

and nearer has she been drawn upon the scientific basis of reasoning, while, at each step, have the boundaries between Science and Religion been more clearly defined. More and more of the edicts of Science has she been compelled to adopt as law. She is sensible of this and dreads Science. Science is sensible of it and despises Religion. Religion is still inclined to settle all questions by exclaiming, "Thus saith the Lord!" "Great is the mystery of godliness," is considered a sufficient argument to establish the credibility of any human conception of Divinity, or his attributes, however gross, distorted, or unworthy of man, much less a God. But the Church is slowly beginning to realize that she must quote something besides her creed to prove her creed. She must cite something besides the Bible to prove the statements of the Scriptures; for the probability of these is the very thing in question. She is beginning to perceive that all sceptics are not fools nor knaves, and that the mind without the element of scepticism in it is little superior to passive matter; for scepticism is the purifier of Religion, and the establisher of Science. The day is come, when reason must be used, even in the religion of Christ, if it shall still prevail. Let Religion prune off, as soon as may be, every sensuous human conception from her only really religious element, the conviction of the existence of The First Principle, and the great bone of contention will fall. No doubt the pruning process will be painful; it will terribly lacerate human pride, and human sensibilities.

Religionists are also very much prone to dodge the legitimate conclusion derived from facts, because they would be perilous to preconceived and cherished ideals, and would lead to scepticism, materialism, fatalism, or atheism. The only true philosophy for the investigation of truth is to enquire, What is, not What ought to be. Religion too seldom applies this rule, but, with craven weakness, begs the question, by first affirming what ought to be, according to certain preconceived dogmas, and then concluding that facts do, or must be forced to conform thereto.

Take one or two examples.

Should you predicate a law of Harmony in the Universe; namely, that there are a mutual dependence and a harmonious development in all Nature's processes, in all things and verities: For instance, in Psychology, that all intelligent, whether manifested, as so-called instinct, in the brute, in man, or in the Infinite, is but a degree, or mode of the Absolute Intelligence. Or that the Potentiality manifested in the phenomena of Electricity, muscular action, light, magnetism, is a mode of the Absolute Force. In short, when you proclaim the grand law of *Evolution*, and show that it implies a superior and more inconceivable Author than the time-honored and time-mouldy, Orthodox conception; when you show that each of the millions of successive degrees of development in mind and matter, according to the simple law of harmony, constitutes a greater mystery, a more wonderful miracle, than the Fiat of Genesis; Christianity will acknowledge it, but with a very great reservation, both mental and expressed. She will admit that it looks reasonable, it may be true, she hopes it is; but, if so, it ought not, must not demolish the fond ideal, which has so long been dearly cherished, of the original sin, primeval purity, and Adamic felicity. The iconoclast of this ideal is the Antichrist. But you persist

in insisting, that the question is, "Is it the truth?" not, "Ought it to be the truth?" You grant that, perhaps, Evolution, when clearly carried out to its legitimate results, may annihilate the doctrine of the fall of man, and consequently play sad havoc with Christ, Regeneration, and the Immaculate Conception. In reply religionists point triumphantly to personal experience, and assert that thousands of good men of undoubted veracity and sound judgment, testify, that they have experienced the joys and happiness, consequent on accepting Jesus as the atonement and Saviour. They have felt ecstatic transport of soul, ineffable, spiritual joys, and the spirit of the Redeemer resting sweetly upon their hearts, in direct answer to prayer. You acknowledge that the testimony is unimpeachable, so far as the phenomena manifested in such cases are concerned. It is folly to deny personal experience. You believe that individuals do feel such joys, and experience such emotions every day. But you suggest that the cause may be something else; that the emotions felt may have been produced in the mind according to psychological laws; perhaps the morbid or abnormal action of the mental faculties. They may have originated in an extremely powerful action of the will—in fine, from excessive Faith. Will and Faith have made the experience real, though both the cause and the emotions were within the mind—entirely subjective. But now behold your adversary is horrified, and finishes the argument in a summary manner, by hurling at you the convenient malediction—If ye doubt, ye shall be damned.

Again, should you declare that the abstract theory of the Universe and Evolution render the very idea of a Triune God, and direct Revelation inconceivable, and that such an idea does violence to the consciousness of an indefinable First Cause, Religion turns away in abhorrence from you, pities your ignorance and depravity, and hurls the dogmas of the Bible at your recreant head—the very thing you ask her to reason with you about. Is it not probable that the revelation of Scripture may be true, in so far as it has been the only language of the mysterious, intelligible to man, or rather the only interpretation which the imperfectly developed, finite mind could give to the revelation of the Infinite, and yet be a false interpretation, when compared with the more refined conception of a Being, utterly mysterious and unconditioned?

But Science, or rather Liberalism, is not guiltless. She is quite liable to ignore "the soul of good" in the deformity of Religion, and exercise little charity. A great deal of the "free thought" of the day is downright, narrow-minded bigotry and prejudice. For example, not long since we heard a talented gentleman and teacher of letters, in our own city confess, that when the woman of Canaan besought aid of Jesus, and he said, "It is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it to dogs," he did a deed of selfish inhumanity, and unworthy even of a generous-hearted man. Now any candid reader must acknowledge, that the whole history of Jesus, and this incident in particular, show that he meant to include all, Jew, Publican, and Canaanite, in the plan of redemption. And right here arises the greatest peril to the disciples of the New Philosophy. I now speak of the average man in society—especially the young. The most pitiable spectacle I know of, is that of a young man or woman—and there

are many such among us—proud of his independence and freedom from the slavery of Creed, and yet rushing to the ridiculous extreme of Atheism or Fatalism. I have known persons, who, because the Bible taught the necessity of virtue, or the doctrine of moral obligation, in other words, the mind's power to discriminate between right and wrong, would deny that there is any virtue, any conscience, any standard of right. This is blind folly, the legitimate fruit of ignorance.

Thus it is seen, as was concluded, in the outset, that it is the evil in each that causes the conflict in Religion and Science. How sad and absurd for an intelligent being to array the faculties of his mind against themselves—his consciousness of the super-human, against his actual knowledge of nature's laws! One is as evidently a constituent of our being as the other—Without either we would be something else, than the human. While on the one hand, it must be admitted that Religion has always and valiantly clung to an ultimate and grand truth, on the other hand the existence of an office for Faith must not be denied. Says Sir William Hamilton: "We are thus taught the salutary lesson, that the capacity of thought is not to be constituted into the measure of existence; and are warned from recognizing the domain of our knowledge as necessarily co-extensive with the horizon of our faith." He furthermore affirms that it is the greatest wisdom in Science to recognize an existence which lies beyond the reach of philosophy.

"It must be so—Plato thou reasonest well!
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after immortality?
Or whence this secret dread, and inward horror,
Of falling into naught? Why shrinks the soul
Back on herself, and startles at destruction?
'Tis the divinity that stirs within us;
'Tis Heaven itself, that points out a hereafter,
And intimates eternity to man."

Behold, then, amnesty and sweet peace will rest upon this mental strife, when Faith and Knowledge, Science and Nescience shall embrace, and acknowledge the sisterly bond which unites them.

G. E. H.

(For the Hesperian Student.)

Centennial Ode.

One hundred years ago to-day,
In Congress met, midst gathering fray,
The hoary heads of blood-bought strands,
To break the ties of tyrant bands,
Which bound America to foreign lands.

When peal on peal afar was heard,
And muffled drum and hast'ning tread,
Were echoing from yonder sky—
Each friend unto his friend drew nigh,
And said, with freedom let us die.

Then far and wide our troops were sent,
Though English balls their columns rent,
'Mid scenes of death and carnage red,
And pale-faced men, whose hearts had bled,
Yet freedom triumphed o'er the dead.

But now the scenes of war are o'er,
And we by kings are ruled no more,
Should not our hearts in joyful song,
Sing praise to God and all His throng,
To Whom our freedom does belong?

J. C. F. MCKESSON.

Proceedings of the Board of Regents.

The recent session of the Board of Regents was an eventful one. Much business of importance was transacted. We give below a summary of the more important proceedings.

The library and cabinet committee recommended the purchase of the "North American Review" for the library.

The Chancellor was authorized to publish the usual catalogue.

It was provided that each student, in the future, shall pay five dollars before entering the analytical class.

The Chancellor and Professor Angley were authorized to publish a catalogue of the Land and Fresh water Shells of Nebraska, as soon as possible.

The names of Prof. Geo. McMillan, Prof. H. C. Burgess, B. S. Taylor, Henry Blake, and Prof. Darley were presented, as candidates for the chair of Modern Languages. Prof. McMillan of Kentucky was elected.

Mr. J. S. Dales, of the class of '73, was chosen Secretary of the Board. The choice was a wise one; Mr. Dales is well qualified for the position.

Mr. H. Culbertson was elected foreman of the Farm. He is a graduate of an eastern institution, also, of our Agricultural College. For the last year he has been foreman of the garden. Prof. Thompson having resigned his position as Dean of the Agricultural College, Mr. Culbertson will perform the duties of that Chair for the ensuing term. We sincerely congratulate Harvey on his appointment. He is worthy of all confidence which the Regents may repose in him.

An appropriation of \$150 was made for the purpose of representing the University at the Centennial.

Regent Tuttle presented the following: *Resolved*, That the faculty submit to the next meeting of the board, some plan, whereby all students may be allowed the privileges of the library alike, if practicable with the safety of the same.

RESIGNATIONS OF CHANCELLOR BENTON AND PROF. THOMPSON.

To the Honorable, the Board of Regents of the University of Nebraska:

In accordance with a notice given at the last meeting of your honorable body, I hereby tender to you my resignation as Chancellor of the University of Nebraska, to take effect at the close of the current year, July, 1876.

This resignation is offered at the present meeting in pursuance of a purpose long since formed, and that the Board may have ample time before the opening of the next year to secure my successor in office.

At the close of this college year the University will have completed five years from its opening, and these probably the most trying years of its history. From the first there have been grave embarrassments, arising from the defective construction of the building, the impoverished condition of the country, and from the large outlays made necessary in the proper opening of the University.

In so short a time, and under such adverse circumstances, to have organized all classes of the University; to have graduated ten students—including the senior class of the present year—and to have reached an attendance of nearly one hundred and sixty students, with concord and efficiency in the Faculty, and entire harmony between the Faculty and so large a body of students is a work of no small magnitude.

Having completed the time, and the work proposed to myself on coming to the University, I desire to be relieved at the close of the present college year of my duties as Chancellor, that I may accept a position offered me in the University of Indianapolis, an institution now of ample resources, and one which I have had the honor of serving for fourteen consecutive years.

I desire also to take this occasion to ex-