Volume IX JANUARY Number 1

Bulletin

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE

REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES

EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH

LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA
1938

CONTENTS

Published four times a year, January, April, July, October, by the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the U. S.

President George W. Richards, Managing Editor; Professor Oswin S. Frantz, Business Manager.

Entered at the postoffice in Lancaster, Pa., as second-class matter.

BULLETIN

Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States

VOLUME IX JANUARY, 1938 NUMBER 1

SEMINARY NEWS

"Life and work" at the Seminary have gone their way this fall rather uneventfully. There has been quite a bit of illness among members of the student body. Three of the Seniors in succession have had to undergo treatment in local hospitals. At this writing we are happy to state that the last of the three is recovering nicely.

Several visitors have come to the Seminary in the interest of one cause or another. Mr. Roy J. McCorkle, secretary of the Interseminary Movement, spent a day with us. A representative of the American Bible Society addressed us in chapel on the work which his organization is doing throughout the world.

The student activities have centered as usual in the Society of Inquiry. This Society sponsored the customary reception to new students at the outset of the Seminary year. A valiant attempt was made to hold the annual outing in Long Park. On three separate occasions a date was set and the necessary arrangements were made, but each time the weatherman intervened. Mr. Gilbert J. Bartholomew is president of the Society during this first semester, Mr. Lonnie A. Carpenter vice-president, and Mr. George P. Stoudt secretary-treasurer.

Perhaps the outstanding event of the fall season was the convocation on November 5th to hear reports of the Oxford and Edinburgh conferences. The unusually fine attendance witnessed to the interest which these conferences have aroused. There must have been a hundred and fifty minister present—principally from Eastern Synod with quite a few from the northern end of Potomac Synod. Dr. William F. DeLong presided, and Dr. J. Rauch Stein conducted the opening devotions, using an order of worship which had been followed at one of the sessions of the Edinburgh confer-

ence. In the morning Dr. Richards gave a masterful portrayal of the quest of our Western world for oneness from the days of Christ to the present. In the afternoon Dr. Henry H. Ranck of Washington, D. C., reported enthusiastically upon his experiences at Edinburgh, and Dr. Harner described the Oxford conference and its findings. Each address was followed by an opportunity for discussion. All felt that the day was well and happily spent.

—N. C. H.

APPRECIATION

The Bulletin Staff appreciates the interest shown in the 1937 numbers, oustanding among which was the Centennial Register. Quite a number of ministers recognized the unusual value of this year's Bulletin and sent their dollar as an expression of their appreciation of the service rendered them. We feel, however, that the matter must have escaped the attention of many others, especially alumni of the seminary in Lancaster, upon whose support we felt we could count. If any such have mislaid the notice mailed to them recently, this appeal may serve as a reminder of their opportunity to express appreciation and loyalty by sending one dollar for one year's subscription to the Bulletin.

ANNIVERSARY SERMON[1]

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32).

I suspect I am the only man in this presence who graduated in the Class of 1887. During the week of Commencement we celebrated in a modest way the one hundredth anniversary of Franklin College and the fiftieth of Marshall College. I feel sure that I could not have selected a text for the sermon on this occasion that would have been more pleasing to my professors in the College and to those in the Seminary the three years following than the words in John's Gospel: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

[1] Sesqui-Centennial Sermon, Franklin and Marshall College, Sunday, October 17, 1937, preached in the College Chapel.

The colony, the church, and the college were founded at the same time. They became the basal pillars of the state. The reformers and the pioneers of continental and of British Protestantism were possessed with the conviction that only by the aid of the school could the full benefits of their religion be realized in the individual and the social life. The poet Schiller said, "Against stupidity even the gods struggle in vain." This conviction was reiterated in one form or another by the founders of the first fifteen colleges in the colonial and the early national period. Their common aim was more than the training of a learned ministry; it was also the preservation in the community of a succession of men duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation."

On a gate of Harvard University the following sentence is inscribed: "After God had carried us safely to New England and we had builded our houses, provided necessities for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship and settled the civil government; one of the next things we looked for was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to our churches when our present ministers shall lie in the dust." The preamble of the charter of Brown University portrays the relation of the college to the commonweal: "Institutions for liberal education are highly beneficial to society by forming the rising generation to virtue, knowledge, and useful literature."

This conception of the function of the college was a heritage also of the pioneers who came from Germany and Switzerland, Holland and France, many of whom found refuge in the Woods of Penn. Franklin College was founded "for the diffusion of knowledge through every part of the State in order to preserve our republican system of government as well as to promote its improvements in the arts and sciences which alone render nations respectable and great." In a shorter sentence in the charter, we are told "it is the design of this institution to make men and useful citizens." The purpose of Franklin College was in full accord with the spirit of Penn's Holy Experiment—"To lay the foundation of a free colony for all mankind." Fifty years after the founding of Franklin College, Marshall College was estab-

lished for "the education of youth in the learned languages, the arts, sciences, and useful literature." That these schools were vitally related to the churches is evident from the fact that the members of the boards of trustees were chosen from the churches.

Both Franklin College and Marshall College had men of distinction in the first faculties. Benjamin Rush, a member of the orginal Board of Trustees, wrote of Franklin College: "A cluster of men more learned or better qualified masters I believe have not met in any university." We need mention only Muhlenberg a botanist of world-wide reputation, Melsheimer the father of entomology in America, and Reichenbach the mathematician. Men of this caliber must have been after Franklin's own heart, for he was among the foremost scientists, philosophers, statesmen, and diplomats of his time. Without exaggeration the words of Dr. Rush may be applied to the first faculty of Marshall College: Rauch the philosopher, Nevin the theologian, and Schaff the historian; all of whom could have taught with perfect satisfaction in any university in Europe or in America. These men, some of them theologians, others philosophers and scientists, each a master of the subject he taught, believed that both Christianity and culture were necessary to lay a solid foundation of a state in which men would be freed from intolerance, bigotry, and tyranny rooted in ignorance, and could enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The catholicity of the ideals of Franklin and of Marshall College is symbolized not only in the faculties but in the men after whom the institutions were named: Franklin, known and revered throughout the civilized world, and Chief Justice Marshall, who laid the foundations of American jurisprudence, through his interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. The members of the Board were men of high degree, among them signers of the Declaration of Independence, a President of the United States, a Governor of Pennsylvania, the merchant prince of New York City in his day, and members of the learned professions. At the dedication of Franklin College were assembled Reformed, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Lutherans, Catholics, Moravians, all of them equally loyal to their church and to their country; and in hearty accord with the first Amendment to the Constitution

forbidding Congress to make a law establishing a religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. A notable statement in the charter of Marshall College expresses both the spirit of the Constitution of our Republic and of the Evangelical and Reformed Church: "Persons of every religious denomination shall be capable of being elected Trustee; nor shall any person, either as principal, professor, tutor, or pupil be refused admittance on account of his sentiments in matters of religion." In the *Reformed Church Messenger,* May 9, 1839, we are told of the organization of "The Society for the Promotion of Christian Union." Among the eleven vice-presidents was Frederick A. Rauch of the German Reformed Church. The founders of our colleges may have been provincials by residence, but in the scope of their vision and the depth of their insight, in the comprehensiveness of their purpose, they were cosmopolites who, in the Sophoclean phrase, saw life steadily and saw it whole.

The men of the Faculties and of the Boards bear witness by their achievements that faith, philosophy, and science are not alien to one another but allies for the making of complete manhood and womanhood. In view of utterances from the past one hundred and fifty years, one reads with more than ordinary interest a sentence from a recent address of the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull: "From the beginning of our history there has been the most definite recognition of the influence on the destiny of the country that religion, as taught by the churches, does and should exert." He reaffirms, in other words, the oft-quoted sentence in Washington's Farewell Address: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in the exclusion of religious principles."

When Thomas Jefferson wrote, "There can be no faith in the future of humanity without a conviction that the truth shall make men free," he harked back to the Galilean Peasant who said two thousand years ago, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." On an occasion like this it is appropriate that we consider the foundations laid in the past, for the superstructure of the future will be strong only when it conforms with the foundation, the principles of which have been tried and found true in the experience of the ages.

Pilate asked of Jesus the most arresting question in the New Testament: "What is truth?" It rings in our ears as persistently now as two thousand years ago. We have since found many things in nature, in history, and in man's life that are true. The verified facts in our encyclopedias are ten thousand times more numerous than in Pilate's day. But these facts are not the truth to which Jesus referred when he said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." Truth is far more than can be seen through the telescope or the microscope, or discovered by the chemist, the biologist, the historian, and the psychologist. It is more even than propositions that can be demonstrated by logic or deduced from data gathered from the heights, the depths, the length, and the breadth of the universe. Truth is more than these things; because life is more than food and the body than raiment, and man needs more than bread.

The most subtle temptation is to put our own purposes, opinions, passions, schemes, little systems, in place of the Truth. We must not blindly take the dictates of priests, or of rulers of states, of business, of diplomacy, for Truth. It is not always what the Church prescribes in dogmas or the State compels its schools to teach. This is the essence of idolatry: the worshipping of the creature instead of the creator, of man instead of God, of the local and the temporal in place of the infinite and the eternal. Truth cannot be printed on a page, carved in marble, painted on canvas.

Truth is a person who lives and labors among men in the spirit of the love and justice that are in Jesus Christ; or, in other words, a personal attitude and disposition toward the three ultimates that determine character—God, man, and things. Godward, it is the attitude of a son to the Father; manward, of a brother toward his fellows; earthward, of a master who controls things for the realization of the abundant life in men, women, and children the world over. The Truth in action is defined in the twofold Commandment of one who never went to school: Love the Lord thy God and thy neighbor as thyself!

The Truth does not in the least interfere with, but rather encourages, sound and scientific scholarship in every department of a college. While God is the Truth and in his Son came to bear

witness to the Truth, he never reveals to men the things that they are to discover, nor answers questions which disturb and perplex them—questions about the origin of the world, of man, of evil, about the laws that control the stars, the strategy of war, what to eat and to drink, how to conduct business, cure disease, and fertilize the soil. Nothing that the historian, the scientist, the philosopher, and the common sense of man, through centuries of experience, can discover, will God reveal.

It is a serious mistake that has caused bitter controversy and injury to life and happiness to assume that the gospel of God is in conflict with the work of the biologist, the psychologist, the sociologist, the moral reformer, and humanitarian activity. These men are to do their work with scientific accuracy in the power of the gospel. On the other hand it is an equally serious error, often with woeful consequences, when the artist, the statesman, the scientist, the reformer, presume to have no need of the Church and are sufficient unto themselves. To neglect or to ignore the one or the other is to develop a stunted manhood which is true neither to God nor man, a credit neither to the college nor to the State. To guard against this separation of religion and culture, President Rauch of Marshall College wrote: "The formation of the character of citizens by the cultivation of the whole man is the aim of education in the proper sense of the term." President John W. Nevin of Franklin and Marshall College said, in 1867, the same thing in other words: "Franklin and Marshall College has for its primary and controlling purpose the enlargement of the mind in its own sphere; not the cultivation merely of utilitarian, practical, and professional skill. Underneath all such practical superstructure must be at least a solid basis of spiritual life."

It is a long time since these words have been uttered. We are living in a new world. Conditions have changed; but the Truth is still the same.

> "The unchangeable unwritten code of Heaven;
> This is not of today and yesterday;
> But lives forever."

Forms of government and social theories come and go; but He who is the Truth, which shall make men free, is the same yesterday, today, and forever.

In view of this undeniable fact, the college of the church has a part to perform that neither the home, the congregation, nor any religious association can do. There comes a time in the life of the college student when the faith of the fathers must be tried before the bar of the scientists. It is the experience which the Apostle describes, when he says: "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child. Now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things." It is at this point of transition from childhood to manhood where the youth needs expert guidance. He may be tempted to give up his Bible and be true to science; or to give up science and be true to the Bible; or to cling tenaciously to both without attempt at reconciliation—a tension which is intolerable for any length of time. It is hard to decide who is the more to be pitied: the credulous college graduate who boasts that he believes everything in the Bible, or the one who boasts that he believes nothing in the Bible. We have as little confidence in the credulity of the one as respect for the scepticism of the other. For neither of them has fought his way through honest doubt, and made a stronger faith his own.

We ask for a teacher in the college faculty who is to harmonize and unify the results of historical, scientific, and philosophic investigation with the ideals of life of Jesus Christ. He must stand by the student while he works in laboratory and observatory, deciphers the records on rocks and tablets, traces the origin of species, and the descent of man, studies religion from fetishism to hero-worship, is inclined to account for man merely by heredity and environment, faces the hostile and devastating forces in nature and the more terrible and pitiless wrath of men and nations, a world bleeding at every pore. In the presence of all this the student must be convinced not only that he *can* still be Christian, but that the best results of time and the deepest experiences of the modern man demand that he *must* be Christian to be true to all the facts of life and to the welfare of men and nations. The American college has had, and now has, men of this type who by word and deed fan into flame the latent sparks of Christian manhood and womanhood which the student brings with him to college halls. He needs to realize that the masters of knowledge may consistently be disciples of Jesus. Years ago I sat at table

with Professor Wernle of Basel, a brilliant leader of a progressive theological school in Europe. He spoke of creeds and catechisms and referred to statements in them which he could no longer hold. But he added with a tremor in his voice and a tear in his eye: *Aber ich mögte gern ein Mensch werden wie Jesus war*—But I should like to become a man like Jesus was.

Such a deep, reasonable, unpretentious, and yet irrepressible passion for Christlikeness ought to be awakened and nurtured in the heart of the college student—an idealism which to some extent would counteract the fanatical zeal for the production of wealth with an inhuman indifference to human welfare; and at the same time would prevent men from becoming the victims of shallow-minded demagogues who proclaim their social and political panaceas for all the ills of life without the least demand for service, self-discipline, and self-sacrifice.

Christianity does not solve all the problems of the individual or the social life. If it did, it would defeat its purpose: to give men the abundant life. For that is both a divine gift and a human achievement. God creates men with abilities and men must turn them into realities. Indeed, the interest, the zest, and the joy of life are in the quest of knowledge and in the winning of freedom through the discovery of the Truth which God reveals in the gradual progress from savagery to enlightenment. Even now after two thousand years of Christianity there is an endless amount of social injustice, callousness to the finer ideals, the misery that comes of poverty and the pride that comes from wealth, political chicanery, men taking advantage of positions of trust for their own aggrandizement and for the exploitation of public resources for the enrichment of a few through the impoverishment of the many. Sin in a hundred forms is eating out the vitals of the nation. The wages of sin is always death. Men have data enough and to spare to prove their pessimistic views of the final outcome of civilization. Even though all this be granted, the world's failure proves the necessity of the gospel for making life endurable and victorious.

No, the purpose of religion is not to explain and solve problems. That is the function of philosophy and science. Religion is to give us vision and to set us tasks; and in the light of the vision

and the power of the Christ we are to perform our tasks. If we are true to Him and his Kingdom, we shall live courageously and die triumphantly though ten thousand unsolved problems and unfinished tasks stare us in the face.

College men, who are assumed to become leaders of their fellows, are to be free from provincialism, partisanship, sectarianism, and to have a world-wide outlook, cosmopolitan sympathies; to have their hearts set on the Truth that makes men free; to see life in its gigantic setting of infinity and eternity and through this vision to have their deepest spiritual energies called into action; to learn that history teaches us that sovereignty passes from the tyrant to the martyr, from the force that strikes men down to the self-sacrifice which wins their reverence; that the meek will inherit the earth, not because the course of time will bring them power but because they will teach men a new conception of power. Both the contemplation of long distances of space and long periods of time, the infinite of the telescope and the infinitesimal of the microscope on the one hand, and the catholicity of the Gospel and of the Kingdom of God on the other, will lend themselves to the making of men of this mold.

Lancaster, Pa.

THE CAUSES BEHIND PRESENT-DAY JAPANESE "IMPERIALISM"

George S. Noss

Japan's present course of action in Asia is rightly called "imperialistic," but very few people realize that probably no nation in the world has been less imperialistic throughout a long history. Except for a mythical invasion of Korea during the reign of the Empress Jingô (time of the later Roman Empire: estimates of its date spread over more than two hundred years), and another invasion of Korea in the time of the Japanese Napoleon, Hideyoshi (last decade of the 16th Century), Japan has been, through all its long history, a stay-at-home nation. Why has Japan dropped this rôle, and adopted a program of political and economic expansion? Perhaps it might not be amiss to "look at the record."

When the Portuguese arrived in Japan in 1542, they brought with them tobacco, firearms, syphilis, and politico-commercial imperialism. A few years later the Basque priest, St. Francis Xavier, brought the first Christian message. Both types of Europeans found a welcome. Very unfortunately, the missionaries who came to Japan during the 16th Century were practically all from Portugal and Spain, both imperialistic powers, and the priests did not dissociate themselves from their political masters sufficiently to enable the Japanese to discriminate. They were further handicapped by the fact that the Head of their Church was a temporal ruler. The necessity of owing allegiance to the "Pappa" (Pope) has always been a sore point with the Japanese, who have in all ages been distinguished for a peculiar veneration for their own Ruling House. Add to this, the various groups of Roman priests, Dominican, Jesuit, and Franciscan, vilified and misrepresented one another, and the presence of English and Dutch traders in Japan led to further trouble, for these gentry did not hesitate to impute the worst of motives to the Spanish and Portuguese priests. Suspicion was heightened by the fact that the Portuguese, through a political envoy, practically refused to trade with the Japanese unless they could at the same time send their missionaries. But the attitude of the Japanese was crystallized by an incident (of the *San Felipe*), which, however trivial it might at first appear, is among the most impressive in history. A Spanish galleon, bound for Mexico from the Philippines with a very rich cargo, drifted to the shores of southeastern Japan. The local baron offered aid, and as the Japanese law gave all wrecked ships to the owner of the place where they might come to grief, the baron's men purposely ran the galleon upon a sand-bar as they were towing it to safe waters, and claimed ship and cargo. The pilot of the ship tried to overawe them by showing them a map of the empire of Philip II. The Japanese asked how all this land had been acquired, and the pilot was so mad as to reply: "Our kings commence by sending missionaries to the lands they wish to subjugate, and when these have made a good start, soldiers are sent who ally themselves to the newly-won Christians, and the rest is easy."

This incident, by itself, could not have influenced the Japanese very much if there had not been so much evidence to back its im-

plications. It ushered in one of the bloodiest persecutions the world ever saw, until the Christian Church was practically stamped out. In the process the Japanese became so afraid of the Europeans that they shut up their country and went into a hermit-like existence for more than two hundred years, and they were only called out of it by the realization that a continued hermit-existence would bring about their complete destruction.

I suppose all of us have heard glowing accounts of the visit of Commodore Perry to Japan, in 1853, as though he were some angel of mercy, with his hands full of olive branches. Let us see what the Japanese saw:

Commodore came with a squadron of heavily armed ships and anchored about as close to Japan's capital city as he could get. When the Japanese asked him to go to the open port of Nagasaki, in the western part of Japan, he made a peremptory refusal. He delivered the President's letter and came back the following year, in the meantime seizing the Bonin Islands, which are right under Japan's nose. It was not long before Mr. Townsend Harris came as an American envoy, and by a judicious mixture of tact and threats of military force he succeeded in negotiating a treaty, which, as far as the viewpoint of the Japanese is concerned, might as well have been dictated at the point of a gun. This treaty was concluded in 1857, and it was not until 1900 that the Japanese freed themselves of the extra-territorial clause concerning consular jurisdiction, and not until 1911 that they finally attained full tariff autonomy. It might be well to observe that in this very year of 1857 the Americans hoisted their flag over Chinese Formosa, for a time. Between 1857 and 1860 the British and French fought a full-sized war with the Chinese, ending with the seizure of Peking and the looting of the Forbidden City. Japan had known all about the Opium Wars fought by Britain against China, and our own war against Mexico. She watched the steady encroachment of Imperial Russia in Siberia and northwestern America, until in 1860 the Russians seized an island in the Straits of Tsushima, which had always been Japanese territory, only to be driven away by the British, for selfish reasons. It is also well to remember than General Ward and "Chinese" Gordon, who at this time were leading armies in China (in connection with the

Chinese Taiping Rebellion), might look like mere adventurers to us, but more like foreign conquerors to the Japanese and Chinese.

It does little good to tell an informed Japanese that we Americans left Japan alone when she was helpless, for he will blandly reply (if he is that frank), that our expansive energies were fully absorbed by the Civil War and the development of the continent which the railroad had thrown open, and that our sea-power had been crippled by the shift from the sailing-vessel to the iron screw-steamer. He will refer to the troubles at the time of the unifications of Germany and Italy, and the blessed (for Japan) fact that in Africa the predatory European powers had something to fight over and digest. Finally, Russia was absorbed in trying to open a way to the Mediterranean, and this left Japan free to save herself from the fate of an Ethiopia or a Morocco.

The last decade of the 19th Century was extraordinarily critical for the Japanese. They watched the European powers turn to the Far East, and tried to block the advance of Russia through South Manchuria, only to have Russia, Germany and France compel them to give up the Manchurian littoral "in the interests of peace." In 1897 two German Catholic missionaries were killed in China, and the Germans seized the port of Tsing-tau in Shantung as a sort of indemnity, after their fleet had cruised along the Chinese coast in search of the best port for their purpose. At the same time the British occupied the near-by port of Wei-hai-wei. The next year the Americans appeared in the Far East, in the Philippines, and the Italians tried to bluff the Chinese into ceding Sanmun Bay (between Shanghai and Hongkong). The Russian imperialists cynically moved into the very Port Arthur they had compelled the Japanese to abandon. The French began to move into southern China from Tonkin, and started various operations on Hanoi Island, off China's southern coast. So that now we have Holland in the East Indies, America in the Philippines, Portugal in Macao, France in Indo-China and Hanoi, England in Hongkong and Wei-hai-wei, and beginning to entrench herself in the valley of the Yangtze-Kiang, Germany in Shantung, and Russia in Manchuria and Mongolia. And then when the Chinese nationalists, in a fury of desperation, tried to sweep these foreigners out, an allied expedition fought its way to Peking, imposed

huge indemnities, and stationed troops which are for the most part still there, after nearly forty years: British, French, Italian, Japanese, and American soldiers.

One may ask what business it is of Japan to complain of what other nations do in China, and why that should excuse her own aggressions there. In reply let me suggest for comparison what our American attitude toward Mexico might be if Japanese detachments of marines were to be stationed at Vera Cruz and Mexico City, where they had been for nearly forty years. Why, even newspaper *rumors* of Japanese naval actions at Magdalena Bay, or the settlement of Japanese "reservists" in Mexico seem to have set us by the ears on more than one occasion!

It is easy to condemn another nation for the same actions we condone in ourselves. We went on a crusade to "free" Cuba, and our marines were "temperately" used to bring about stable conditions in Central America (for the United Fruit Company). We also dug the Panama Canal, that "greatest engineering feat of all time" for the benefit of the human family. But it is humiliating to watch the reaction produced in the mind of an educated Japanese by the single word "Nicaragua." As for the Panama Canal, haven't I heard them talk about the time forty-odd adventurers backed onto a pier and announced to the world that "Panama" had severed relations with Colombia; and how the American warships (which just happened to be close by) prevented the Colombian authorities from suppressing the "revolution"; and how the Panamanian Government had almost immediately been recognized, and a "Commission" sent to Washington, where, less than a month later, a drawn-up treaty was shoved across the table for them to sign, granting the United States the rights to a Canal Zone; and how the sensitive American conscience could not operate to pay the price Colombia had originally demanded, until it seemed vast oil deposits had been discovered in Colombia which were in danger of falling into European hands! In this way do the nations of the earth study one another's iniquities.

There was so much evidence supporting Japanese suspicion of American aims that we cannot blame them for refusing to read into the "Open Door" Statement (of John Hay) any more mean-

ing than is to be found in the bare words themselves: that the United States did not want its own rights interfered with. We can understand why, after the Portsmouth Treaty with Russia was negotiated, the first Japanese reaction was a furious resentment, and a feeling that America had tricked them out of the fruits of their victory: a feeling which the subsequent actions of the Harriman railway interests in Manchuria did nothing to remedy.

The feeling aroused by our unfortunate attitude toward Japanese immigrants is particularly depressing to contemplate because it is so unnecessary. What a powerful exacerbescent is here made out of almost nothing! The Japanese don't want to send us floods of immigrants: they couldn't send their surplus population abroad even if there was a place for them to go to. There are not enough ships on the Pacifific to take care of a million people a year, in excess of present passenger-space requirements. If there were enough ships, Japan could not afford the cost of all this expatriation, which would, in addition, leave her exactly where she was, in the matter of a crowded population. Fundamentally, the Japanese population problem will have to be solved by a decreasing birth-rate, which as a matter of fact is already in operation, and which will in all likelihood stabilize Japan's population at something like twenty million souls in excess of those which she now has. This number can be taken care of if there is a proper industrialization and a secure market for the products of that industrialization. Of course we don't want floods of immigrants from any country, but we could at least put the Japanese on a quota basis, and admit about a hundred carefully selected Japanese a year. In addition to the number of other benefits, we could deprive the Japanese gutter-press of the chance to blame their population troubles on us, and direct their attention to this problem, which no one else can settle for them.

Purely as a matter of enlightened selfishness, it would pay us to "get out of Asia" in a military sense: take our gunboats out of the Chinese rivers, and our marines out of Chinese cities, and set the Philippines free. In an economic sense the Philippines are already in the Japanese orbit, just as the West Indies are in ours, and there is nothing more pathetic and futile in the world

than to see the American army authorities attempting to build up a Filipino war-machine when anyone should see that the Philippines will, politically, exist on Japan's sufferance. We should appeal to Japan's best self, and that can only be even begun by making Japan feel more secure.

"Getting out of Asia" includes a change in our naval policy: we should no longer think of a Navy that will be able to operate on Japan's side of the Pacific. Think of the effect upon our national thinking if a foreign power, or a combination of foreign powers, should build a naval force designed to "restrain" us in the Caribbean. Think of how, in such an eventuality, naval-building appropriations would pass through Congress with a whoop and a hurrah, and of how the very welkin would ring and re-echo! The Japanese fleet is said by those who ought to know, to be designed for fighting self-defense actions in Japan's own waters, and our own fleet should be on a similar basis.

But these are only palliatives: the real cure lies in helping Japan to feel secure in economic matters. I refer in particular to supplies of raw materials. The Japanese are said to have just enough iron in the ground to last our steel mills one year, and enough coal to last us a dozen years. They have an estimated oil reserve of only five hundred million tons. They have no land really suitable for growing cotton, and the road to supplies of crude rubber is "covered" by naval bases belonging to England, France, and the United States. Finally, practically all their wool must be imported from Australia. We have ample, not to say superabundant, supplies of all of these "sinews of war" except rubber, and no country could shut us off from supplies in South America. Can you imagine the greatly-increased affection with which we would regard the fighting services if we had to get most of our iron and oil from abroad, and all of our cotton and wool and rubber? That is, as long as we could contemplate a world society in which the nations unable to defend themselves would get the contemptuous treatment meted out to the Ethiopias and Spains, the Cubas, and Indias, and Chinas. The Japanese people dare not attempt to make their way in this world by trade alone, for a world based on force would destroy them.

What is needed is a recognition of the fact that all the material resources of the world belong to the whole human family. This would not mean that we Americans must set up foreign concessions in our Pennsylvania anthracite fields, or in our helium-producing areas in Texas, or that the Japanese must hand over districts to us in which we could raise our own silk. It means that all nations must be given the right to buy their raw materials in world markets at fair prices, with access to these markets fully guaranteed at all times, and with no favors nor exceptions. Certainly it will forever be impossible to share territories among the nations so as to give them all balanced supplies of materials, for even if the miracle could be accomplished, the changing values of raw materials due to new discoveries and new technical developments would constantly upset the balance.

It will be objected that the setting up of such international markets of raw materials will be an almost insuperable task. But we all know what the alternative is. If a brave and determined people cannot secure their future in any other way, they will inevitably appeal to the sword, just as the father of starving children, for whom food cannot be gotten in any other way, has a moral although not a legal right to "steal" it.

It is for this reason that it is idle to expect the "moderates" in Japan to restrain the "extremists." I don't believe there ever was a nation more united as regards its objectives. The moderates and extremists in Japan differ in degree, and not in kind, and the appointment of a more "conciliatory" cabinet in Tokyo means only that *the same goal* will be sought by more subtle and indirect means. The Chinaman can see the Japanese soldiers invading his land, but if he is thoughtful he can see behind those soldiers driving forces among which the political, commercial, and economic policies of the United States are as potent as any.

July, 1937, Aomosi, Japan

THE REVIVAL OF MYSTICAL RELIGION

Ralph L. Holland

The theological pyrotechnics of American Protestantism that attracted so much attention in the twenties have apparently died down. Charges of heresy on one hand and of obscurantism on the other are happily not being hurled so freely now. This statement, however, is not tantamount with the assertion that men are not as deeply concerned with religion as then but it does indicate a shift in theological emphases. Something is happening in the religious world.

There are three main trunk lines in present day Protestant thought, from which many detours and by-paths have been explored. At present an impartial observer cannot help but note that all three of these heretofore dominant emphases are inadequate to meet the demands placed upon them, and that they must make room for something else. All three—Fundamentalism, Modernism and Barthianism—have made important contributions to theological thinking and religious experience. Yet it is likewise true that each of them contains certain weaknesses which keep it from serving as Protestantism's sole religious guide.

After evaluating each of these three emphases we can the more clearly chart the course over which we must travel in the quest for an adequate theology. Modern man, living as he does in an age of tensity and perplexity, needs as man has never needed, a religion that sustains, fulfills, corrects and empowers.

Fundamentalism

When the Protestant Reformation began its leaders and adherents believed that the Roman Church was no longer true to the authority originally entrusted to her, therefore the church in order to fulfil her divine mission must purify herself, and if needs be, break away from the established hierarchy. As time went on it became increasingly clear that the established church was uncompromisingly determined to have nothing to do with the schismatics. Obviously there was but one course open to them: the course adopted by Luther, when at the Diet of Worms he flung defiance into the face of the tribunal that was trying him,

as he cried "*Heir stehe ich. Ich kan nicht anders. So helfe mir Gott. Amen.*"

The new learning of recent centuries has forced the church to come to terms with new views of the world and of the Bible. In Catholicism this was branded sinful and placed under the ban, but in Protestantism there has been a different story. Two movements arose in Protestantism in response to this new learning, the conservative group becoming known as the Fundamentalists and the liberal element as the Modernists.

For the Fundamentalist religion rests as it does for the Roman Catholic, on authority. Both believe "that Christian doctrine had been officially formulated in antiquity and that theologians of all ages were under obligation to conform to the divine pattern."[1] The Catholic and the Fundamentalist agree that religion rests ultimately upon authority but they differ as to the basis of that authority. The Catholic appeals to the divine church with its divinely appointed hierarchy, while the Fundamentalist appeals to the Word of God as containing the revelation of divine will.

To be sure, the Fundamentalist, in this authoritarian appeal, reserves the right to interpret the Bible according to his own lights and this interpretation is the *ne plus ultra.* This has given rise to differing interpretations and ultimately to a multitudinous sectarianism in Protestant Christianity. The basic doctrine of Fundamentalism—the literal inspiration of an infallible Bible—has given the Fundamentalist a foundation for the theological framework which he has reared upon it. This theological system, he insists, is the absolute criterion, the *sine qua non,* of Christianity.

Fundamentalism, with its conservatism, has carried over from the Catholic Church much of the past and has made it our heritage. It has been well that this is so, for Catholicism merits no monopoly on Christianity's historic achievements and accretions.

Nevertheless, Fundamentalism contains two grave weaknesses that will eventually topple it to its doom. These are, first, the Fundamentalist insistence that truth was once delivered in the past, and that deliverance is mankind's only authority. Second,

[1] Gerald Birney Smith, *Current Christian Thinking,* Chicago, 1928. Page 35.

Fundamentalism fails to separate the chaff from the grain, the important from the irrelevant.

Looking at these weaknesses more carefully, the first declares that truth was once revealed by God and is recorded in his Word. The derivative corollary is that truth is no longer revealed. But this is not true to life! New truth is revealing itself constantly. We possess truth today that men a century ago never dreamed of. In each new discovery God reveals himself more completely, and in every new invention we learn to use truth in still larger areas of life.

"In the first place," writes Dr. Gerald Birney Smith, "the Protestant movement took place while mediaeval thinking still ruled the minds of men. Descartes, who is called "the father of modern philosophy" was born a century after Luther. Galileo, who so strikingly indicated the enormous value of the scientific method of discovering truth, was brought to trial for his heretical utterances in 1616, ninety-nine years after Luther posted his theses. During the days of Luther and Calvin, religious thinking followed the methods which had been worked out by the mediaeval scholars. The theology of Protestantism was thus discussed and shaped for a century in terms of mediaeval scholarship. Protestantism really belongs to the Middle Ages as far as its original theology is concerned."[2] "The new movement, like Catholicism, emphasized the supreme importance of submission to the will of God; it simply declared that each individual could discover that will without the intervention of the Church."[3]

And how could the will of God be discovered? Through only one means—the Bible alone can reveal it. This view has been perpetuated and developed by Fundamentalism into a formidable theological system. One of the leading books of the Fundamentalist position[4] asserts that the Fundamentalists are the only true Christians. In this view mankind is bound down to the authority of the past by a definite bibliolatry. The spirit of God can speak only through that one medium: man and God cannot come into direct relationship with each other—any fellowship between them

[2] G. B. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 21f.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[4] J. G. Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism,*

must take place through the veil of the past. But this is not true to fact: God does speak in the present, too.

God is constantly revealing himself in the life of man. As considerable gains are being wrought each year in the areas of philosophy, science, art, etc., so they are being made in the realm of religion as well. It is impossible to shackle religion to the dank, musty stone walls of the sepulchral past. God is not static: he is still working in his world and in humanity. Our supreme need is a growing revelation of himself in our personal and social life. We are not mere automatons that can be wound up by an ancient theological key and then kept on running. As the body demands constant nourishment, so the soul needs constant spiritual communion with God. Thus the first of Fundamentalism's weaknesses, its attempt to shackle the souls of men to the past, must break down under its own fallacy, and its inadequacy to meet the needs of men under present day conditions.

The second weakness of Fundamentalism—its failure to separate the chaff from the grain, the worth*less* from the worth*while*—is just as fallacious as its insistence that God's revelation of himself be confined to the past. In this failure to separate the irrelevant from the important, Fundamentalism confounds religion *per se* with what people have thought about it; that is, it has not separated religion from theology. Oftentimes in the history of the church theological battles have been fought over what have come to be regarded as trifling matters, while the vital considerations of living religious importance have escaped so much as a mere notice. The battles of the church in the fourth century and during the entire period of the formation of the ecumenical creeds were not so much conflicts of religion as they were life and death struggles of theology. Philosophies of religion rather than the teachings of Jesus gripped the thinking of the doctors. Was salvation wrought through the Atonement as the Eastern fathers taught, or was it accomplished by a propitiation accomplished through the death of Christ as the Western fathers believed? Interest lay greatly in the nature of the God-head—was Jesus of the same substance as God or was he simply like Him? Was he *homoousion* or *homoion?* The central note of our Lord's teaching was the Kingdom of God, but the creeds do not mention that.

Jesus was never interested in speculative theology, yet that was the life-blood of the ecumenical councils, and has been too much so of the church throughout her history. It is dominant in the Fundamentalist position still. No wonder then as we regard church history to observe a *crippled, theological Christianity* creeping over Europe and America and latterly over Asia, instead of the *vital, personal and social religion of Jesus.*

Basic in the theological emphasis which has ever characterized Fundamentalism has been its doctrinal insistence upon the literal inspiration of the Bible. The Bible is all God's own dictation from Genesis 1:1 straight through to Revelation 22:21. Every part of the Bible, being this literally inspired word of God, is of equal worth. Thus the genealogical records of *Numbers,* the Bedouin love-songs of the *Songs of Solomon,* are on an equal footing with the Sermon on the Mount, the interpretative life of Christ found in the Fourth Gospel, or the thirteenth chapter of *I Corinthians.* This doctrine is downright confusing to men seeking guidance in religion. Indubitably some parts of the Bible are of a much higher worth than others, both intrinsically and as a means of answering human need. One is reminded by the Fundamentalist position of Mahayana Buddhism, which in its onward sweep across Asia was ostensibly triumphant. It gathered into its bosom all that it found, engulfing the most diametrically contradictory doctrines and practices, even the very Hinduism out of which it originally arose in protest. So, Fundamentalism has embraced too much of the past in indiscriminate fashion. Its *sanctus sanctorum* lies embedded in its doctrine of the revelation of God made in the past. It steadfastly refuses to believe that any good can come out of the Nazareth of the present.

Obviously, Fundamentalism with these presuppositions and theological insistences, out of gear as they are with the modern temper, cannot serve as mankind's religious guide in the twentieth century with its new problems and issues. We must look for other guidance.

Modernism

Into the reign of authoritarionism which, under the aegis of Catholicism and later under that of Protestantism as well, had

gained such a hold on Christianity through the centuries came the enlightening influence of the modern spirit of inquiry. Catholic theologians had followed the speculative methods of Greek philosophers, and they were for several centuries followed by Protestant theologians. When the scientific temper did arise the Catholic church placed it under the ban, but the Protestants had already defied the authority of the church. Here were the seeds of a modernist factor which invited men to examine the whole field of Christianity as they examined other fields as chemistry, physics, medicine, etc. Protestant thinkers soon placed their birthright into operation, and examined religion along with other areas of life. The password of the scientific method was Aristotelian—nothing human was foreign to it, not even religion.

When Modernism penetrated into the field of religion it began to study religion objectively and critically. It sought to separate the chaff from the grain, and in so doing delivered Christianity from many of her besetting sins. The Bible became the subject of penetrating investigation and searching analysis. Passages became more understandable as they were read against the background in which they were written, old superstitions about the Bible were swept away. In theology certain doctrines heretofore authoritatively held were seen to have but scant value, if, indeed they were not a hindrance to Christian thought and life. Without question Modernism was a sorely needed corrective upon the religious scene, but its very spirit prevents it from being mankind's sole religious guide. Modernism is essential as a *method* in theological study, but it is nothing more. Used beyond that legitimate scope it degenerates into a spineless humanism or arrogant skepticism. It is not religion itself, it is method, pure and simple. Where it has failed us we have abused it, trying to make it serve as religion when it is only a method of theological study. Paring knives and frying pans have a legitimate place in the preparation of food, but they cannot serve as food, because they do not have the proper ingredients in the correct ratio. And when Modernism is used as a religion, it is soon found to be a dry and sterile substitute for spiritual hunger.

Modernism does, however, point men away from a religion of external authority to a religion of experience. But herein lies a grave

danger and one that has caused much grief—its humanity-centered value-judgments when carried into the area of religion may, unless we are alert, tend toward a form of humanism, hedonism, personalism, etc., without an adequate conception of an objective deity. Modernism analyzes religion as the physicist analyzes the spectrum. It is the critical inquiry whose method and aim are focalized on the attainment of truth. There are those who pride themselves on their religion of modernism only to discover in a crisis that they have substituted a method of seeking religious truth for the reality itself. Real religion in their lives may be almost *nil;* they have mistaken the paring knives and frying pans for the meat and vegetables. What was regarded as religion may be only a plagiarism on religion—some sort of psychologized autosuggestive personalism. Here the vulnerable point of Modernism is clearly discernible as we see a descriptive, analytical method of studying religion as men would study a newly discovered planet or element. But it lacks the dynamic of personal religion: it is definitely not a power by which men can live and make adjustment to.

Barthianism

The past decade or so has brought to our attention the theology of Karl Barth and his associates. This theology has already made a considerable impact on American theological thinking. Arising out of post-war conditions in Germany, it is essentially a theology of despair. Its dialectical method and paradoxes, so difficult of understanding, are yet no stranger to us than the basic thoughts which underlie the system and characterize it.

Barthianism "is a natural religious reaction to the liberal, humanistic-romantic Protestantism of the last century,"[5] writes Nicholas A. Berdyaev. Barth and his followers have done us a necessary service in calling us away from the auto-suggestivity, humanism and immanentalism into which Modernism had been drifting. This school at least has an objective deity, but this doctrine has been carried to an almost insane logical consummation. This is due in large measure to the deep eschatalogical concept that it has adopted toward Christianity. The eschatalogical interpretation of the New Testament, initiated by Johannes Weiss and

[5] N. A. Berdyaev, article in *Christendom,* Vol. II, No. 2, p. 229.

popularized by Albert Schweitzer has found its theological master in Karl Barth. Recent New Testament criticism, literary and historical, as well as form-criticism (*Formgeschichte*), are now setting forth in clear demonstration the fallacy of this emphasis. While it is true that Jesus did use an apocalyptic designation for himself—"Son of Man" *bar nash'* (Aramaic), and probably also *huios tou anthropou* (Greek),—it does not follow that he meant to convey by it the apocalyptic connotation. Rather, he poured new spiritual content into the term, and gave it a new significance to meet the requirements of his spiritual mission.

This pronounced eschatalogical emphasis in Barth carries for its doctrine of God a logical corollary. God exists, to be sure, but he exists far away from the experience of men. Between God and man there is an impassable chasm. Now such a God can be of little value to man, who according to this view is utterly helpless and depraved. These doctrines are not from our Lord, who taught the nearness of God to man, and the worth of even the least of men. Barthianism is a recrudescence of Calvinistic deism carried out to wider implications. God is outside his world, is supremely objective in his relationship to man. He is the Wholly Other. The Barthian conception of God strikingly resembles the idea of God in Buddhism. Buddhism does not deny the existence of deity, but declares that like humanity, it is caught in the endless meshes of existence on the wheel of life, and it therefore of no practical value to humanity. This doctrine of an objective God, whether it be in Buddhism, Calvin or Barth, does have at least the merit of directing men outside of themselves if they would know God more completely. Humanism, hedonism, immanentalism, and autosuggestivity are basically humanity-centered. Barth has compelled us to look above ourselves in terms quite different from Fundamentalism.

Barth's position, like that of Thomas Aquinas, degrades rather than elevates man. It finds no point of contact in man's fallen nature to which the Word, upon which he lays so much stress, can appeal. God is supreme in his heaven while man is a creature degraded by his sin. The only way in which man can become a new creature is through the annihilation of his old fallen nature, not through its perfection. This is indeed a far cry from the

teaching of Jesus—"Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect," and the message in the parable of the Prodigal Son.

The damning weakness of Barthianism is its failure to disclose God as one with whom man can enter into personal relationship. He exists, but He is so far distant from the human scene and so impossible of approach that one finds but scant comfort in Him in times of need. When we are defeated, ill, sorrowful, perplexed, we need more than a theological concept of an absentee deity far removed from daily life. If I mistake not, Jesus' very ministry sought to reveal God not as distant from man as the scribes and Pharisees taught, but as very near and reaching down into life. God cannot be then relegated to the periphery of human experience. We need the Fatherly God of Jesus, not the absentee aloof God of Barth, in daily life.

Mysticism

These three, Fundamentalism, Modernism and Barthianism make strange bedfellows, yet in a sense, the essential weakness of all three is the same although they disclose it quite differently. They all make religion objective, outside of the individual man. Fundamentalism makes religion authoritative, legalistic, doctrinal. It cannot meet the needs of modern man because it fails precisely as Judaism failed to meet the needs of Jesus and Paul, and Catholicism the needs of Luther. Modernism looks at religion as a field of human interest to investigate, explain, psychologize, etc., as it regards any other area of life or of matter, whether it be the solar system or molecular structure. It cannot meet the needs of man because it is primarily a method of looking at religion and in its dissection it simply analyzes the antecedents and spiritual fruit which it investigates, and makes man rather than God the center of the universe. Barthianism, while emphasizing God, the Word, Grace, etc., relegates God so far away from the life of man, transplants Him to the periphery of human experience, that in so far as He is related to the individual, God might as well be non-existent.

What then is the answer to the religious needs of man in our day? I think it is what we might well call Mystical religion. By

this I do not mean magic, seances, mystery and all the other fads that popularly sail under that color. By Mysticism I mean definite two-way communion between God and man—a communion that is direct and not necessarily to be had only through the media of legalisms and doctrines; not simply through the process of analysis; nor yet a wishful thinking of an absentee deity, but, definite, personal fellowship with God. In this kind of mystic communion we are guided by Jesus Christ who is the world's supreme mystic.

Throughout his life as we catch glimpses of it in the gospel records, we find him ever seeking to place his life and will at the disposal of his heavenly Father. A few of his mystical experiences have come down to us as for example—at the Baptism, in the Wilderness Temptations, on the morning after his first day of ministry in Capernaum, at the return of the Seventy, at the Transfiguration, in the Garden of Gethsemane and during his Crucifixion. In these experiences we see his soul disclosed as he prostrated himself before his Father. These were moments of transcending importance, for in them he felt new spiritual power surging into his soul to strengthen, guide, and encourage. His mysticism enabled him to live such a life as only he has ever lived —a life of absolute honesty, beauty, purity and love—a life that truly revealed the character of God to humanity.

Jesus' certainty of the spiritual world was ever real. He knew God, not as a theological formula, but as his Father, and sought above all else to be directed and strengthened by him. Yet Jesus knew as well the deepest needs of his fellow men. He loved both God and man more than he did his own life. His mission was to reveal the true nature of God to mankind and to bring men to God. To this great task he dedicated his life. That he was a true mystic is attested by the fact that he never relied upon his own strength or wisdom but sought continuously to receive these things from his Father with whom he communed so intimately.

His authority and clear perception did not come to him from the musty scrolls of the rabbis and Pharisees, nor yet from the tedious repetition of the scribes. They came to him directly from God, and on the authority of his baptismal messianic commission he went forth to teach and preach and heal. His mysticism was vital, born of God, and nurtured in his absolute obedience to the

divine will. "Whatever the topic, the discourse of Jesus moved in the realm of immediate vision, which only the mystic approaches. It would appear then, that although we can trace certain moments of crises in the mystic experiences of Jesus, the great characteristic of his mysticism was his continual living in the atmosphere of the 'Beyond'. In other words, in Jesus the mystic experience was not unusual, but constant and normal."[6] Any view of Jesus' life which fails to come to terms with his mysticism, a factor which played so important and vital a rôle in his life, misses one of the most significant aspects of his personality, without which it is impossible to properly appraise him in history.

This is not a new theology; it is a revitalization of the religious experience which lies at the tap-root of Christianity, for this fellowship with God is the very essence of our faith. Dr. Hocking has well written, "The mystic in action is the prophet. . . . Hence it is that the great mystics have been the great founders, great agitators, ... There are no deeds more permanent than those of Buddha, or Mohammed or Jesus. . . . The deeds of mystics have constituted the hard part of history; the rest has its day and passes."[7]

It must be remembered that Mysticism involves more than mere contemplation. One must not mistake "wallowing in the mire of sentimental bliss" for mysticism. The true mystic arises from his fellowship with God and carries his vision of truth into action. He invites the tests of pragmatism. On the Mount of Transfiguration Peter was so emotionally aroused that he wanted to stay there indefinitely—"Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah." He had been carried away by the transcendent beauty of it all and above all things else, desired to perpetuate that high moment of fellowship with God by remaining aloof from the world. Did Jesus give assent to that suggestion? Not for a moment! It was necessary to go down onto the plains where there

[6] G. A. Barton in Sneath's *At One with the Invisible,* p. 79. New York, 1921.

[7] W. E. Hocking, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience,* p. 511ff. New Haven, 1924.

were hatreds and jealousies and strifes, where there were devil-ridden men to be cleansed, sick to be healed, ignorant to be taught and the poor to have the gospel preached to them. The Transfiguration vision was not complete until it had been brought into the fellowship of humanity. And every mystic experience, like it, must be consummated in action.

Sometimes one hears of people who desire to be known as mystics, but who never do anything about actualizing their religious experience. No engineer ever constructed a bridge by sentimentalizing his technical training. Not until he began to bring his engineering knowledge to play on various forms of inert matter—stone and steel, etc., did he swing his bridge across the chasm. In religion, mysticism reaches its goal when the man who experiences God in spiritual fellowship does something to actualize the vision bequeathed in the moments of silence. Any man who sings the praises of peace and does nothing to help bring peace about, or who lauds the ideals of justice and fair play in commerce and industry yet does nothing to help forward those interests, or who decries unscrupulous politics and is afraid to sully his hands by helping to cleanse them—people like that are not genuine mystics, whatever their claims may be. *Genuine mysticism is religion in action,*—but not human action only. Mystical religion demands that men surrender their will to that of God as he reveals it and then honestly seek to accomplish that will.

Now mystical religion is not out to destroy the creeds and theologies of mankind. But it does seek to make them no longer pious and beautifully sonorous phrases. Where these have failed to meet the needs of men in the quest for vital religion, mysticism seeks to reinterpret them or else to restate the theological bases of our faith.

We should bear in mind that the Church has ever emphasized mystical religion. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is referred to in liturgical literature as "the mystical exhibition of His offering made once, but of force always to put away sin." Through the sacrament men are led into a relationship by which, if they yield themselves completely to it, they are brought face to face with God to enjoy this fellowship about which we have been thinking now. The Church is frequently the means by which men are

brought into the presence of God, but whether or not they actually share the Presence is a matter of their individual relationship to God. Then the Church goes a step further—after one has entered into communion with God it becomes the medium through which he can work to help bring about the Kingdom of God. Such mysticism, obviously, is both an individual and a social experience. There is joy in the personal communion with God, and there is likewise joy through serving men in carrying out the practical social workings of the experience.

Several forces in America have brought us to the necessity of a further consideration of mystical religion. These are, The National Preaching Mission, The Oxford Group Movement, and the ever present revivalistic influence.

No one who spent several days in sympathetic hearing of the national missioners can help but realize that these men and women have definitely touched reality. They have found contact, stood face to face, with God. Theirs is not a religion merely of doctrines and laws, nor yet of objective analysis and investigation, nor is it a matter of relegating God to the farthermost periphery of his creation. Theirs is a religion that has found and seen and heard God. They have been touched with divine power. There was a time three centuries ago when science was descriptive. Men described the world and nature and themselves. Then they began to apply science, by harnessing it to nature, and produced machines. Right now a great deal of our religious life is in the descriptive stage. But it must be extricated from purely intellectual formulations and put to work, made dynamic. God must be allowed to work more completely in our personal and social life. Once we allow Him to dominate our life by the purposive removal of barriers which have been allowed to come between Him and us, we enable religion to become dynamic.

The second factor urging the further investigation of mysticism is the Oxford Group Movement. One does not have to agree with everything about the Oxford Groups to admit that there is here ample evidence that many people in the Groups have touched reality through their religious surrender. These people take time each day for communion with God, seeking to ascertain the divine plan and direction for themselves constantly. Changes wrought

in the lives of some of these people through the influence of the Groups adequately testify to our skeptical generation that there is a power to which these people have made adjustment and are made better in proportion to the degree in which they allow it to work in them.

We have ever been aware of the revivalistic influence in Protestantism. In this form of religious expression there is an underlying search for God, a desire to enter into close fellowship with Him. This is a form of mysticism. The danger of the revivalistic expression of religion is that it frequently spends itself in ecstatic emotionalism, without bearing a corresponding fruit in the actual social regeneration of men with which real Christianity must be vitally concerned. True mysticism eventuates in actual fellowship with God and in really trying to fulfill the divine calling.

Thus, the National Preaching Mission with its nation-wide impact, and the Oxford Group Movement with its emphasis on the quiet hour and obedience to the direction of God, and the revivalistic influences which point men to a spiritual reality beyond themselves,—these are all witnesses to the fact that there is definitely a spiritual ferment going on in America today. I am constrained to believe that this is not just a surface movement, but that it has its roots deep down in the spiritual nature of men and women. It is accordingly not so discernible a movement as Fundamentalism or Modernism or Barthianism, but it is none the less real. This spiritual ferment is taking the form and must continue to increasingly take the form of mystical religion, a touching of the human and the divine, by which the human enters into definite relationship with the divine, deriving from God guidance and power and fellowship.

Sometimes there are those who question the possibility of mankind ever coming to ascertain the divine will. Never having had such an experience themselves they question it in others as well. This skeptical attitude even develops into ridicule and denial of the reality of the mystical experience.

There has come to the attention of the scientific world within the past decade some remarkable findings in the field of parapsychology. Through objective and impartial investigations it has

been scientifically demonstrated that there is such a thing as clairvoyance. It has long been known that telepathy is more than a pipe-dream. Now we learn that both clairvoyance and telepathy are realities. It is possible for man to learn something of his objective world without the use of his physical senses. Alexis Carel in his book, *Man The Unknown,* declares in no uncertain terms that man can have communication with man without the use of the physical organs of communication—sight, touch, speech, hearing, etc. To be sure, only the beginnings have been made in the investigations of telepathy and clairvoyance, but there is already evidence enough to demonstrate their reality. Further investigations will in all probability bring some startling revelations to light.

Since it is now demonstrably true that man can enter into communication with man through mental processes alone, how much more convincing it is that man can enter into definite, two-way communion directly with God. We have not needed to await a scientific demonstration of this fact for men down through the ages have known it through experience—Moses at the Burning Bush, Isaiah in the Temple, Jesus on many occasions, Paul on the Damascus Road, aboard ship, in Corinth, etc., St. Francis of Assisi on Mount Averno, Sadhu Sundar Singh and Toyohiko Kagawa frequently, not to mention mystics of non-Christian or non-Jewish religions. These mystics through the ages have actually experienced God as definitely, and perhaps even more definitely, than we experience each other in our daily fellowship and work and play.

Mystical religion is not a cult of the bizarre. It is not a form of magic or mystery *per se,* nor is it a type of autosuggestion. It is a religion of spiritual reality. And it is this emphasis in religion toward which men are moving, away from the theologies and theological insistences of the past. The mystical religion toward which we are moving will combine the spiritual best of Fundamentalism, Modernism and Barthianism—it will still be loyal to the highest that we know, but this will be based upon an inner rather than upon an external authority. It will be a religion that welcomes investigation of all the phenomena and accessories of religion. And it will be above all a religion that

enables man to find God personally as Jesus found Him in the Garden of Gethsemane.

Mystical religion is the religion of inner assurance, of complete submission to the Father's will. It is a religion of action, not of mere contemplation, for it enables the man who possesses it to know God as an Unseen Comrade, fighting in the battles of life with him, not taking his place, but helping him to accomplish what has been revealed to him as the will of God. A man with mystical religion has a power that nothing can destroy, a peace that no storm can disquiet, for like Barak of old, he knows that the very stars in their courses are fighting his particular Sisera. Such a man lays stress upon the value and validity of mystic religious experience.

It is this goal of communion with God which the troubled life of man in his modern world is seeking, and toward which he casts longing eyes.

Fort Washington, Pa.

YOUTH AND THE CHURCH

Fred D. Wentzel

How powerful is the Church in the life of modern youth? What adaptations in philosophy and in program would increase its power? These are the major questions with which we propose to deal.

Let us begin by trying to define the kind of power we purpose to exercise in our work with youth. We venture a definition which would not receive universal support, but which probably represents the prevailing mind in the Evangelical and Reformed Church. We want all our young people to know through personal experience the grandeur and the power of the Christian faith. We want this faith to redeem their desires, their attitudes, and their social behavior. We want them to share what Maeterlinck calls "the great expectation," that is, we want them to seek first the Kingdom of God, and to undertake the kind of self-discipline and cooperative action which promise to realize this Christian expectation. We want them to become co-creators with God

of a reverent, brotherly, beautiful world. We want them, in the building of that world, to labor as far as possible with their elders in the Christian fellowship, but we believe it necessary to encourage them to go beyond the timidities, the fears, the prejudices, and the complacencies which invariably impede in the older generation the free course of the will of God.

Now, to what extent are we succeeding in these purposes? May we not modestly claim that our young people are more kindly in disposition, more generous in their responses to need, more reverent in their attitudes toward nature and toward persons, and more aware of the presence of God in human affairs than their non-religious associates? Perhaps their level of attitude and conduct is higher also in choosing vocations, in cultivating friendships, in establishing homes, in assuming responsibility as citizens, although in these areas there is much reason to believe that their lives are fashioned by custom and tradition more than by the constraints of religion. When we go on to examine the influence of the Church in arousing social concern, in developing an intelligent but intense dissatisfaction with the vulgarities, the iniquities and the fratricides of the community, in creating a persistent desire for righteousness in the larger group relationships which assume immeasurable significance today and in planning with young people a rational, courageous program for the redeeming of society, we must confess comparative impotence. In his recent book, "Christ's Way and the World's," Henry Smith Leiper says: "Communism, which up to 1918 existed only as a radical theory for social reorganization, has captured one-sixth of the habitable area of the globe and directs the destinies of more than a tenth of the human race. Even more serious is the fact that, in our world, the enthusiastic, affirmative, forward-looking masses of youth are not to be found in the Christian Church so much as in the rising religions of Communism and hypernationalism—notably in Russia and Germany."

Are we more successful in developing appreciation for beauty and the will to make the new world more beautiful than the old? Our high schools and our colleges emphasize art, music and great literature, and the present generation is partly for this reason interested in beauty and in the skills of the artist to a degree that

would in past years have been thought impossible. Beauty in color and form and song and ritual is changing the patterns of worship in many churches. Our young people are slowly, and sometimes against the will of those in power, introducing into their study and worship, and into their recreational programs, the beauty of poem and drama and music, and the graceful movements of the folk-dance. But for vast numbers of our youth, beauty is still alien to religion. This is especially true of natural beauty. In his recent visit to America, Kagawa took occasion to explore with some of his audiences the religious resources of flowers and trees and stones and stars. It is refreshing to see how this versatile leader interprets beauty as a means of grace.

How much our young people are strangers to nature is obvious to any one who works with them in camps and summer schools. Here are little green grasses lifting in their hands the dew-impearled gossamer of the spider's web, towering trees made musical by the winds, streams singing songs down rock-strewn valleys, scarlet tanagers flashing their bright bodies in the sun, clouds rolling majestically into ever changing shapes, clean rain splashing on dusty roads and swelling streams to torrents, still nights made mysterious and awesome by stars and the moon and the white mists on the meadows,—and many of our campers are at first indifferent, or afraid, or blind to the glory of God in all this lavish and marvelous beauty of the world. So some of our young people are indifferent, or afraid, or blind in the presence of the ugliness of weeds and litter in streets and fields, of rickety houses in villages and slums, of little children bent and warped by early and wracking labor, of young men herded into bread lines while farmers destroy their corn and wheat, of old men separated from their wives and imprisoned in the poor house, of brothers dashing out the brains of brothers on the field of battle. The artist's surrender to beauty, the artist's revulsion at ugliness,—these might be made part of our religious culture, enlarging and enriching personality and adding momentum to the urge for a more godly society, but the Christian Church has scarcely begun to make such artistic resources available to its youth.

We seem, then, to have considerable success in establishing the habits of a personal piety in our youth, some success in influenc-

ing the decisions they make and the activities they undertake as members of social groups, and little success in creating the prophetic disposition and in developing the concerns and the skills of social rebuilders. Let us look first at our program and then at our philosophy in an effort to discover how we might increase the power of the Church.

One of the most striking facts about the present life of our congregations is the fact of division, the tendency to isolate youth from other age-groups. Partly because of the insistence of youth leaders, partly because of the stubborn traditions of adults and partly because of the contemporary mind-set of young people themselves, we have built high walls between the older and the younger members of our churches. Certainly youth ought to be encouraged to develop leadership within its own ranks, to exercise initiative and to draw upon its own resources, but it is surprising to see how many congregations take it for granted that the best policy with reference to young people is to let them proceed independently and in isolation. Two things must be said about this common assumption. The first is that it violates a law of life and of religion. The second is that it effectively denies to young people a place in the comprehensive fellowship of the church which would give them opportunity to bring to the Christian enterprise their vision, their idealism, their wisdom and their practical ability.

Consider for a moment the law which a policy of isolation violates. We learn through association far more than we learn through deliberate teaching. There is in every family a spirit, a disposition, a way of facing life which gradually permeates and possesses the child. This spirit may occasionally be interpreted in words, but more frequently it operates in silence. What is true of the family is true of the congregation. The attitudes and the concerns of historic Christianity live and move in the older members of our churches. How then can we expect to wield power in the life of the young if we insist on giving them a place of their own and a program of their own, and leave them severely alone? It is idle to believe that the strategy of Abraham and Lot can solve what we call the young people's problem, or bring to our young people whatever gifts of insight and love and devotion the older generation may have.

We need to think very seriously of the fact that division and isolation deny to young people a responsible share in the life and the work of the Church. When they feel, as many of them do, that we regard them as children, that we ask them only to pass hymnals during the church service and to distribute flowers afterward, that we do not really want them to be partners in determining policies and formulating programs, how can we hope that the Church will have a large and continuing influence in the directing of their lives? Young people and adults need to be together far more than our departments and societies and special youth services assume, but in being together their relationships must be governed, not by the ways of condescension or domination or toleration, but by the ways of fellowship. Both the temper of modern youth and the principles of the Christian religion indicate that we must greatly readjust the common methods of church administration if we are to assure the Church power over the affections and the loyalties of the young. However difficult it may be, democracy alone will satisfy youth's hunger for recognition.

When we commit ourselves to according youth a democratic share in governing the Church and in carrying out its enterprises, we are not yielding to the illusion that youth has a peculiar wisdom, a unique courage, a native radicalism which, if given leeway, would save the world. Youth possesses indeed a reckless energy and a certain detachment from customs and institutions, but these peculiar qualities may be converted to evil ends as readily as to good ends. An editorial in the Winter, 1936 edition of "Radical Religion" probably expresses the mind of many youth leaders: "Since the war we have heard much of the special resources of youth, as youth, in solving the problems of the world. . . . Yet in most of the universities of the world today the majority of the students are devotees of a cult of romantic reaction. In fascist countries they drive their more liberal professors from the academic chair. Youth is easily corrupted. One of the saddest aspects of contemporary culture is that decadent cults which win only the qualified allegiance of the mature are able to claim the fanatic loyalty of the younger people."

A second aspect of our present program which militates against power among the young, is our general and unwarranted trust in

organization. How can young people marshal their energies for great ends when they belong to classes, leagues, guilds, dramatic societies, scout troops, clubs, choirs, each organization subtracting a little from the total until the youth fellowship practically ceases to exist? Perhaps the chief reason for the multiplying of organizations lies in our lack of clear, unifying purposes. It is amazing to observe how many groups carry on routine programs, now with zeal, now with something akin to despair, but seldom with the urge of powerful ideals. The young people of a congregation organize because they see the young people of another congregation organizing, or because their elders think a certain type of organization is essential, or because some regional or national group exerts pressure for the establishing of one more local church unit. Comparatively few organizations grow from within, from a deep sense of need in the experience of youth.

It ought to be recognized, as we look forward to the building of a youth program for the merged Church, that whereas we suffer in the local church from over-organization, we suffer in the denomination from under-organization. This is particularly true of the Reformed branch of our union. Except as they touch youth of other congregations and other denominations in the occasional conferences of area Sunday School associations, Christian Endeavor unions and summer schools and camps, our young people think and labor for the most part in the provincial terms of the local congregation. One of the chief contributions of the camp to the religious education of our youth is in its broadening of vision and interest and friendship and effort, in its creating of a fellowship that transcends the narrow limits of one church or of a small group of churches in the same community. There is a source of power in area and national groups which afford opportunity for association on a wide basis and in a variety of activities but avoid top-heavy and ironclad organizational forms, of which we ought to avail ourselves in the future.

Again, we limit our power with youth by the theoretical education which we practice. Let us go immediately to illustrations. There is a growing appreciation of the need of young people for sane religious guidance with reference to friendship and the building of a home. We are coming to recognize that the Church

cannot transfer to the high school, the college and the writers of books and pamphlets its responsibility in this field. Therefore, we introduce into our church school literature and into our materials for young people's societies, rather timid and often superficial attempts to acquaint young people with the facts that they need in order to achieve the finest physical and emotional and spiritual maturity. How is our ineffective policy of theoretical education illustrated in our program for friends and home-builders? Mostly by our cleaving to the tradition that in our classes and clubs young men and women must meet separately, and by our insistence that friendship and marriage should not be discussed in mixed groups. We want our boys and girls to learn how to live together, but we try to educate them by keeping them apart. Many of our colleges are in this respect no wiser and no more powerful than our churches. Coeducational camps are still in the minority, although almost every camp includes courses on what are called "boy-girl relationships." It is incredible that such fearful, theoretical, abstract educational policies can to any considerable extent achieve their ends.

Suppose we agree that the Church should aim to develop appreciation of beauty, particularly the beauty of the natural world. How do we proceed? Usually it is on a theoretical basis. We seldom bring nature into the church, save at harvest home services, and we do not take the church out into nature. It would be an unusual, though exalting experience for our city congregations to observe their harvest home services on some high hill in the open country, overlooking the valleys where the marvelous, eternal drama of seed-time and harvest is enacted,—and what educational process could be more reasonable? If we wish to use the religious possibilities of the natural world, we must emphasize more generally and enthusiastically the place of the summer camp in our program, for the camp bears a threefold witness to God: it interprets the Christian tradition in ways that are meaningful for our young people today; it aims to make the life of reverent fellowship attractive by a joyful practice of it; and through the clean, beautiful, mysterious forms and processes of nature it helps the camper discover his own place in the universe and the greater place of a living, creating, wonderful God.

Think of one more illustration of our theoretical education. The history of our own country, and the startling campaign of one European nation to create a religion based on racial purity, have made many leaders of the Church conscious of the urgent necessity for moving in the direction of interracial fellowship. Some of our young people are more excited about this necessity than their elders. How do we proceed? We study such books as "Blind Spots," by Leiper, and "The Story of the American Negro," by Brown. We use Negro Spirituals in some of our worship. But we take care to keep the Negro himself at long range. When a missionary society in one of our mid-western states invites a Negro leader to speak at an evening meeting, not a single home in the city will give him lodging for the night. When a Negro educator of national reputation addresses one of our Synodical conferences, a minister becomes so agitated that he walks out, berating those who presume to permit this member of the despised race to proclaim the gospel at a meeting of his white superiors. When three Negro girls appear as fraternal delegates at our National Conference on Christian Education at Lakeside, Ohio, a minister asks, "What are these people doing here? We don't have any Negro churches, do we?" When a Negro boy attends one of our Intermediate camps, a church woman objects, "The very thought of allowing 'niggers' to come to a Reformed Church camp!" Now, leaving to one side for the moment the claims made upon us by the religion of reconciliation which we profess, reason and common sense compel us to believe that we will not achieve internal fellowship in America without an experimental association of representatives of various races. Studying missionary courses in the local church and at missionary conferences may be nothing more than a Don Quixote romance unless it is supplemented by activities that are personal and vital.

We have multiplied illustrations because it seems to us that we have here one of the major explanations of the limited power of the modern Church in the life of youth. A vital as over against a theoretical education would require more energy and resourcefulness and time, and expose us to greater inconvenience and peril. Yet the conclusion is inescapable that the Church cannot be very powerful with young people when its leaders are content

to study books, to coin maxims, to invent generalizations, to pass resolutions, in a word, to go through the motions of a monastic education which is not energetic, or adventurous, or wise or religious enough to interpret Christianity, not as an opportunity to elaborate and rehearse theories, but as a guide to the difficult business of reverent, fraternal living.

Finally, the roots of our weakness lie in the irrelevance of our program. To great numbers of young people, it seems that the Church does not greatly care about their crucial interests. They need jobs, and get little assistance from the Church for finding their way in our economic wilderness. They are worried about marriage, and discover few guides in the congregation. They organize an interracial youth fellowship, and are discouraged by ministers and other adults in their churches who are aloof or hostile. They employ a non-violent technique in a hosiery mill strike because they are convinced that this in the Christian way to gain just ends, but they report that the leaders of their classes and societies and congregations call them queer and regard them as dangerous. They organize a cooperative buying club, and are denied a place of meeting. Thus they come to the conclusion that their practical problems and their deepest enthusiasms receive scant attention and niggardly support in the Christian Church. Most of the lessons they are asked to study in their church schools, many of the topics they are invited to discuss in their societies, some of the sermons they hear from their pulpits appear to them partially or wholly irrelevant. They are not vital. They do not matter. They are exotic and inconsequential. If one is moved to think these sentiments extreme and unjustified, he has only to visit a number of churches and observe what is actually happening. In voicing such judgments our young people may be generalizing on the basis of limited experience, but that there is a real basis for their attitude is beyond question. Only a few weeks ago, we visited a rural church in Ohio. The lesson for the day had to do with Cain and Abel. For a full half hour, the members of the class which we attended reviewed the ancient story of the offerings of the two brothers, one of which was accepted by God, the other rejected. It did not seem to occur to the teacher that the Biblical record might have bearing on current life. Just

two weeks before the class met, brothers had killed brothers when police charged a group of marching pickets near a steel mill in South Chicago. Brothers were killing brothers in Spain. Whatever light the old story had to shed on these modern events was kept hidden under the bushel of an irrelevant discussion. Can we wonder that young people go away from such meetings with a feeling of relief that they can now proceed to things that really matter, or with a feeling of disappointment that the Church has fallen so far short of a significant ministry to their present tragic needs?

Some adaptations in philosophy which might tend to make the Church more powerful in its dealing with young people, are suggested in our analysis of the weak characteristics of its present program. We need to rethink the meaning of reverent fellowship as a goal toward which all churchly efforts should be directed, and as a valid method in the management of the Church's affairs. The practice of Christian fellowship would make it impossible for adults to isolate young people, or to exercise lordship over them, or to offer them unimportant tasks and an insignificant place in the councils where basic policies are determined. It is encouraging to notice that where churches and denominations regard young people, not as inferiors or as wards, but as fellows, there is an eager response.

We need in our philosophy to subordinate organization to the clarifying and achieving of Christian purposes. Only so can we liberate our young people from the treadmill of a multiplicity of routine meetings, and our leaders from the necessity of spending precious energy on maintaining forms that have lost their religious vitality. The passing of an organization is frequently an occasion, not for sorrow, but for rejoicing. As our vision widens and our programs change, the number and the form of our organizations must change, lest they become an impediment to progress. But our concern that organization must always be the means for realizing the great ends of the Christian religion in individual life and in the life of the world, should not blind us to the necessity for the kind of organization which promises to bind the youth of our merged Church into a comprehensive, purposeful fellowship, nor should it stand in the way of our joining with young people

of other denominations in the united movement which goes by the name of Christian Youth Building a New World.

We need in our philosophy to emphasize vital as over against verbal education. This is a perennial necessity for the religious person and the religious institution. We face continually the temptation to rest our case on verbal formulations, to believe that we have met an issue when we have reached a theoretical conclusion about it, to be content with reading books about people who are different from ourselves when we ought to be rubbing elbows with them and subjecting our spirits and our habits to the discipline of Christian readjustment. The struggle of little children with the hard and cruel facts of our sinful society is less immediate and terrible than the struggle of youth, but for them as well as for our young people, an education which does not experiment with life is either fruitless or mischievous. A *powerful* religious education must be a *vital* religious education.

Lastly, we need in our philosophy of church work with young people, to rethink the relationship between the meditative and the active aspects of religion. The feeling on the part of youth that what we do in the Church is irrelevant to their primary interests and their deepest enthusiasms, arises partly from our preoccupation with the "conscious and deliberate turning of the mind to God in prayer, thanksgiving and meditation," which is one side of the religious life, and our relative disregard of the other side, which is "a surrender of the whole life with all its activities to the will of God." We are not uninterested in the jobs that youth vainly seek, the recreation that they desire, the problems of friendship and marriage which vex them, their interracial fellowships, their non-violent strike techniques, their concern about cooperatives, but we are so much interested in worship and in what we call the cultivation of religious habits, that we have too little time left to guide young people in religiously ordering their daily lives. In one of the Oxford Conference books, entitled, "The Church and Its Function in Society," J. H. Oldham writes: "The difficulty has its roots in the fact that the church as an organized society is distinguished from other forms of human association by its concern for worship and teaching. . . . These are not simply particular forms of human activity, but acts constituting the being of the church. But it is disastrous

if the truth that the ministry of the Word and the administration of the sacraments constitute the church and that it is the performance of these acts that differentiates it from other human activities, leads us to suppose that worship is the whole or the characteristic business of the church. The church is a worshipping community. But it is at the same time a company of redeemed persons transplanted into a new sphere of life in which their actions are determined by new principles. The God whom the church worships is a God who has a will and a purpose for the world. The business of the church is to do God's will, and the place where it has to be done is in the world. The church as an organized society is not an end in itself, though we are always tending in practice, if not in theory, to make it an end in itself. It exists for the sake of the world, and it is fulfilling the purpose of its existence in the measure that through its worship it is alive and operative in the world. . . . We stand before a great historic task—the task of restoring the lost unity between worship and work."

If our churches take seriously the united movement, Christian Youth Building a New World, they may go far toward the performance of what Oldham calls "a great historic task." For this movement is fundamentally the whole purpose and program of the Christian Church, interpreted in terms that are meaningful and appealing to young people in our contemporary world. It comprehends insights and emphases that are both meditative and active, individual and social, theological and practical, local and international. It is concerned about the development of personal religious living; it is equally concerned with the achievement of the Christian way of life in the stimulating but terrific environment which the world now presents. To make it our own would give us some assurance that the work of our churches would not be considered by young people either divisive, or formal, or theoretical or irrelevant. Energetic and hopeful, but fearfully beset by uncertainties and perplexities from within, and from without by the evil principalities and powers of this world, our young people desire nothing more earnestly than that we should walk with them in reverence and in brotherhood toward that kingdom of God which they choose to call the New World. May God give us faith and wisdom, love and courage, so to walk.

Philadelphia, Pa.