hands of the devil as to take liquor. I felt compelled to refuse her further admission into our home.

So, Mr. Editor, can you not help in the spreading crusade to stamp out the evolution forever and guide the Southwest in a return to a God-fearing righteousness?

JONATHAN MORTON

COLORADO

INTELLECTUAL recreation of a 100% Nordic Blond of the fair town of Loveland, as

sermon 187

Why are believers afraid of Evolution?

1. That believers are afraid of Ev. was evidenced this summer in the dramatic trial at Dayton ~~which~~ which was the direct outcome of the anti-Ev. legislation enacted in that State somewhat earlier by a body of sincere well meaning believers. I am confident that there ^{are} hundreds of thousands of believers in the U.S. who would gladly vote if given a chance for the suppression of the teaching of Ev. in the public schools & colleges of America.

2. ~~Why?~~ And they would be sincere about it, too. If they were not sincere, the situation would not be so serious. The Ky. legislators were sincere. Bryan was sincere. The most harmful people in the world are not ~~the~~ hypocrites, but ~~the~~ sincere people who ~~are~~ happen to be wrong. The charlatan is a much easier foe to conquer than the fanatic. The men who established the registration and devastated Europe during a 100 yrs. of rel. warfare were, I am sure, sincere and honest ~~believers~~ ^{+ guideless}.

It is ^{not} every 6 to be sincere. One must make sure that
the cause he espouses is a true cause. Else
his loyalty to it is distinctly malevolent. Sincerity
is no test of truth, nor is it an ~~exemptation~~ ~~exonerates~~
for mischief perpetrated in pursuit of a wrong-
headed policy or cause.

3. Why are Bel. afraid of Ev.? Because they understand
neither the nature of true belief nor the ~~true~~ true
meaning of Ev. And it is when men understand
things least that they fight most about them.
Conflict requires the dark gloom of misunderstanding
and confusion for its life and sustenance.
The bel. who is afraid of Ev. thinks, without ^{attempting to} ~~verify~~
his conclusions, that religion stands or falls by the
acceptance of certain dogmas, and that Ev. by
implication denies these dogmas and $\therefore$ destroys
✓ religion. ^{Or} he will charge Ev. with agnosticism and
atheism, and with a gross measure of all the
social peccancy of the day. (Just)

He believes also that E. posits a mechanistic theory of the
universe, & thereby denies the existence of God.



4. Now it is true that Ex. - and for that matter Science in general
while it has ~~not~~ ^{undoubtedly} ~~undermines~~ certain dogmas which the orthodox believe
holds to be at the heart of religion. "It denies, ^{E.g.} the plenary
inspiration of the Bible in matters historical and scientific.
^{which was first to adopt the doctrine of Ev.}
Geology & discredits the whole Masoretic Canonization. Biology
disputes the Bibl. account of the origin of species.
Since the histor. narratives of the Bible have been found
by comparative studies to be highly unhistorical.

(2) Again Ev. seems to rule out of court the miracles which are so dear to the hearts of the orthodox believers. Ev. sets out to explain natural phenomena, naturally and not supernaturally; to account for the origin and mutations of species by the operations of certain ^{mechanisms} ~~definite~~ laws ~~a certain fixed plan~~, which run through the whole of the animal kingdom. The believer whose theology instructs him to assume that every species represents an act of special creation, the sunset and every change the result of the sudden ^{and at vast, unknown periods} intervention of the deity ~~cannot~~ ^{cannot but} feel that Ev. has banished God from His

until it completely changes the type, the species. The process is impersonal + relentless. The unfit are killed off. Natural selection ^{is} ~~was~~ blind, brutal murder. ^{It was assumed that} life was governed not by a beneficent intelligence but by a ruthless, destructive force. And this is how the Early Ev. interpreters' doctrine, and for 1/2 a century it obsessed the minds, men ^{not only in realms of biology but also} in morals, in politics, in business in international relations. Men became turned cynics, materialists, atheists, and many committed suicide. — And the bel. naturally feared this doctrine & held it in abhorrence.

6. But the hypothesis, Nat. Sele. — and please remember that while Ev. is a fact, Nat. Sele. is only an hypothesis — has been supplemented by H. in recent years — Species change not always because they have to, but often because they want to. Variations in an organism may be an experiment in self-expression. There is in life

And it is this inner urge, ~~which~~ more powerful
than external pressure, which effects the ^{transformation} mutations
in species.

a restless internal urge, & will, to be more
& to be different. This will, if it to ~~be~~ ^{be} ~~present~~ ^{present} every 4 will express itself in new
faculties. The word becomes flesh. The idea
becomes a thing. This conception of creative
Evolution ^{partial urge in the universe, a thrust for perfection + cease-}
^{less} ^{evolution} ^{within the framework}
of the whole & science ^{part} as well as the theory of
M. Sche. - leaves room in life for the exercise
of free will, for intelligent purposefulness, for
God. ^{But it is the teacher, mechan. conception}
which the hel. has in mind, when he ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~upon~~
Evolution.

7. Other dogmas suffer eclipse in the light of Ev.
The dogma of the Fall, Man, upon which the
other dogma of Salvation by ^{the} atonement of the
sacrificed Christ is based, also is crowded
out by the corollary of Ev. that man far
from having fallen, ^{from an orig. state}
is perfect, is rising, ^{for the people mean} ~~there is no~~

stage of self-transcendence to reach higher levels of
perfection,

8. But ~~the~~ what the orth. bel. often fails to realize
is that Ev. ^{for} that matter sc., ~~does not~~ while they
endanger some dogmas, his faith. do not in
the least endanger Faith itself?

^{Ev. even as sc. itself}
1. Science ~~is~~ the ~~beliefs~~ not faith but superstition, not
prophecy but idolatry, not hope but fear. A
Faith that speaks etc. etc. It is not the
function of rel. What matters it
what the origin of Man ^{as being} etc. What matters
it how species were formed - reform -

9. The spheres of rel. & sc. are altogether diff.
They have a common source ^{it is true and} for common
aim. They spring from man's essential
needs to adapt himself to the world around
him - in order to survive, to make
life, to augment man's estate. But

even as their essential intents are different
their roads are different. The one follows
the road of observation, analysis & description.
The other the road of contemplation and
interpretation. The one studies & correlates
facts, describes operations, defines processes.
The other gropes for reason & purpose, for
origins & destinies. Science asks 'how?'
Rel. asks 'why?' and 'whither?'. Science aims
to give man knowledge, and control over the
world. Rel - hope, confidence & buoyancy. Both
are true. Neither need claim priority of value
or supremacy of truth. Both have their limitations
for both are human efforts. Sc. Truth
is no more real than rel. Truth. Even tho
it seems to be more concrete. Sc. sees no
more reality than rel. Absol. rel. is beyond
mental ken. Sc. works with same faulty
senses, with same constructed intellect, with
same postulates & axioms as rel - neither
~~needs the~~

10. Again, while K. describes processes, strained account
for the beginnings of things. K. cannot tell how life
originated, how the first atoms were created,
how consciousness came into being, how the first
69 every was set in motion. At the threshold of
the essential mystery, the race, it is always
the helpless -

11. Nor can it by knowledge create one grain
of sand, or one ray of light, or one thing at
all. A sk. may know all the secrets of paint
& color, their chem. comp. & interrelations, but he
will be unable to paint as Raphael or Vermeer
painted, who knew nothing of the secrets
of color. Shakespeare. Hamlet: Real
Creative achievement comes not from
the know. ^{about} things but out of the very heart
of the things ess. - out of the heart of the universe.
Just as ^{life} ~~the~~ life is uncreated by man, but
passes as a current from germ to germ.

than the medium of man, so the Spn. life, to
as the life the intellect. life passes as
a current whose source is from mind to
mind than the medium of man - a current
whose source is in unknown all life
Mind of the Infinite -

12. So, has it? far from outflaming Faith, established
than its own limitations the vast circumstances
where Faith & Faith alone is imperial -

13. Faith does not need the day butterflies & the
pillars of sand of custom &c. notions to
support it. One should not wish to build his
faith on the shifting sands of ^{cheap} doctrine
which may be discarded to-morrow.
If there is anything in that great document
of the human mind - the Bible - which has been
their necessary treasure. Unhindered - why let
it go. ^{אם לא תאמין} ^{אם לא תאמין} ^{אם לא תאמין} -

The Bible is not a H. Text-Book. It was not meant to
be history. Account, creation was another to
establish sanctity & Sabbath. Flood, the certainty of
Divine punishment — The auth., Bible was
to be found not in its physical aspect — not in the
accuracy of its ac. accounts & hist. narratives
but rather in the profound sacred wisdom it
contains, in its ethical sublimity. Its poetic
grandeur, its prophetic usage, its marvellous
underst., all the fretted words, human life,
the providence, inspiration & Consolation —

W. Shakespeare is full of anachronisms, does not
disturb the audience of Lear. The painter, the Pen.
was often painted Bibl. Character. in the garb
of B.C. & Italy. who not affect value, their
paintings. They were artists, not archaeologists.
The Biblical writers too dressed up Jesus.
Further in the garb of their day. They put
their sp. Jesus in Eastern settings. The settings
may be discarded or changed. The Jesus remains.

14. Men have said that the Theory of Ev. rich man
of his high estate. makes him a developed
beast - king of the ape of the jungle. But is
it wisdom to have fallen from a high estate
than to have risen from a low estate?
How depressing life would be if in the midst
of its riches & crimes & misery we were suddenly
to remember that we were once perfect, pure
& god-like. As there is no other divine remembrance
in existence. ^{But} How inspiring life becomes when
in the midst of our failures & miseries. We
recall that we ~~are~~ are as yet far ahead
of where we at first were - that we have
won! that we had the courage & power
to rise & that by that to-day we may
rise still higher! ^{Full from 10th} ~~the most~~ ^{height} ~~is the most~~
hopeful creed that has yet come to man.

(1) It places man in the midst of universal anarchy
by law & not by, by purpose & not in an
Anarchic realm which ruled by a whimsical
tyrant

(2) He places man in the midst of an Elysian world, ~~as the~~ in the stream of an ascending and adventurous life, ^{which is a free} ~~to which~~ his own will is potent and creative and ad in a few moments from which to escape only at death.

(3) ~~It develops all his superstitions & his delusions~~
He plans his golden age in the future, and sets no limits to the glory which may be his & to the heights which he may reach.

8. But what bel. fails to realize. Evidence beyond Earth.
- Sc. doubts -

9. Spheres of Rel. & Sc. are altogether diff - Road of one
1. Road of one, observation etc.
2. One studies & calculates, doubts, defers - for a reason.
3. How? Why?
4. One man know. Doubt - Hope -
5. No priority - subway. Sc. works with same
faulty senses -

10. Can not account for beginning - life, Mysteries

11. Can not make one grain - faint sound.
shakes peas. Come not from know.
about things - but - from to germ

12. Can not outlaw faith - Rather -

13. Faith does not need clay buttons - Bible
1 x 10

A. Bible - authority - Shakespeare. Renais
sance.

14. Then from Ev rob man high estate -
As it is not clear - How depressing -