

The Humanist Pulpit

Series XIV

No. 5

CAN THE GOD- IDEA BE SAVED



JOHN H. DIETRICH

Price Ten Cents

The First Unitarian Society
1526 Harmon Place
Minneapolis, Minn.

This pamphlet contains an address delivered before the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, at its regular Sunday morning meeting, Dec. 14th, 1930, by the minister, John H. Dietrich, and is published for the purpose of reaching those people who are in sympathy with our work but are unable to attend our meetings.

The minister of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis is granted absolute freedom of thought and speech. The Sunday morning addresses are the expression of his individual convictions and he alone is responsible for them.

Twelve addresses are published during the church year from September to June, and subscriptions for the annual series are received at one dollar postpaid. If in addition the Sunday morning programs are desired, the subscription price for the two (addresses and programs) is two dollars. Address the Secretary, First Unitarian Society, 1526 Harmon Place, Minneapolis, Minn.

Extra copies of this pamphlet and all others that are still in print may be procured from the above address for ten cents each, postpaid.

Mr. Dietrich's addresses are broadcast over WDGY.

Can the God-Idea Be Saved?

A RECENT book reports a conversation with a young man and his wife, when the subject turned to religion, and the young woman said, "I have no God. They have taken him away, and I don't know where to find him. My childish conception of a man-God on a throne in the sky is gone and gone entirely, and I think rightly gone. I hear people speaking of the immanent God filling all nature, but this makes me feel that God is so spread out as to be of no great value to me." I refer to this conversation, not because it is unique, but because it is so very common. Every modern minister has heard that woeful wail from the lips of people who have apparently just come to life in a world of reality and feel that among the lost beauties of the past is a God with whom they had a personal relation. In fact, this is probably the great religious problem of our time—the one that is bothering people more than anything else. And it is bothering the ministers even more than the laymen. No criticism directed at Modernism has been more apt than the statement that "Modernism strains its throat in vain to utter the word 'God' with conviction and command." The chief business of the Modernist clergy today is to define God in such a way as to be able to continue the use of the term.

But this thought and talk about God is not confined to any one group of religionists. It is found on every hand. People have never discussed God more seriously and believed in him less seriously than today; that is, there is more talk about God and less faith in God now than at any time in human history. Of course, the first is dependent

upon the second—the preachers are talking so much about God just because the people are ignoring him. The orthodox ministers speak of the people turning away from God, and ascribe this fact to various reasons. The Modernists tell us that we have lost God because our conception of him has not kept pace with modern knowledge, and seek to reinterpret the idea. The atheist looks with delight upon the dwindling faith, because to him it means that people have outgrown an idea which was pure superstition. In any case, God as a definite idea in human thought and God as a definite influence in human life, seems to be fading rapidly from the human stage. Ideas of God which were yesterday as definite as the characters in a play, have today become as fanciful as the gnomes in a fairy tale. Our fathers had a picture of God as clear as some great mountain upon a cloudless horizon; but this picture has gradually become so enshrouded in fog that most people are inclined to regard the whole thing as an illusion. In other words, the modern man no longer accepts the idea of God with the ease and certainty that our fathers did; on the contrary, he finds it increasingly difficult to fit this idea into the knowledge of our time. What seemed to be not only natural, but inevitable a generation ago, seems now to require a distinct effort of the imagination and will. Nay, in many ways the idea is coming to be positively embarrassing; it seems to be not a help but a hindrance to our understanding of the world and of human life.

This lack of faith in God is given statistical proof by the many questionnaires which have been circulated in the past few years. The religious world was startled some years ago by the publication of a book entitled *Belief in God and Immortality* by Professor Leuba of Bryn Mawr College. His conclusions were based upon a questionnaire addressed to hundreds of people representing every walk of life and various degrees of education and culture; and he found that more than two-thirds of the people disclaimed any definite belief in God, while the greater number of the remainder described their idea of God in terms too vague to be useful. About this same percentage prevails in many more recent questionnaires—all giving the impression that

people have either lost the idea of God or veiled him in such vacuous definitions as to reduce him to a philosophical concept, illustrating the truth of Felix Adler's statement that "the idea of God, although still precious to many, seems to be held in an increasingly vague and indefinite way, and to be fading away in the region of impalpable analogies and nebulous sentiments."

This same idea was treated by Mark Van Doran in the August number of Scribner's magazine, under the title of "Substitutes for God." He tells us that man's religious history has been the record of finding substitutes for God, and the latest substitute is the substitute of words, of definitions; which has done more than anything else to rouse in plain men the suspicion that God does not exist. The philosophers having lost their faith resort to meaningless words, which has destroyed the faith of the common people. Mr. Van Doran continues, that disappointment must always lie around the corner in our quest for God. Yet we go on, he says, condemned it would seem to endless search after what is not there. "Nothing about man is more pathetic than this boundless capacity for illusion. . . . Surely no other animal tries so hard and so long to do what it cannot do."

I

Of course there is nothing new about this loss of faith in God. As one looks back over history one of its most striking features is the mortality among the gods, although their demise has usually been recorded in terms of exaltation by rival worshippers. That is, new gods have always come to take the place of the old, and many scholars like to point to this fact as the evolution of the god-idea, telling us that each new God represented a higher conception than the previous one. They say the gods have always come and gone one after another. They move across the pages of theology like kings across the pages of history. One rises to reign in glory for a little time, only to pass and thus give place to his successor. Dr. Crapsey in his book, entitled *The Ways of the Gods*, has told this story of the making and unmaking of the gods with unusual

clarity. "The spiritual history of the race," he says, "is nothing else than the history of the passing of the gods—one god going, another god coming—all gods are in the melting pot, and the god of the future is in the process of the casting."

And what is happening today is merely the passing of the latest of these gods, the Christian God. Like all of his innumerable predecessors, he has risen and had his splendid day, and now is moving on. The Egyptian gods are only convenient words for cross-word puzzles. The Roman gods are nothing more than dramatic figures in the vast mythology of the classic world. The Jewish God is but a symbol for certain ethical ideals. So now with the Christian God. Before the same influences of changing cultures, plus the new and overwhelming influence of natural science in our modern time, this latest deity is moving into the shadows, never to be seen again. Already the vast cathedrals reared to his glory in the Middle Ages are monuments of the past rather than living altars of the present. All the rites of ceremony and forms of obedience connected with his name are passing into neglect and disuse. The very language of faith in him is dropping from men's vocabularies. What we see today is what Thomas Hardy describes so vividly in that poem, *God's Funeral* which I read to you this morning, and which portrays the conviction that the best minds of the present age are deliberately engaged in the business of disposing of the dead God who has ruled during the centuries of Christian history.

But the death of this latest of the gods is much more significant than the passing of the previous gods. Practically all the changes in the god-idea in the past were merely from one form of personal agency with supernatural power to another, which seemed better to fit the circumstances of a differing culture. But the swing today is away from every form of personal agency and supernatural power, with the underlying question as to whether a conception of God which is neither personal nor supernatural can be considered a god at all. Generally speaking, it is not difficult to see the various steps by which man outgrew

the conception of the government of the world by personal forces. From what we know of primitive thought, we realize that in early communities the gods flourished with all the exuberance of a tropical vegetation, and that they dominated the whole situation. Everything from the fall of a raindrop to the movement of a planet was the work of gods. But little by little this vast territory has been reclaimed. In less primitive times their numbers diminish, and their sphere of influence becomes more and more sharply defined. As time goes on, the gods are still credited with the ability to do certain things, but there are other things which do somehow get done without them. Advancing civilization sees the process continued, until the gods become so diminished in power and weakened in numbers that their very impotency breeds for them the kind of pity which one feels for an autocratic kaiser reduced to the level of a voteless citizen.

It is not necessary to enter into an elaborate discussion of the steps by which this process took place, besides I have done this for you in the past; but I would mention the main line of development. Primitive man read his surroundings in the light of his own consciousness. Everywhere he saw the evidence of will and anger, desire and caprice. The world was the theater of personal agents not dissimilar to himself. As man felt his own powerlessness in the midst of tremendous, and often hostile agencies, which overtopped his own meagre powers, he was led to feel the desire to ally himself with these agencies and propitiate them in order that all might be well with him. Man was ever more convinced that his own life was bound up with the plans of the gods. To displease them was to incur the most serious danger. The winds and storms, floods and droughts, plagues and death, were under the control of the gods, and it behooved man to walk carefully lest he offend them. As time passed, demons and gods gave way to the sovereignty of one mighty deity who gathered to himself all the powers and activities of the many gods whom man had worshipped and placated. Then, as people grew more refined and developed a deeper ethical consciousness, this one God took on more refined

and ethical characteristics; but I am not so much concerned this morning either with the number of the gods or with their realm of activity, as with the idea of personal agency itself, for it is this that constitutes the major element in the discussions about God today.

II

The thing I wish you to note is that the change from many gods to one, or from a cruel and revengeful monarch to a just and loving father, did not involve any essential modification of the accepted notions of agency. Nature, and human life with it, was thought of as under the control of a supernatural personal agent who guided the course of events in accordance with his purposes. This was true of the latest Christian God as it was of the earliest savage god. And it is this fact of personal agency that has disappeared today as a result of our knowledge of the way in which things work. There is no exception to the rule that as soon as any group of phenomena is brought within the conception of law the notion of personal agency in connection with these phenomena disappears. And the sum of the process is seen in the work of the great law-givers of science—Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Laplace, Lyall, Darwin, Einstein, and others, who have presented us with a universe in which the conception of personal agency simply has no place.

In the region of the physical sciences this process may be regarded as complete. When the astronomers of today sweep the heavens with their giant telescopes and bring into view the trillions of miles of stellar space, they turn to many an anxious heart to say that in all the galaxies of the heavens there is no suggestion of personal agency. When the geologists trace the long evolution of the formation of this planet, and the biologists trace the long period of the development of life, and the historians follow the intricate growth of the human race—all the result of the evolutionary process, they all confess that at no point in the past, either in time or space, is there evidence that the supernatural broke through to change the natural order.

When the surgeons probe into the minutest organs of the human body, or X-ray it, or dissect it, they find nothing that suggests a soul; and when the psychologists trace the ways in which human beings mould their thoughts and their behavior into human character, they ignore entirely the thought that a divine voice speaks through conscience its message to the soul of man. In all these realms results are achieved, not through personal agency, but through law,—cause and effect, action and reaction, stimulus and response. In the light of all that natural science teaches, personal agency and supernaturalism has passed from the stage forever.

In morals and sociology, purely on account of the greater complexity of the subjects, mystical and semi-supernatural concepts still linger, but it is only a question of time for these branches of knowledge to follow the same course as the physical sciences, because the whole tendency is in that direction. In morals we are able to trace more or less completely the development of the moral sense from its first beginnings in the animal world to its highest developments in man, without the aid of any outside personal agency. All the ethical scholars today treat morality in a purely natural way, simply as the science of social relationships. And what we call good and bad are the results wrought out of human experience as to what is beneficial or inimical to human life. Besides, the closest study of nature outside of man fails to reveal any ethical qualities. Evidently nature is unmoral, and what we call moral values are simply the estimates which man has placed upon certain behavior. The bounties of nature which we were formerly taught came as benedictions of a divine being out of love for humanity, we now see thrust upon us without regard for our needs; while the evil aspects of nature are visited upon us without any consideration of our deserts, clearly indicating that nature is neither personal nor moral. In fact it has become quite clear that instead of being a help to morals the god-idea has been an obstacle. In the name of God, vices have been declared virtues and virtues branded as vices without any regard to their social value. And the scientific ethicists today declare that historical de-

velopment shows that an intelligent morality, one that is capable of adapting itself to the changing circumstances of human nature, has only become possible with the breaking down of belief in God.

Exactly the same situation faces us in connection with our individual and social activities. It is generally understood today among sociologists that the gods have nothing of any value to contribute to the development of our social life. Cause and effect has come to play almost as important a part in our social life as in the natural world. Events are no longer ascribed to supernatural causes, but rather to preceding events which contributed directly to the situation. In other words, the principle of cause and effect applies to the human order as well as the natural order, and every action in each person's life, as well as every fresh unfolding of the vast panorama of history, is the result of human antecedents and explainable by human causes. This marks the beginning of the end and registers the truth that man must be his own savior here as elsewhere. We know that in the struggle for existence, for place and for progress the point we reach depends upon ourselves and the environment in which we act. We know that if ever we are to have a more just and efficient social order, it must come by human effort and not through any effort of the gods. We know that whether we pray or don't pray, go to church or don't go to church, believe in the gods or don't believe in them, makes no real or substantial difference to natural happenings. We see good men suffer and bad men happy, and those who are not ignorant and have the courage to look facts in the face, decline to put their faith in a deity who is incapable of doing all things right or else too careless to exert his power.

III

It is in the face of such a situation that one wonders if the God-idea which has persisted through the centuries of human history can be saved, or indeed if it is desirable that it should be saved. To this question there are just three answers among modern thinkers: the first is the an-

swer of atheism, which says that it cannot and should not be saved; the second is the answer of theism, which says that it can and should be saved; and the third is the answer of Humanism which teaches that the God-idea has been greatly overstressed, and that it is *not important whether* it be saved or not. Let us look at these different points of view.

First, there is the answer of the atheist or materialist. To him the passing of the Christian god marks the passing of all gods whatsoever. This is the end, the final disclosure of the essentially mythical character, of the divine principle. In other words, man has come at last, after all the ignorance and superstition of the past, to emancipation from illusion. We know today, says the atheist, that life is simply an integration, more or less complicated, of matter and motion. Its appearance and process constitute a purely mechanical operation, in which the workings of a spiritual or immaterial principle appears at no single point. From beginning to end every detail of the process is contained within the realm of what can be seen and touched and measured and tested. The world in the last analysis is a machine, and any theory which can explain its phenomena must of necessity be a theory of mechanics.

The atheist accepts the scientific view of the universe, which finds no room for an over-ruling intelligence. As a noted scientist, Sir Oliver Lodge, says, "Orthodox science shows us a self-contained and self-sufficient universe, not in touch with anything above or beyond itself." The scientific view leaves no room for the operations of a God; it proclaims a universe in which all that occurs is the consequence of constant and indestructible forces, the operations of which can be foreseen and relied upon; and the atheist accepts this view, and denies the existence of any being capable of modifying the action of these forces.

Concerning the idea of God as it has persisted through the centuries, the atheist regards it as an inference to explain the inexplicable. In other words, he says, the term "God" has been used as a stop-gap for our ignorance.

We have ascribed to him those things which we could not explain by natural processes, with the result that the more knowledge men have attained the less gods there have been; and since the belief in one God, the more knowledge men have attained, the less power they have ascribed to this one God. As Spinoza says, "Man pursues in explanation of any phenomena, from cause to cause, till at last he takes refuge in the will of God—in other words, the sanctuary of ignorance." That is, the more knowledge the less gods or the less God, so that if we could know all there would be no need of belief in God. In other words, if our knowledge of natural law were complete, there would be no unknown, and therefore no necessity of belief in God.

To the atheist, therefore, the continued advance of scientific knowledge spells the death not only of all the gods, but of the idea of God itself. And he hails this prospect with *delight*, because he believes that the whole idea has been stultifying to human nature, and the sooner we get rid of it the better it will be for human life. To him the idea cannot be saved if our advance in knowledge continues and should not be saved. God is dead, and there is nothing left to do but to bury him, somewhat after the suggestion of Thomas Hardy.

Next we have the answer of theism, namely: that the idea of God can be saved and should be saved, because to the theist belief in God is the be-all and end-all of existence. But today we have two kinds of theists—the orthodox who believe in God pretty much as men have always believed in him, and the modernists who are trying to reinterpret the idea in order to bring it into conformity with the facts of science. The former believe in the real existence in the universe of a supernatural person as the fundamental factor of reality. This person has had various names, has been pictured in various ways, and has been clothed with a great variety of specific attributes; but at bottom he has always had the same qualities of infinity and eternity, and he has always exercised the same functions, which are substantially three in number—as outlined by the great theologian, who said, "Theism is the

doctrine that nature has a creator and preserver, the nations a governor, men a heavenly father and judge." This means in the first place that God is the creator of all things and therefore the eternal answer to the eternal question concerning the origin of the universe and all it contains; in the second place, that he is the ruler and sustainer of all the processes of the world, and therefore the eternal answer to the eternal question of order; in the third place, that he is the *comforter and friend of mankind* and therefore the eternal answer to the eternal question of sorrow and suffering. Such is theism as we have known it in the past, and as we still know it abundantly in the present. In brief, it is the assumption that the universe as we know it and see it is not self-sufficient, that it depends upon something other than itself, and that this something is at least analogous to a person who wills and plans. In other words, theism in its purity interprets the universe in terms of personal agency, and ascribes the drift away from belief in God today to various causes, such as our highly commercialized and materialized civilization, and principally to the teaching of what Dr. Riley loves to call "science falsely so-called."

But I have already shown you that the theory of personal agency can scarcely any longer be held in the face of our modern knowledge, and so we have a large group of people, still in the orthodox churches, who are trying to re-interpret the idea of God so as to free it from the embarrassment of contradictory facts. And they justify the many conceptions of God in the past and their present re-interpretation by the theory that God has always impressed himself upon man, but has been able to reveal only so much of himself as man at any one time was capable of receiving. God is here at the heart of the universe, but he can be seen only to the extent that we can see. The whole process of revelation is dependent not only upon the reality of God, but also upon the apprehension of man. One can dip from the ocean only as much water as his cup will hold. One can catch from the waves of the air only such broadcasting stations as his radio set is strong enough to "get," and the reception will be good or bad in relation to the

atmospheric conditions or tuning of the receiving set. Shelley has expressed this in a much more beautiful figure in one of his poems, when he says that

"Life, like a dome of many colored glass,
Stains the white radiance of eternity."

What he is trying to say is that the eternal light pours down upon us all in dazzling whiteness, but when it strikes man, as the sunshine strikes a colored window, it gets through not as it is, but as the quality of man reflects. That is why the idea of God in every age corresponds to the character of man. God himself is the same, it is only man's interpretation of him that is different. One writer says: "The gods pass, but God remains." Only as man grows can the knowledge of God grow; and so while God remains the same, our conceptions of him have been higher and nobler, as our vision has cleared, as our minds have opened, and our experience deepened. And if we would account for this *growth of man to higher and higher levels*, this modernist does so by affirming that man aspires, like a flower, upward to the sun that gives it life. Such is the position of these modern theists—that God lives within the universe, that he works in man, and moulds him to an ever-growing apprehension of his being. In short, according to the modified theist, the whole process is one of God impressing himself upon the universe and upon man.

I should note here, however, that many of these men who call themselves theists, and thus pretend to believe in God, have in their interpretation stepped beyond the bounds of theism and given us definitions which can scarcely be used in connection with the word "God." In other words, they are well aware of the inadequacy of theism and are developing variations of the theory which practically contain the elements of a new species of thought. For instance, one of them speaks of "a finite God," another interprets God as "a phase of the behavior of the universe," and still another as "that quality in environment that sustains human values." Professor Horton in his book on *Theism and the Modern Mood* gives three definitions of

God. First, he says, God is my own better self; second, God is all that is best in our human heritage; third, God is a vast cosmic drift toward harmony. Now surely there is such a thing as my better self, and our human heritage, although the cosmic drift toward harmony is questionable; but why not call these things by their right name, why call them God? Professor Horton simply represents a host of men who proceed on the assumption that we must at any cost retain the old beliefs even if we have to distort them beyond recognition. Belief in God must be retained, no matter what the word may signify, because it would be too horrible to admit ourselves atheists. These men are trying to save the idea of God but their meaningless definitions succeed only in arousing in plain men the suspicion that God no longer exists.

Finally, we have the attitude of Humanism, which is not very much interested in saving the God-idea. Theism and atheism largely represent the positive and negative forms of thought which centers around God, whereas Humanism would transfer the center of thought to man. The Humanist accepts the scientific view of the universe as well as the atheist, but refuses to indulge in dogmatic denials. He maintains an open and inquiring mind even in regard to the idea of God, but refuses to indulge in intellectual subterfuge in order to maintain an idea which he considers of minor importance. He is confident that the time has arrived for a new approach to the whole problem—an approach, not in terms of the universe impressing itself upon man, but in terms of man impressing himself upon the universe, or upon those parts of it with which as he comes into contact.

In regard to orthodox theism, the Humanist finds it impossible to discover the presence of any divine or supernatural person in the universe. His attitude is something like that of the materialistic astronomer who boastfully declared that he had searched the heavens with his telescope and was unable to find God. The Humanist of course is not so crude as to imagine that God, if he exists, could be seen through a telescope; but the story is a kind of parable

to illustrate the attitude of the Humanist toward the God-idea, who is unable to fit it into the structure of the universe as we now understand it. The nature of the universe and of man, as revealed by the sciences of physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, does not leave much room for such an assumption; and in all his study of natural and human phenomena he simple does not find any evidence of the existence of a personal God. Likewise in regard to the modified theism he reverses the situation, and believes, not that the universe is impressing itself upon man, but that man is impressing himself upon the universe, and explains the universe in terms of his own experience. He thinks of the God-idea not as something outside ourselves that makes us what we are; but rather the result of something inside ourselves which is projected out into the universe, in terms of our desires, aspirations, and ideals. This explains all the ideas of God which have come from the past, as well as the growing conception about which the Modernist speaks. An old Greek philosopher once pointed out that if horses thought of gods, these gods would be horses, and that if cattle pictured deities they would be cattle. And thus man has made God to be like himself. And as man's life has improved intellectually and morally the idea of God has naturally expanded. Thus, not God, but man makes the other in his own image. In other words, man does not grow as the result of God impressing himself upon man, but the idea of God grows as the result of man's development. The Humanist believes in personality, but in his own personality, not that of the universe; and insists that the theist, when he ascribes personality to the universe, is merely interpreting it in terms of his own experience.

It is in this belief in personality that the Humanist differs from the materialistic atheist also. I may be wrong, but as I understand materialism it denies the real essence of personality even in man. Now Humanism goes all the way with this kind of atheism insofar as the world of natural phenomena is concerned, until it comes to man, and here it recognizes what we call personality, which defies all analysis in terms of materialistic laws and processes. In fact, its distinction from both theism and atheism centers

around this idea of personality. Unlike atheism, it declares that there is personality in man; unlike theism, it declares that personality is in man alone—that in humanity it appears for the first time. His theory is that life began on this planet unnumbered ages ago. It slowly developed in myriad changing forms—blind, purposeless, unconscious, until eventually it developed consciousness in man. With this consciousness—an awareness of the evolving process, an interest in its meaning, and a desire to control it—came personality as we understand it. Just because the life-force is now self-conscious, and therefore self-controlled and self-directed, it is something more than mere mechanism. It has become through consciousness a personality. It became man, and from that moment the destiny of the world has been in his keeping. Hence the central importance of humanity. All we are and all we hope to be is wrapped up within man himself in relation to his environment.

Thus Humanism places the emphasis upon man, and makes him the be-all and end-all of existence. The whole evolutionary process is summed up in him, as its highest product. In him the process has become intelligent, purposive, ethical. If we have values, they are human values. If we have purpose, it is human purpose. If we have ends, they are human ends. And thus recognizing the supreme worth of man, Humanism teaches that it is his supreme duty to enrich human life to the utmost limits of man's capacity by creating and fostering those values which contribute to its enhancement. Man, therefore, is his own end. He exists to glorify, not God, but himself, and thus attain the ideal goal which already exists in his vision. So the Humanist is not very much interested in the God-idea, except that he considers it a detriment whenever and wherever it has diverted man's thought and effort from the real tasks which lie about him. The Humanist places his confidence in intelligent human effort, and not in God; and his great desire is to arouse men to a real sense of their opportunities and responsibilities as the controllers of human destiny, and to transfer their thought from seeking help from the gods, whence no help comes, to a firm and confident reliance upon themselves. His faith is not in the

power and willingness of God, but in intelligent thinking and co-operative effort among men themselves.

These are the three approaches to this problem of God as I understand them—the theistic, the atheistic, and the humanistic. There remains the question as to which of them we shall select as our own. This question I have no desire to answer for you. My purpose this morning as always is to present the problem as best I can, and leave the decision to you. I would have you understand the trend of theological thought as it is working itself out today, and then upon the basis of that understanding, adopt the philosophy which seems to be real to you in your own experience. As for me, I accept the Humanistic point of view as the one which best fits the situation and from which I gain the greatest satisfactions. But the beauty of our fellowship is that no matter how greatly we differ on problems of this kind we can all work together in harmony toward the full expression of human life and the building of a world which fosters rather than hinders human development. This freedom of fellowship is vastly more important than any particular philosophy. Who of us would not see life sweet and wholesome? Then let us above all preserve our freedom of thought. It is authority and dogma that make hypocrites and slaves, freedom makes for sincerity and creative effort. With unhindered thought mankind will advance rapidly along those avenues of aspiration and endeavor which lead to nobler ideals and worthier ends.

Humanist Addresses

One of the methods of spreading our ideas is through the publication of Mr. Dietrich's addresses. Twelve of these are published in pamphlet form during each year. These publications are known as The Humanist Pulpit and are sold at the Unitarian Center, as well as at the Shubert theater on Sunday mornings, for five cents a copy, ten cents by mail. They also are sent to subscribers for one dollar a year. These pamphlets go regularly into every state in the Union and to almost every foreign country. More than two hundred and fifty thousand (250,000) have been distributed in the last six years. At the end of each year the series is gathered into a volume, giving them permanent form in a well bound and good looking book. These are known as The Humanist Pulpit, Volume I, II, III, etc. They sell for one dollar each. These addresses are printed in order to reach those people outside the Twin Cities who are interested in Humanism but who are unable to attend the Sunday morning services. It is largely through them that Mr. Dietrich's name and message have become familiar to so many people throughout the world.

If you wish to follow these discussions by Mr. Dietrich on religion and the problems of living from the humanistic point of view, fill in the blank below and mail to us with one dollar.

PUBLICATION COMMITTEE,
1526 Harmon Place,
Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find one dollar (\$1.00) for which please send Mr. Dietrich's published addresses (12 numbers) for one year to the following address:

Name

Street and No.

City

State

It is the custom to publish Mr. Dietrich's addresses in a series of twelve numbers during the church year, from September to June. Many of these are out of print, but the titles listed below are still available and may be obtained by application in person or by mail to The Publication Committee, 1526 Harmon Place, Minneapolis, at the price of 10 cents per copy.

The Dominating Dead
The Advance of Humanism
How the Gods Were Made
Luther Burbank—His Life, His Work, His Religion
What is a Liberal?
Who Are These Unitarians?
Who Are These Fundamentalists?
A Free Pulpit
How to Think Clearly
Must We Believe in Immortality?
The Road to Tolerance
Was Jesus Miraculously Born?
Did Jesus Really Live?
What Is An Atheist?
Is There a Moral Law?
Religion Without Revelation
Did Jesus Rise From the Dead?
Shall Women Be Free?
My Religion
Robert G. Ingersoll—An Appreciation
Is Atheism a Menace?
Thomas Paine
What Happens to a College Student's Religion?
What's Wrong with the Younger Generation?
What Is Happiness?
The Myth of a Superior Race
The Superstition of Sin
What's Wrong With the Clergy?
What Does It Mean to be Spiritual?
The Vexing Problem of Censorship
Thankful—For What and to Whom?
New Bibles for Old
The Conspiracy of Silence About Sex
What if the World Went Humanist?
The Ethics of Birth Control
Religion in Russia
Religion Without God
Is the Universe Friendly or Unfriendly?
Shall We Pray?
The Control of Worry
Can the God-Idea Be Saved?