

THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS VIEWS OF REV. GILBERT REID, D.D.

DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHINA

Donald H. Bishop

One of the most outstanding Christian leaders of China in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was Gilbert Reid. He was born at Laurel, New York in 1857. He graduated from Hamilton College in 1879 and Union Theological Seminary in New York City in 1882. He then went to China as a missionary under the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, serving at Chefoo until 1885 and at Tsinan through 1892.

Reid became increasingly restless with the usual type of missionary work because it was not directed toward the more influential segments of Chinese society. He was well acquainted with the traditional Confucian view that those with superior talents and influence should be an example and should use their capacities and position for the well-being of all not just their own advancement. Thus, if the literati and heads of state could be converted to Christianity, their example would be very helpful in the conversion of the masses.

When Reid returned to the United States on furlough in late 1893, he asked permission from the Mission Board to initiate a mission among the more influential classes. Their refusal provoked his ire, and he returned to China determined to work on his own. His efforts took the form of the International Institute of China, or The Hall of Respect for the Worthies, as his Chinese friends called it. Its headquarters was in Peking from 1894 to 1902 when it was moved to its permanent location, the French quarter of Shanghai (290 Avenue Joffre).

In a small pamphlet put out by the Institute Reid indicated its aims: "The objects may be summed up in two words: Harmony, Truth. . . . Harmony,

friendliness and peace between China and other countries and between the adherents of different religions. . . help to China in all her efforts at reform . . . inculcation of truth, righteousness, knowledge, and enlightenment . . . cooperation with China's own leaders, and utilization of greatest influence for greatest good."

The Institute received the sanction of the Imperial Board of Foreign Affairs in 1897. On its Executive Committee and Advisory Council were leading citizens of Shanghai, Chinese as well as non-Chinese. This was in itself unique and indicative of the nature and goals of the organization. The work was carried on through four committees, or sections, as they were called - the Educational, Commercial, Religious, and the Women's- the last being referred at one time by Dr. Reid as the "Ladies International Teacup Club, where the spirit of conciliation may be put into practice by respectable and cultured ladies. . .". A number of activities were carried on by each Committee, those of the Religious one being most important for our purposes here.

The goals and activities of the International Institute reflected the basic philosophical and religious outlook of its founder. I shall discuss Reid's philosophical views under four headings- man, metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics.

Reid believed man to be essentially good, a spiritual being, and finite. Man is good because he is God-created and has the capacity for knowing truth and loving universally. Reid made a strong statement to that effect- "The unity of truth and the universality of God's love reveal themselves in every human soul.", and pointed out that, "The great Confucian philosopher of the Sung dynasty Chu Fu Tsze expressed the truth in a few words: 'All nature and all men are endowed from Heaven with an inner Law.'" Absent in Reid's writings and speeches is an emphasis upon the utter depravity of man, which we might expect from his Calvinist background. Reid held instead to a much more optimistic

view of man and one wonders if this may have been a result, in part at least, of his being exposed to Chinese ways of thinking for so many years. Confucius held that man is what we might call "neutral" at birth and becomes good or bad depending on the friends he has, the environment he lives in, and the choices he makes. Mencius, as a proponent of idealistic Confucianism, was even more optimistic, claiming that "All men have a sense of commiseration."

Reid also believed that man is naturally religious, although his spiritual like his moral nature must be constantly cultivated. Reid wrote that, ". . . religious truth is more natural to man, more his rightful prerogative than scientific truth. The latter is acquired; the former is born." He declared that God "is present in man's moral and religious nature" and that man's "chief duty is to know and follow the Word of God and the Will of God". In good Presbyterian fashion Reid referred to the question in The Westminster Shorter Catechism, "What is the chief end of man?", and its answer, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." Man's goodness is evidenced in his being created by God; his spirituality is evidenced in God being man's chief end.

While man is created in the image of God, he is not God. God is infinite and man is finite. This means that individuals are imperfect, subject to error, limited in insight and understanding. Being such does not mean that they are inherently evil, Reid asserted. Man has an innate sense of shame, as Confucius said, but this does not mean that they are sinners. In this respect Reid leaned toward a Socratic and Platonic view of man. They claimed that a person commits wrong mainly out of ignorance not intention, and, when he has been enlightened, educated or informed of his wrong doing, he will naturally cease from it.

Reid believed that there is good in each man, even the worst, and that we should "appeal to the best in every man and not pander to his baser passions"

He strongly asserted the principle of equality. He rejected class and race notions and distinctions. His belief in the dignity and worth of every individual led Reid a number of times to side against his fellow westerners who treated the Chinese contemptuously and tried to take advantage of them.

Metaphysics deals with the question of the nature of reality. Reid's metaphysical position was, first of all, that reality is essentially good. He rejected an Augustinian view of the world as evil and death as a means of release from it. Nor did he subscribe to the prevailing nineteenth century Darwinian view of man as but another organism in nature and nature operating in terms of the law of the jungle with the result that competition, conflict and violence is inevitable in human as in animal societies.

Reid viewed nature and reality from another perspective. It is bounteous. The natural world is such that there is enough, actual or potential, for all. Starvation and hunger are unnecessary as far as nature herself is concerned. It was this basic view which led Reid to be concerned about the masses of people in China whose lot was one of misery and suffering. Such a condition was contrary to the nature of reality, Reid believed. The quarrels and antagonisms rendering Chinese society at the time were also an antithesis of nature, Reid believed. He felt that another characteristic of reality was its harmony and that man should reflect that natural harmony in his society. Perhaps Reid was influenced by Taoism in this respect for it teaches the harmony of the Cosmos, the harmony of man and nature, and the harmony of man and his fellow men.

Undoubtedly the most important of Reid's metaphysical views was his rejection of the dialectical dualism of the west. Western philosophies and religions in general have viewed reality as being divided into sets or twos, saved-damned, man-woman, up-down, good-bad, this-that, for-against,

mine-yours. Westerners have thought of the two members of the set, especially since Darwinianism, as being in a relationship of opposites, opposition, conflict, mutually exclusive. Thus the connecting word between each set is or, this or that, good or bad.

Reid did not accept such a dialectical dualism, and here again it is interesting to speculate as to how much he was influenced by Chinese thought. For he was attracted much more by the non-dialectical dualism of Confucianism and the pluralistic monism of Taoism. Confucianism recognizes the existence of pairs or opposites; but the connective is the term and, not or. Thus Yang and Yin--man and woman, ruler and subject, parents and children, this and that--one not excluding the other but supplementing the other to make up a whole. Or on the other hand, the pluralistic monism of Taoism which upholds the unity or oneness of all things, each item in reality being a particular manifestation of that oneness or Tao.

Epistemology deals with questions of knowledge and truth, what we can know and how we know it. In regard to this Reid was an idealist. There are universal, eternal, immutable truths which man can know. Reid was not a relativist and skeptic. He was a monist and pluralist in epistemology as in metaphysics. Truth is, and is one: but it can be manifested in more than one way. In his book, A Christian's Appreciation of Other Faiths, Reid wrote, "Truth is truth, whether uttered by Sophocles or Plato in Athens, by Hillel or Jesus in Palestine, by Seneca or Aruelius in Rome. Truth, too, whether in sacred books or other literature, whether in holy prophets or through ordinary channels, whether in science, philosophy, in history, or in mysticism, is all truth, and, what is more, it is one."

Reid rejected a compartmentalized view of truth. He believed that the oneness of truth has as its implication the unity of mankind. Truth can bring

mankind together in a common search. Truth unites, while error or falsehood divides. The unitive function of truth is indicated in Reid's statement that, "Mankind may never be able to unite in a system of Religion, whose teachings, rites, formularies, and tenets fall within the grasp of all men's belief, but it does seem possible for mankind to unite in devotion to truth." In a parallel statement Reid declared, "In so far as all Religions and all truth are traced back to God, and in so far as all men yield themselves to Him, is unity made possible in religion, in truth, and in the human race."

There are three other items in Reid's epistemology which are significant. One is the inability of man, because of his finiteness, to know truth completely. Absolute truth is known only by God. "Truth is infallible and ineffable only when found in God," Reid wrote. Man knows only in part. Each person sees things from his own point of view and tends to believe that his partial view is the whole truth. The result is narrow mindedness and bigotry. Reid put the matter very succinctly in the following statements: "To finite minds truth cannot appear in all its completeness or comprehensiveness, for truth in its totality is infinite. Each one sees a fragment of truth. This fragmentary character of one's perception of truth, whilst unavoidable, becomes error, when it is represented to one's own consciousness as the complete truth, rather than the fragmentary truth. The character of truth as opposed to error is to hold to the due proportion of each form and fragment of truth, conscious of his necessary limitations, is humble rather than proud, tolerant rather than bigoted, teachable rather than dogmatic."

In the second place Reid believed in the final triumph of Truth. One reason for it is that God is the source of truth; in fact, God is truth. God is also sovereign and therefore ultimately truth will prevail. Man's role is that of an agent of truth. He is to seek the truth and do the truth, calling on God for help in all such endeavors. For what man cannot do by

himself. he can do through God's aid and Grace. Thirdly, Reid believed that morality is a prerequisite for knowledge or truth. What Reid had in mind here is that the mind must be purified or redeemed, as well as the body, if it is to know truth. The mind must be cleansed of selfishness just as much as man must be purified of his sensual nature. One implication of this would be the view that a person must not seek knowledge or Truth to use for his own selfish ends or advancement. Truth must be used for the good of all.

We see in such views of Reid's certain ethical tenets which he adhered to. One is the close relationship of religion and morality. A person cannot validly claim to be religious if he is immoral. What is more, "The blessing of Heaven rests on every soul which faithfully strives to do good to others," Reid asserted. Reid rejected ethical relativism, which grounds morality in subjectivism thus declaring that the good is only what each person feels it to be. He believed that, as there are eternal truths, so there are universal ethical principles which all men are obligated to act in terms of. Love and justice are two of them.

A third moral principle is that like begets like. Reid quoted Mencius statement in this respect, "Reverence others and they will reverence you; love others and they will love you." In a speech at the Institute on relations between Westerners and Chinese Reid said of the latter, ". . . if we are conciliatory to them, they will be conciliatory to us." And in another speech at the Institute dealing with religious scriptures he stated, "If the Christian has respect for the classics of other Religions, he may hope that others will have respect for the great series of classics contained within our Bible." One sees in such statements the ancient Confucian principle of reciprocity, the treating of others as we want to be ourselves.

Reid also believed in what might be called an exemplary ethics or ethics by example. The best way to procreate the good is by being a paradigm of it oneself. Reid was familiar with the Confucian concept of the Chun-tzu or Sheng jen, the ideal perfect man in society who serves as a model for others to follow. He had read in the Classics Confucius' statement, "Excellence does not remain alone; it is sure to attract neighbors." Reid was distressed that many times missionaries did not exemplify in their own lives what they taught regarding universal love, compassion, conciliation and respect for all human beings. He wrote, "If we rest our work as religious teachers on the worth of our teachings and the blamelessness of our own lives, then those who before were hostile will become friends"

Reid believed that nations as well as individuals should practice the basic virtues. In an essay called "Conciliation In China" he wrote, "If it be true that our western civilization is superior to the ancient civilization of the Chinese, or even if we think that with us rests the superiority, then it is for us, first of all in our approach to the Chinese, under the various conditions of modern life, to show forth in our lives, and in all our relations with them, the spirit of conciliation, that thereby there may exist between us and them true peace. Perhaps more important than all else is the spirit of conciliation in our relation with the religious teachings and problems of China. Our spirit must be constructive rather than destructive If we win them by the attractiveness of our conciliatory disposition, we have won the day, and there will be peace in the land and very largely peace throughout the world." We see in such statements of Reid's the emphasis by Christ on taking the first step and going the second mile and Motzu's emphasis on universal good-will.

A discussion of Reid's ethical views should include his attitude toward violence and war. Reid was greatly distressed by the throes of dissension

and strife which China was caught up in at the turn of the century. He favored gradual, peaceful change rather than violent revolution. War inevitably is accompanied by widespread destruction, misery, and suffering. Reid identified with the masses of Chinese who bore the brunt of the suffering of war.

Reid opposed war on practical and religious grounds. He believed that violence seldom achieves the end it seeks. It is the wrong means; and ends and means are so inter-related that only through good means can good ends be realized. Reid called World War I an "appalling war". He stated that, "I simply hold the view of ordinary thinking that war per se, whatever the excuses offered by either side, is utter folly." He said that in war, "Each one seeks to do his worst under the excuse that the other man, the 'enemy' is to blame and no one else." Reid held that war was not only contrary to Christ's teachings but "to the teachings of all religions." He added that, ". . . my conception of Christianity is to adhere to processes of law, rather than to resort to bloodshed, to believe in the force of truth, rather than depend on force of arms" And in commenting on the situation in 1913 in a speech at the Institute Reid said, "So in Christianity there is presented the strange anomaly of a Christ preaching and practising compassion, peace, gentleness and obedience, while the nations of the world which exalt **militarism** are those called Christian."

* * *

Three facets of Reid's religious views may be turned to now--his concept of God, his definition of religion, and his outlook regarding the inter-relationship of the world's religions. It is interesting to note that,

despite his Presbyterian background, Reid took a non-Calvinist view of God. God is not vindictive, selective, jealous, angry but loving, kind, merciful, compassionate. Writing on missions Reid notes that some of Jesus' followers had ". . . tended both to limit their own love and to place a boundary on the love of God . . ." but the new type of Christian missionary is filled ". . . with a joyful sense of God's infinite love rather than with suspicion, hardly expressed but nonetheless felt, that God is arbitrary and partial."

Earlier in the book he had written, "It must be true that God cares equally for the souls of all His children, and that he finds access to them, helps them, teaches them, comforts them, saves them, by methods and means that are not seen and temporal, and by ways in which no man can tell whence He cometh and whither He goeth, and that He is only limited in the giving of Himself to them by their capacity to respond and receive. People of old used to think that the divine action was confined to here and there, now and then; but the conviction is growing and spreading that the only defensible conception of the moral action of God on humanity is that of a continuous and impartial influence, limited to no age or race." In a similar vein a few pages later he wrote that God's love ". . . is made known and spoken of in the teachings of the different Faiths. In Confucianism it is fraternity, in Buddhism compassion, in Taoism gentleness, in Islam charity, and in Judaism and Christianity it is brotherly-kindness." Reid, then, viewed God as a God of love, whose love goes out equally to all mankind.

Reid also associated God and truth, even at times, in Buddhist fashion equating the two. He declared God to be ". . . primal Truth, as well as primal Goodness." Elsewhere he wrote, "Religion comes from truth or an eternal Principle of Law, and this comes from Heaven or God," and, "The teaching of all the great Faiths agrees in tracing all truth back to God,

and in requiring that all submit to God." Reid was influenced quite strongly by the Logos theology found in the Gospel of John. Undoubtedly he was swayed to some extent also by such passages from Buddhist sutras as, "The truth is the end and aim of all existence . . . The world is built for truth . . . Truth cannot be fashioned. Truth is one and the same; it is immutable . . . Truth is the essence of life, for truth endureth beyond the death of the body." Reid believed that anyone who is seeking truth is searching for God. And anyone who practices truth is acting in a God-like manner or carrying out God's will.

Another aspect of God emphasized by Reid was his immanence. God is not a distant, cold, impersonal, utterly transcendent being as the Deist pictures him. Instead he is close, warm, concerned, ever near to those who call on him. He is immanent or present in all things. Reid declared that, "In finding order, harmony, bounty, beauty, truth, wisdom, justice, goodness, and love, God is found." Reid quoted Dr. Hunter's statement that, "We dare not pretend to limit the ways by which he makes known His personality and His presence, and moves, illuminates and guides His children. He draws nigh to them, not only in and through His creation and the course of history, not only through the teaching and example of His great prophets, holy servants, and beloved sons, but immediately mind with mind, spirit with spirit." Reid's emphasis on God's immanence is an example of how Americans were influenced by the Romanticist Movement found in the United States in the mid-nineteenth century. If we were to speculate on the extent to which Reid was influenced by Chinese thinking, one might wonder if Taoism might not have had some effect on him too. For Reid had many Taoist friends and was well versed in Taoist beliefs.

One of the aspects of God's being which Reid was especially attracted by was the concept of God as Father, for its major and most important

implication is the Brotherhood of Man. Reid believed in the Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God. That brotherhood must be universal. It must include all people, irregardless of race or creed. The International Institute which Reid directed was an example of such a belief, for its membership included Chinese who were Confucianist, Taoist, Buddhist and Islam. It included westerners of British, American, Dutch, French, German, Russian and Scandinavian origin. Its cosmopolitan nature, in fact, was a source of contention at times. Orthodox Christians criticized Reid for allowing non-Christians to be members. During World War I the western membership split along national lines, weakening the Institute greatly. Reid, nevertheless, held faithfully to his original view of the Institute as an inclusive fellowship. As a Christian he felt he could not do otherwise.

Reid believed that a genuine world brotherhood of man is possible only if it is grounded in God. Self-interest is surely not an adequate basis for enduring relationships. Nor is humanistic, enlightened self-interest. Peace and brotherhood will result, Reid claimed, only when men see themselves and each other as sons of God, are concerned about others as much as themselves, and strive to do God's will in their relations with one another.

Reid was fond of St. Paul's words, ". . . He hath made of one blood every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth . . ." He rejected the Calvinist doctrine of the "Elect" on pragmatic grounds; that is, it resulted in divisions which led to hostility and disunity, not brotherhood. Thus it was contrary to the nature and will of God. Its nineteenth and twentieth century counterpart was reflected, Reid believed, in the old method of prosecuting missions which was ". . . either to represent

Christianity as the only true religion, or, through comparison, to represent its superiority." Reid said that "Such an attitude antagonizes and creates jealousy." Instead he supported the new method which ". . . lays stress on truth, and whilst certain truths may be regarded as more vital or fundamental than others, there is not the same rigid line of demarcation, creating a mutual antagonism."

As to defining religion, Reid rejected a definition of religion as creed. Being religious is not a matter of mental assent to a set of statements or dogmas concocted by religious leaders in the past. ". . . Christ did not measure the devotion of His followers by any intellectual apprehension of his nature or of his mysterious relation to God," Reid wrote. He added that, "All the Christian Creeds are less than Jesus Christ, and should not in one's affection and veneration, be ever allowed to supplant Him." Such a statement reflects one of Reid's views of religion, namely, in the case of the Christian, the revering and following the example of Christ. Reid stated that, "The story of the life which Jesus lived, whether thought of as Son of Man or Son of God, and whether the life be the divine life of a man or the human life of God, or, free from all intellectual inquiries, be taken simply as the life of a person called Jesus, who lived in Judea and Galilee some 1000 years ago, is a story far more effective in shaping character than the mere intellectual effort to grasp and give assent to a creed." Reminiscent of Thomas à Kempis' book is Reid's statement, "To be able to give a definition of Christ, acceptable to the rigidly orthodox, is not so great an achievement in religion as to secure an imitation of Christ, the goal for all, about which no dispute need arise."

Reid was critical of a creedalistic definition because he believed creeds divided rather than united people. Of those such as the Nicene he

wrote, "The ecumenical creeds did not unite, but divided Christendom . . . The world wide conquest of the Gospel must be retarded by division, and can be hastened only by unity, a unity of common faith, hope, love, rather than a uniformity of creed, code, or polity" Reflecting the German theologian Schleiermacher, Reid defined religion also as sentiment or feeling, and experience. He cited Hamilton's statement that, "Religion as a sentiment and an emotion is the fundamental constant belonging to all forms of Religion." Reid himself declared, "Men's emotions, more than men's keenness of intellect, men's desires and aspirations, what we call sentiments, hard to define and incapable of being bound in anything iron-clad, these are really the essential constant of all forms of religious worship. They are not the exclusive and distinctive mark of any one Religion, but they belong to all Religions. There is here more than affinity of belief or opinion; there is kinship of feeling." Some of the most basic feelings associated with religion are love, compassion, kindness, reverence, duty, and appreciation. In addition Reid looked upon God as a being to be experienced. Religions and religious scriptures, then, are accounts of man's experiences of God.

Reid also associated religion with spirituality. An interesting statement of his to this effect is, ". . . there is both union and concord amongst all who, in any land or in any Faith, are cultivating the religious spirit. I have often felt in China more drawn to some quiet, spiritual-minded Taoist than to the cold dogmatism of some of the Christian brethren. The religious spirit means far more than religious doctrines."

In summary, Reid disavowed a doctrinal definition of religion. He viewed religion in personalistic fashion, and as a way of life. He associated religion with the inner rather than external. His was not an anti-

intellectualistic but an a-intellectualistic definition. Unity was his basic criterion. The religious is that which unites, not divides, mankind. Reid's views in this regard reflected the Modernist Movement of the late 19th century. We see influences, too, of the Chinese religious tradition, in this case Taoism and perhaps Buddhism.

Reid's religious views in regard to his concept of God and definition of religion have been described. It remains now to indicate his answer to the question of the interaction of religions and how the first two are related to it. This was a pressing problem to Reid because the country he came to as a missionary had three major religions more ancient than Christianity and numbering as many if not more adherents than Christianity's through the centuries. Reid's attitude was colored by such facts as well as his basic philosophical and religious premises.

Reid rejected the absolute type claim of Christian orthodoxy that Christianity is the one and only true religion. Such "exclusiveness should disappear", Reid said, if truth is to prevail and Christianity accomplish its task. Reid did not agree, however, with the synthetic approach advocated by some. This was to take the best elements of each religion and mould them into a single world religion acceptable to all people.

Instead Reid advocated what might be called a pluralistic position. He envisaged a situation in which the religions of the world would coexist peacefully and work together on common problems and goals. Each would respect and learn from the other. Harmony would prevail. There would not be just passive tolerance but active appreciation. Reid wrote that, "Better than toleration are sympathy and appreciation, the one the act of the heart and the other the intellect . . . It is clear that such a purpose to appreciate others and think well of their beliefs and practises is more akin to spirituality

of life and to a Gospel of love than is the opposite purpose." Regarding himself he said, "I'm willing to learn from other faiths and I sincerely hope that they in turn may receive the inspiration and vitality, the comfort and peace, which Christian truths import." Reid was attracted by the ideal embodied in Confucius' statement, "The Princely Man wants men to be in harmony, but not to be alike; the Small Man wants men to be alike, but not to be in harmony."

The philosophical position in which Reid's pluralism was grounded is what is traditionally called by philosophers idealism and realism. Realism holds that universals do really exist just as much as particulars or particular things do. Plato would say, for example, that the universal is manifested in the particular or the particular is simply a manifestation of the universal. Furthermore a universal may be manifested in more than one particular.

The implication of this view for religion is as follows. There is only one Truth or one Universal Religion of which each particular religion is but a singular manifestation. Thus we find Reid making the following statements: "The supremacy of truth comes ahead of any Religion . . ."; ". . . God dwells in every Religion, every Sacred Scripture, and every Holy Teacher . . ."; ". . . no one Religion is as great as Truth . . ."; ". . . it means more to follow the truth than to follow a Religion . . ."; "Different Religions, and especially different schools of thought within the same Religion, lay emphasis on different phases of one universal truth. Reid spoke of the various religions as "forms of infinite truth." We ought to recognize the "insufficiency of any particular Religion and the sufficiency of the underlying principles of all Religions." Reid agreed that to claim that the spirit of religion or the inner soul of religion

is universal is "something very different from claiming for any outward form of Religion ultimate universality." Reid distinguished between secular and religious truth. He held to the ultimate triumph of the latter, but he disagreed with those who argued that any particular religion is a full and exclusive manifestation of religious truth.

Reid used other arguments to support his pluralism. In regard to Christ he said that, ". . . even Christ never taught that all others had no truth. He never limited truth to Himself alone." Moreover, "Christ never spoke a word in condemnation of the religions of Greece and Rome or even the sects of Judaism." Reid's view regarding incarnation was that, "God, indeed, as the infinite one inhabiting eternity, is ever manifesting himself, and in a special way manifested Himself in the flesh, in the name Christ Jesus, but no one manifestation is the whole of the Infinite and cannot be."

Reid was influenced also by the syncretistic nature of Eastern religions. He wrote that "China presented the greatest example of the synthetic spirit in religion. The Chinese, unless they be priests, belong to no one religion, but accept truths and teachings, rites and tenets from all three . . . The three great Religions of China are not in any sense mutually exclusive . . . Thus the story is told of the scholar of the sixth century, Fu Hsi, that he was wont to wear a Taoist cap, a Buddhist scarf, and Confucian shoes . . . The Japanese have a same happy combination of Shintoism, Buddhism, and Confucianism."

One of the most important items of Reid's philosophy was his rejection of a dialectal dualism in metaphysics and epistemology. The implication of this for religion is profound. It means, as Reid realized and accepted, the invalidity of such dichotomies as true-false, natural-revealed, saved-

damned, universal-ethnic, bible-nbn-bible, and victory-defeat. To set a religion or religions in the context of one or the other is an unverifiable methodology. Reflecting his own view, Reid wrote, "Neither does the modern scholar speak of true and false religion . . . Neither are we so accustomed as men in the past to speak of a natural and revealed Religion, for every Religion . . . reveals to a greater or smaller degree the mind of God . . . The old schemes which hinged on a fixed distinction between the Religion of the Bible and all Religions outside the pale of Biblical revelation, succeeded by dint of excluding a large part of the phenomena." Reid was especially emphatic about the invalidity and foolishness of the victory-defeat dualism. He wrote that ". . . the new concept of missions places the emphasis on appreciation of the religious beliefs of others, rather than on the destruction or even criticism of these beliefs. The prevalent view held hitherto has been, that other Religions were false and ought to be overthrown." From such a viewpoint there is truth in every religion and one cannot validly claim religion A is true and religion B is false. Likewise one cannot validly assert that the adherents of one religion are doomed and those of another saved.

It is interesting to speculate as to how Reid arrived at such an epistemological and metaphysical monism. Western thought, religious and secular, is definitely dualistic. Aristotle's law of the excluded middle is a concise example of this; and Aquinas, in developing classical Medieval Christian thought, drew directly on Aristotle. A very likely thesis is that Reid was influenced to an extent by some 19th century trends in western thought but even more by Confucian non-dialectical dualistic philosophy which sees reality in terms of complementaries, the Yang and, not or, Yin.

Reid argued also that the nature of man invalidates any absolute type truth claim for a particular religion. As pointed out earlier, man is finite; only God is infinite. When a person asserts absolute truth for himself, when he claims that his is the only true religion, he is asserting himself as infinite; and he is by so doing usurping God's prerogative and role. He is committing the sin of setting himself up as God. Reid wrote, "As complete comprehension of God is impossible, so complete apprehension of truth is impossible. Finite beings have only partial revelations of God and partial comprehension of God's truth. Truth ever appears to finite minds in fragments. No one mind is capable of containing all the truth or all of the Infinite." Reid stated that ". . . one should flee bigotry and acknowledge that those who differ have also truth with them." He was attracted by St. Paul's statement in I Corinthians, "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part." And he reminded his listeners of F. Max Muller's statements, "Truth wherever it appears is welcome, nor will any doctrine seem the less true because it was seen not only by Moses or Christ but by Buddha or Laotze," and, "If the doctrines of Christianity were met with in other religions also, surely that would not affect their value or diminish their truth"

Reid's religious pluralism was based also on what he called the unities or harmonies between religions. There are certain beliefs and practices accepted by all religions. In a speech at the Institute Reid pointed out "eight fundamental principles common to all the great Faiths. These were exhortation to do right, training of one's own character in righteousness, helping others to do right, recognition of a Supreme Being, belief in retribution, belief in a future life, in some cases immortality, the duty of repentance, and the desire for salvation."

Reid believed that, if these parallels were emphasized, there would be much less quarreling between adherents of the various religions. The recognition of such similarities could be the basis for peaceful coexistence. The trouble is that the bigot confuses the externals of religion with true religion. Thus they "idolize the Church more than God." They stop short of the "essence" of religion because they only see the "phenomena" of religion. Their type of religion becomes a divisive rather than unifying force in the world.

Reid believed that each person should attempt to discern and live up to the best in his own tradition. Harmony would be the result. For this reason Reid advocated a "return to the root" movement, to use a Taoist expression. He wrote, "We may not only say, 'Back to Christ', but Back to the Buddha, back to Lao Tze, back to Confucius and Mencius, and back to the holy men, who had gone on before." Reid believed that, if one is to get to the truth in religion, one must go back to the original founder. He said, "When we take the teachings of the first men in the line of spiritual genealogy, we see how near these men and their thoughts were to each other. It is here that anything like approach to unity amongst Religions can be found. As the Christianity of Christ is better than the Christianity of any Christian, so the Taoism of Lao Tze is better than the Taoism of any Taoist."

Reid also admonished those who constantly harped on the faults of religions other than their own and compared those with religions in terms of their worst with their own in terms of the best. This was not only intellectual dishonesty as it is an invalid analogy; but it is also a rude and discourteous thing to do. "The courteous, and also the most beneficial, thing to be done by the follower of one religion in reference to another

religion is to point out the excellences, not the defects, of the other," Reid said.

Such a statement serves to illustrate the kind of person Gilbert Reid was. He was an extraordinary person, magnanimous in mind and spirit. He acknowledged and appreciated truth, beauty and goodness wherever he found it. He was quite ready to live and let live. He advocated sociological as well as religious pluralism--"It may be that our own customs, manners, and code of etiquette are best for us, but that does not imply that their adoption would be of any value or any charm to the Chinese. For us to insist that they shall not only learn our language and our sciences, and accept our religion, but also adopt all of the ways of Western life, would only mean that they, with all their progressiveness, would merely be nationalized . . . Better far for them to retain that which is best in their own excellent system of ceremony, than to be lowered by the familiarity of Western intercourse."

These statements show that Reid was not without beliefs himself. He believed in his own religion and culture. He stated that, "Because of God's presence Christianity assumes its high place in the affections and adoration of men . . ." and ". . . the supreme leadership of Christ in drawing men unto the Father, with promised hope of eternal life, and blessed forgiveness, and lives made pure---these are the things we see before our eyes, in the coming brotherhood of truth." But Reid would not force or coerce his religion or culture upon others. He dedicated his life to the presentation of Christ and Christian truths to non-Christians. But, he believed it was up to them, after hearing, to decide for themselves. It was a life fashioned in such a mold that led a eulogist to write in The Chinese Recorder after his death in 1927 that Reid's "special contribution" was "his imitation of Christ."

A Summary of Professor Donald H. Bishop's Article on Rev. Gilbert Reid

(尚賢堂主人李佳白的哲學和宗教思想提要)

畢孝伯教授對於李佳白思想的研究，很自然地分爲哲學、宗教兩部份。哲學分爲四層研究。第一，論人，首標性善說，與儒家思想相同。進一步主張人是有神性的，因爲人是上帝照自己的「形象」所造的。但人是有限而上帝是無限的。有限並不是性惡，只是愚蒙而易犯罪，這個缺點可用教育來補救。第二，李佳白的形上學，認爲一切真實都是善的。他對於奧古斯丁的「人世是惡，死是解脫」的說法，和達爾文「物競天擇，適者生存」的說法，都不同意。尤其反對西方的辨證二元論（善惡，上下，爾我），而贊成中國的相輔相成天人合一的說法。第三，李佳白的認識論把知識和真理密切聯繫。人可認識真理。真理只有一個，但其表現可有許多方法。真理就是真理，不問其爲耶儒釋道，聲光化電；但都歸于一，就是上帝。第四，關於倫理思想，李佳白以爲（1）道德與宗教有密切關係，不道德的人不能有合乎宗教的生活。（2）真理永恆，道德普遍。一切的人都須遵守倫理原則。（3）人對人的行爲必然是種瓜得瓜，種豆得豆。他對基督徒說，如果我們尊敬外教的經典，外教也會尊敬我們聖經裡的教訓。他主張以身作則的倫理：「德不孤，必有鄰」。他反對暴力戰爭。好目的必須用好手段來達成。

李佳白的宗教思想可分析爲三層。第一，他的上帝觀與他的長老會加爾文派不同。他的上帝與其說是嫉惡如仇的上帝，毋寧說是大慈大悲的上帝。他又認上帝是真理，是父親，是在我們的上下四方，關注我們。第二，他的宗教定義是：宗教不是教條。他說教條把我們分開；一切教條都比不上耶穌基督。他批評如尼西亞信經等說，全基督教會的共同信條，只會把基督徒分開，阻滯福音傳遍全球。宗教是感情，經驗，人格，生活方式。他欣賞中國人的宗教精神優於基督徒的冷酷教條。第三，對於各宗教的關係，李佳白深受中國人宗教觀念的影響。但他不贊成取諸教之長，而綜合成一個世界宗教的看法。他採取一個多元的立場，主張諸教和平共存，要共同努力，解決共同的問題。要互相尊敬，互相學習。不只是消極的容忍，更須是積極的欣賞。畢孝伯教授稱之爲「君子和而不同」的宗教觀。（顧敦錄）

Dr. Donald H. Bishop is a professor in the Department of Philosophy, College of Sciences and Arts, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, U. S. A. He was one of the members of the Institute of Chinese Cultural Studies for the professors in American colleges and universities, sponsored by the State Department and held on the campus of Tunghai University during the nineteen sixties. Dr. Bishop made outstanding contributions during the lectures and discussion meetings of the Conference. He has been for a long time a scholar in the subject of the development of ethical thought and practice in China.

Rev. Gilbert Reid, or Li Chia Pe 李佳白 in Chinese, was a popular scholar-missionary in China at the end of the Ch'ing Dynasty and beginning of the Republic. He worked among the Chinese intellectuals and government officials with enthusiasm and with great success. He used to talk to many Chinese students, both in China and in America, among whom was Hu Shih when the latter was a student at Cornell University (Hu Shih's Diary, June 16-17, 1911).

Professor Bishop's excellent paper on Gilbert Reid is divided conveniently into two parts—Part one deals with Reid's philosophical views which are discussed under four headings—man, metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, and part two with his religious views which are subdivided into three main topics; namely, his conception of God, his definition of religion, and his outlook regarding the inter-relationship of the world's religions. A resume in Chinese with appropriate elucidations is attached to the end of the article. (T. J. Ku)