

Volume XIII

JANUARY

Number 1

Bulletin

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

OF THE

REFORMED CHURCH IN THE

UNITED STATES

EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED CHURCH



LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

1942

CONTENTS

<i>Seminary News Items</i>	1
<i>Pulpit Vacancies and Ministerial Salaries</i>	4
<i>Jesus and the Modern World</i>	11
<i>Some Religious Factors in a Christian Education</i>	30
<i>The Timelessness of Preaching</i>	37

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

President Theodore F. Herman, Managing Editor; Professor David Dunn, Business Manager.

Office of Publications: 519 Pine St., Lancaster, Pa.

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

BULLETIN

Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States

VOLUME XIII

JANUARY, 1942

NUMBER 1

SEMINARY NEWS ITEMS

The October issue of *The Bulletin* carried a brief statement regarding the opening exercises of the Seminary on Tuesday, September 30, and the personnel of the incoming class. It was not possible at that time to report the Field Work assignments of the new Juniors. Messrs. Baum, Gregory, Groff, Lander, Longsdorf, Musser, Nagle, Rahn, Seldomridge, and Snyder are becoming acquainted with social service theory and practice under the supervision of one of the head case-workers of the Lancaster Community Service Association. The remaining men are fulfilling a variety of responsibilities in churches of our denomination in Lancaster city and county. Mr. Boyer is at Willow Street five miles south of the city. Mr. Keiser is at Grace Church, Eden. Mr. Light is at Millersville. Mr. Voll is at Rohrerstown. Messrs. Danner, Koehler, Stauffenberg, Weaver, and Whitebread are working respectively within First, Faith, St. John's, St. Peter's, and St. Luke's churches of the city. The cooperation of those who make this program of Field Work possible is sincerely appreciated.

* * * * *

The Society of Inquiry has had an unusually active season this fall. The first major event was the reception of the new students, which was given in the dormitory lounge on October 8. The reception was as usual a good mixture of fun and seriousness—with perhaps an extra measure of the latter this year because of the gravity of the world situation. Mrs. William H. Bollman, wife of the pastor of First Church in Lancaster, addressed one of the meetings of the Society on the subject, "The Duties of a Minister's Wife." At another meeting the speaker was the Rev. Charles Webber of the Social Action Commission of

the Methodist Church. His topic was, "Can a Minister Be a Radical?"

The Society was represented by fifteen delegates at the annual conference of the Middle Atlantic Section of the Interseminary Movement, which was held this year on November 6, 7, and 8 at Princeton, N. J. The delegates returned with the good news that the 1942 conference will be held at our Seminary. On November 17 the Society met to hear the reports of its delegates. Mr. Cyrus R. Pangborn, the secretary of the Interseminary Movement, was present at this meeting and spent two days in all with our students.

Not the least of the Society's activities during the past months was the renovation of the dormitory lounge. The administration of the Seminary gave financial aid in the purchase of necessary materials, and the students contributed a good many hours of work. The gymnasium in the dormitory basement is also being reoutfitted with proper athletic equipment.

* * * * *

The entire Seminary family was saddened by the death on November 6 of Mrs. Edward S. Bromer, following a tragic automobile accident a few days previously. The funeral service was held on November 10, and an adjustment in the schedule of classes was made to permit attendance at the service.

* * * * *

A thoroughly enjoyable event was the reception which the professors and their wives tendered the students and their wives—present and prospective—on November 19. The reception line formed in the Board of Visitors room in the main building, after which the assembly adjourned to the refectory for refreshments and an evening of good fellowship. It is to be hoped that a precedent has hereby been set for future years.

* * * * *

The Wednesday chapel services this fall had as guest preachers a number of our Evangelical and Reformed pastors from the immediate vicinity, as well as clergymen of sister denominations. The presence and the messages of these men have been much appreciated by both students and faculty.

The Evangelical and Reformed Ministers' Association of Lancaster City and County was instrumental in affording the Seminary a most meaningful introduction to the Christmas season. On December 9 the Association presented the pageant-play, "Christmas in Coventry," in the Seminary Chapel. The two scenes depicted first a bereaved Coventry family gathered in their home for an evening meal following the devastating bombings of a year ago, and then the people of the community assembled amid the ruins of their cathedral for a Christmas service. At the close of the play the ministers and their wives and the Seminary family enjoyed a brief Christmas party. The play was repeated the following evening for the benefit of the membership of our congregations within the community.

—N. C. H.

PULPIT VACANCIES AND MINISTERIAL SALARIES

SCOTT R. WAGNER

The subject of this paper has two parts—one relating to the placement of pastors and the other relating to ministerial salaries or, what I presume is more definitely intended, some adjustment toward the equalization of pastors' salaries.

In regard to the first section of the subject, let me review the function of the Placement Committee as provided in the Constitution of our Church. The Constitution says, in By-law 66, that when a pastor desires to change his pastoral relationship, he shall communicate with a Placement Committee through its Chairman. The President of the Synod is automatically the Chairman of the Placement Committee. Further, if the congregation or charge desires a change of pastor, the Consistory or Church Council, through its secretary, shall send a written request, with a statement of reasons for the same, to the Chairman of the Placement Committee. When a resignation has been duly accepted, the Synod or Synodical Council shall dissolve the pastoral relationship and declare the pulpit vacant. In Article 65 of the By-laws, it is the apparent hope that the Placement Committee may be able to fill a vacant charge very speedily. The article states that in order that every congregation or charge may have a pastor and every minister have a charge, the Placement Committee shall cooperate in an endeavor to fill all vacancies as quickly as possible. In Article 68, it is stated that, whenever a change of pastor seems advisable for the welfare of the congregation or of the pastor, or in the interest of the Church at large, the Placement Committee shall effect the change, but only after due conference with both parties and with the approval of either or both. The words "the Placement Committee shall effect the change" constitute a very misleading statement. The Placement Committee does not have the power or authority to simply declare that a certain pastor is to be released from his present pastoral office and be transferred to another charge. It was (I believe) the thought of the makers of the Constitution that in some unusual and mysterious way the Placement Committee could relieve pastors from their charges when it was the desire of the pastors to be transferred to another

charge. But the makers of the Constitution somehow did not keep in mind that the congregation must be willing to accept a man before the Placement Committee can do very much about the transfer. And, according to the Constitution, the congregation must nominate a candidate for the office of pastor and must hold an election for him on a particular pre-determined day. The congregation, therefore, and not the Placement Committee, is the authority as to whom they will call for their next pastor. It is true the Placement Committee can confer with the consistory of a vacant charge, but the Placement Committee cannot compel the consistory to place in nomination any man recommended by the Committee. The influence which the Placement Committee can have, depends largely upon the confidence which the vacant charge may have in the judgment of the Placement Committee.

After an experience of more than two years, as Chairman of the Placement Committee of the Potomac Synod, it is my judgment that all that we can do is to sit with the consistory and furnish them with such information as we may have at hand or may have been able to obtain about a given number of pastors who would be glad to have their names submitted. The Placement Committee of our Synod does not try to unduly persuade any consistory. It functions as a unit to help the consistory to avoid making a mistake, and even here there is a very delicate matter at stake because the Placement Committee would not like to assume that it had the judgment to refuse to recommend any person who would like to be recommended to a vacant charge. One of the Synods petitioned the General Synod last year to compel the Placement Committee to place every applicant's name before the consistory of the vacant charge. In a way this has been done frequently in our Synod. In one case there were more than one hundred applicants for an opportunity to appear for a trial sermon. Naturally, the consistory in this instance could not know about the men or their background. The Placement Committee was able to furnish information in regard to their former pastorates and in regard to their educational qualifications and other such matters which do not require any discerning judgment, but are only a matter of record. The consistory then in conference with the Placement Committee laid aside one applicant after an-

other until the number had been reduced to five. The congregation then sent committees to hear these five men in their home pulpits, and out of that experience one was selected and was in due course of time nominated, elected, and installed as pastor.

On the other hand, there are some charges that become vacant that very few ministers desire to serve. In such cases the Placement Committee may challenge certain men as to whether or not they would consider a call to serve in such a field. Small rural charges do not have many ministers seeking to serve them, and yet the Placement Committee has been able, in our Synod and I think in every other Synod, to find some man who is both willing and qualified to serve.

The Constitution seems to stress the idea that the important part of placing pastors in congregations is for the benefit of the pastors themselves, whereas I think we ought to keep in mind that the congregation or charge is the more important phase of the work to be considered. The pastor exists for the purpose of serving a charge. A charge does not exist for the purpose of serving a pastor. Naturally the two must work together in cooperation and as far as possible in harmony. But the pastor's office is an office of serving the church, and therefore the welfare of the congregation is of first importance.

In the case of a dispute or a disagreement between a pastor and a congregation, the interests of both are to be conserved as far as possible, but the congregation's interest and welfare are of more importance than the individual pastor's need. The preservation of the congregation must in all cases as far as possible be the uppermost question in mind.

There used to be, in the Church, a rather wide-spread feeling, on the part of ministers, that there was some virtue other than human in the idea of a call, both to the ministry and a particular call to a particular charge. We somehow seem to be losing sight of the fact that God may still have something to do with the action of a charge in calling a certain man to become its pastor. It seems to me that while it is perfectly proper to use a Placement Committee and to secure as many letters of recommendation and endorsement as possible, pastors should still keep in mind that God calls those whom He chooses to serve Him in His Church.

Out of an experience in the ministry for 41 years, it is my judgment that many ministers who would like to leave a field for what would be perhaps a more promising field from various viewpoints, would do well not merely to keep in mind the factor of God, but also to keep in mind that some things come to pass as a reward for labor well done. Ministers in their early years and often all through lifetime so fail to improve themselves that they are denied opportunities for service in other or larger fields. It is a common observation that men who studied as hard as they could after their graduation, who kept themselves growing, and who kept themselves in touch with the life of the Church, and so improved their talent,—that such men had no need of assistance in being able to have a call to some other charge. A great number of men have risen to fairly high positions in the Church, who never ask anyone for a recommendation, but who, aside from building their own personal equipment to a higher degree, also served so thoroughly in the pastoral office that a reputation was attained for both ability and for faithful service. If every pastor, after he is ordained, would set himself to determine to grow, there would not be much need for the sometimes complicated work of the Placement Committee. Pastors who are anxious for a change, would do well to have someone who would be frank enough and honest enough to point out to them certain evident shortcomings, evident not to themselves perhaps, but evident to others. For example, a couple of years ago a certain minister called upon a certain layman in a vacant charge, seeking to have this layman use his influence to secure for him a hearing. This layman, who is a professional man and occupies a place of importance in his chosen field of work, said, in talking about the instance, that the man had many spots on his clothing which were more than one day old. That may seem to be a trifling thing, but after all it is an important matter that a minister keep himself reasonably well groomed if he is to receive proper consideration in his personal contacts.

Shortly after the Potomac Synod adjourned last June, I received a letter from one of the delegate elders who is by profession a lawyer, and who faithfully attended all the sessions of the Synod. He had this to say in his letter about the meeting of

Synod: "I am of the impression that about 25% of the ministers are doing an excellent job, that 25% are doing a very poor job, and about 50% are doing a fair job that could be done much better." In reply to that letter, I said as follows:

"I am very glad to have you express yourself in regard to the degree of industry and efficiency amongst the clergy. Your evaluation of it is about the same as mine. I am not unmindful that something of a similar division may be made in regard to every other profession or occupation, but the one thing that grows out of the matter of the varying degrees of work amongst the clergy, is that it becomes almost impossible to accomplish anything about a uniform salary for pastors. There are no doubt some pastors who really do work hard and receive only a small compensation, but I am convinced there are other pastors who do not even try to improve themselves, and much less try to become more efficient in their work. And the same type of indifference to hard work lies back of the fact that many charges do not pay much on their apportionment."

This naturally leads to the second phase of the subject of this paper—the matter of adjusting pastors' salaries.

The Committee on Christian Social Action made a somewhat extensive report to the last General Synod, which you will find in the Blue Book. This Committee was unable to arrive at any definite conclusion as to how the matter of salaries might become more equitable. Suggestions have been made that pastors who receive more than a certain amount (say \$1,500) should be assessed from 1% to 5% of their salary, and that sum turned over to some central committee who would make appropriations out of such assessment for the benefit of pastors whose salaries are less than \$1,500. All of us are ready to admit that many salaries are entirely inadequate for a minister to properly support himself and his family. And while we are in sympathy with any movement which will bring relief to such pastors as are in need, I think it would be only fair to say (though it may seem somewhat unkind to say it) that if there is to be some form of assessment upon pastors who have larger salaries for the benefit of those who have lower salaries, there should be found some method of finding out whether the man with the lower salary works as hard as the man with the higher salary.

Again here, as in the former part of this paper, the question of hard work is of primary importance. Many ministers in their early ministerial days had a miserably low salary, but they had a tremendous degree of industry, and in the course of a few years they were called to charges where the compensations were more liberal.

We should also keep in mind that living expenses vary to a very large degree in different charges, and the style of living is not always of the pastor's own choosing. If there is a parsonage (and there is in most cases) that parsonage must be furnished and maintained not merely according to the taste or even the ability of the pastor, but certain more or less influential members of the congregation want their pastor and his family to have a certain standing (as they would put it) in the congregation and in the community, and they sometimes compel the pastor to have more expensive furniture than is necessary, and to have certain household assistance (also more than the budget would allow or is necessary) in order that in their social life they may give the impression or have the satisfaction of feeling that their pastor is well cared for and lives on a certain satisfactory scale of life. There are so many things that enter into the question of the salary and how the salary must be used, that it would probably be impossible to have anything like a satisfactory salary scale.

Then it is also important that we keep in mind that there is naturally a difference in the talent of men in every walk of life. Take for example the field of life insurance, where the field is open to any man who desires to enter that kind of work. The amount of compensation received by life-insurance salesmen varies to a very great extent, from the lower round of not being able to make a living, to the upper round where the compensation is very lucrative. And the reason for the variation in income must to a certain large extent be recognized as the result in the difference in ability, as well as perhaps some difference in industry. And in the ministry it is proper to feel that something of the same type of result must occur. In the Potomac Synod the goal has been set that the minimum salary should consist of \$1,500 and parsonage. This goal may never be entirely attained, but it is a goal worth striving for.

In concluding this paper I wish to re-emphasize what has been mentioned in various ways in the paper—that the best assistance a man can have for receiving a call to a charge and for receiving compensation sufficient to meet his needs, is hard work—continuous hard work in rendering service to the congregation, to the church at large, in increasing his own personality stature, all the time keeping a lively faith in the leading and guiding power of God, our heavenly Father.

Hagerstown, Md.

JESUS AND THE MODERN WORLD

OSWIN S. FRANTZ

Between Jesus and the modern world there is a gap in time of about two thousand years. This as history goes is a long time. But far as they are apart in time they have very close connections in other respects. And not a few of us have a deep conviction that the greatest need of our day is a general recognition of the fact that these two factors in history so far apart in years have or should be made to have a very vital connection with each other. To show this vital relationship is the purpose of this paper.

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF OUR MODERN WORLD

The most outstanding characteristic of our modern world is the fact that it is in a state of chaos and confusion. It matters little from what viewpoint one approaches our age the conclusion is the same, confusion and chaos. It should be admitted, of course, that any age is a chaos while one is living in it. It takes a perspective of history to see form or order in any period of time. Accordingly the observer of today's life being denied this perspective is bound to see mostly chaos and confusion. But even allowing for this handicap, no student of our times can escape the conviction that this is a time of chaos and confusion.

There is first of all political confusion. Three outstanding political ideals are fighting either for their own life or for the conquest of the world. They are the well known forms of Fascism, Bolshevism, and Democracy. As long as each of these fought within its own sphere and in its own name one did not have a great deal of difficulty in making his choice. But then came what were thought to be impossible combinations. Nazism joined hands with bolshevism in an effort to overcome capitalism and democracy. Still later democratic Finland joined hands with nazi Germany to fight bolshevistic Russia. And now the United States, avowedly opposed to communism, supports Russia, the home and world wide propagator of communism. Truly confusion worse confounded. Where can a man to-day tender his political loyalty and devotion without qualms of conscience? And the political road to the future is no clearer than the maze

in which national ideals find themselves today. Even we who profess to hold to the ideal of democracy are uncertain as to the course democracy may or must take in order to save itself. The book, *Whither Mankind*, has this significant statement on this matter, "The struggle for political democracy was in most countries long and hard fought. Everywhere, however, its theoretical promise far outran its realizations, substantial as some of these have been. In consequence the instinct of self-preservation in democracy may not be as deep-struck as many serenely assume. Certainly the great experiment has not completely substantiated the Aristotelian conceit that man is by nature a political animal. Concerning the future of law and government in the Western world, as Richard Hooker said of God, no doubt the safest eloquence is silence." The political status reflects confusion and chaos both in its present form and its future outlook.

Moral confusion is equally rampant. Here too absolutes are given up. Truth, justice, and goodness are considered as relatives, not absolutes. Circumstances determine whether they belong to one category or another. Avowed proponents of the validity of certain moral truths a decade ago today advocate the opposite of what they formerly held. "Circumstances are different now" is all that they can answer to those who reprove them for their 'bout face in their stand on moral issues. And when these leaders in moral teachings make such summersaults what but vast confusion must be in the minds of those who have submitted to their leadership. Left to themselves these common folk have no way of knowing whether the circumstances warrant one attitude or another. They have no yardstick with which to measure their moral cloth. Hence this moral confusion.

But more tragic yet is the confusion that prevails in our ideas about man himself. Is he or is he not of noble origin? Is or is not life worth its cost? Is or is not man of value to his day and generation? Wherein lies the worth of personality? Such questions frequently expressed or implied in present day discussions reveal the fact that there is no common conviction on the significance and importance of man as an individual. Our culture seems to reflect a dualism along this line of thought. Professor Sorokin of Harvard University gives us a fine description of this

dualism in our present day culture. He calls attention to the fact that there is that in our culture which glorifies man. In fact he claims that "our culture has become homo-centric, humanitarian, and humanistic par-excellence. Man is its glorious center. It makes him the measure of all things. It exalts him as the hero and the greatest value, not by virtue of his creation by God in God's own image, but in his own right, by virtue of man's own marvelous achievements. It professes a firm belief in the possibility of limitless progress based on man's ability to control his own destiny, to eradicate all social and cultural evils, and to create an even finer and better world." Such a view of man predominating in the minds of many, at least until quite recently, reflects an era of real glorification of man and his culture.

Such confidence in human capacity and human culture, while no longer as prevalent as in former days, still finds expression in a few of our modern writers. One reads the books of Robert Frost and Lewis Mumford and others writing in a similar vein with a feeling of delight because they breathe a spirit of high hope for man the glory of life. Van Wyck Brooke writes of Frost and Mumford thus: "In these men one feels a joyous confidence in human nature, an abounding faith in the will, a sense of the heroic in the human adventure, good will, the leaven of existence." These and others hold to the goodness of human nature. They inspire us to say with Walt Whitman, "Allons the road is before us."

Unfortunately this is only one aspect of our culture and society. There is a darker and even dismal aspect too. This aspect is reflected in our science, our philosophy, our art, our economics, and even our religion. In all of these we find elements that point to the degradation of man rather than his glorification. Berdyaev speaks of this darker aspect of modern life as Dehumanization. "We are witnessing," he says, "the process of dehumanization in all phases of culture and of social life. Above all moral consciousness is being dehumanized. Man has ceased to be the supreme value; he has ceased to have any value at all."

This process of robbing man of his glory has been a steady one and has had a variety of contributors. Science, first of all, had its hand in taking the crown of glory from human nature. Quot-

ing Professor Sorokin again, "Take the contemporary Science and ask how it defines man. The current answers are that man is a variety of electron-proton complex; or an animal closely related to the ape or monkey; or a reflex mechanism; or a variety of stimulus-response relationships; or a psychological bag filled either by libido or basic physiological drives; or a mechanism controlled mainly by stomach and economic forces; or just a *homo faber* manufacturing various tools and instruments, and so on." Such analyses of man, whatever element of truth they may contain, at best leave man in a low estate. Not infrequently scientists go so far in the direction of lowering man as to deprive him even of "mind, of thought, of consciousness, of conscience, of volitions, and reduce him to a pure mechanism of unconditioned and conditioned reflexes." And so when science is through with man much of his glory has departed.

Biographers make their contribution to this deglorification of man by their debunking our great men of the past. One was accustomed when reading biographies to feel that he was keeping company with great men. Now, because of this debunking craze, one lays a biography aside with more or less of a feeling of disappointment brought about by the consciousness that even the so called great were after all very ordinary, if not at times vicious, human creatures.

Novelists for the most part create a similar feeling with respect to human life. Generally speaking they seem to revel in despair. Van Brooks speaks of them in this fashion, "It seems as if our writers passively wallowed in misery, calling it fate, as if the most powerful writers, from James Joyce to Hemingway, from Eliot of the Waste Land to Eugene O'Neill and Theodore Dreiser, were bent on proving that life is a dark little pocket. The intense minds, good or evil, are those that wield the power; and the genius that has moulded the mind of the present is almost wholly destructive; and even where, as in many cases, these writers are fighting for social justice, they still picture life as hardly worth the trouble fighting for it. Their tone is cynical, bleak, hardboiled, hard-bitten and life for them is vain, dark and empty."

The field of Art in so far as sculpture and painting represent it

reflects the same attitude toward the dignity and indignity of man. Sorokin after contrasting the art of today with that honored in the past draws this conclusion: "To be brief, contemporary art is largely a museum of human pathology. It is centered around a police morgue, a criminal's hide out, and the sex organs; it lives and operates mainly in the region of social sewers. If we have to believe contemporary art in its representation of man and his culture, we can hardly have any respect, admiration and adoration for them. To this extent contemporary art is an act of man's debasement and vilification."

To this confusion with reference to our conception of man's dignity and worth religion too makes its contribution. Most of us are quite familiar with that form of thought that makes man but a miserable creature in the sight of God, in and of himself capable of no good or saving work. This "cult of imperfectionism," as Professor Harry Ward calls it, produces in man anything but a zeal for self improvement and effort at social regeneration. Men of this cult argue that the taking of the next possible step in the development of society will bring us face to face with old evils in a new form, and this attitude becomes a substitute for doing anything to make the next step possible. And so we have our age marked by the confusion resulting from the preachments of the promoters of the Social Gospel and these preachers of human imperfection.

And so the story goes on. As one passes from one field of research to another one faces in each case prevailing elements bespeaking human weakness, inefficiency, futility, and degradation. Little wonder then that the observer feels inclined at times to make the sentiment of the Psalmist the cry of his own heart and say, "What is man" that anyone should be mindful of him? Indeed when one considers the treatment that man gets from capitalistic industry, totalitarian nationalism, or materialistic progressivism, one cannot escape the conclusion that these movements do not count man of sufficient worth to be mindful of him.

And all this in the face of age long teachings that man is made in the image of God; that he is the crown of all of God's creations. And in the face also of man's inner conviction of his own worth and destiny and his inner urge and drive for worthwhile goals.

These contrasts, I say, leave him in a state of confusion even concerning his own person or the possible significance of his own life.

II. ATTITUDES RESULTING FROM THESE CHAOTIC CONDITIONS

Out of this melee of confusion have grown certain attitudes that characterize our day. We note first of all the disillusionment of former hopes. It is not so long since we had our hopes built up to the point where social regeneration was believed to be in the offing, economic justice and economic security just around the corner, the outlawry and abolition of war almost an accomplished fact. And then almost suddenly through the catastrophies of war, the hardships of an economic depression, the violation and abrogation of national and international agreements, most of these fine hopes and aspirations were blasted. Little wonder that a general feeling of disillusionment took possession of us.

Disillusionments of this kind naturally lead to an attitude of frustration and pessimism. What chance does life offer one under such devastating conditions? What is the use of working toward some worthwhile ends if these ends themselves are to be brought to naught by the ravages of war and the inhumanities of man? Earnest Tittle in, "Christians in an Unchristian Society," refers to European observers who remark upon the optimism that is still found in the United States where, as one of them has said, "Christians still believe in the efficacy of constructive effort." A European, this same observer declares, "cannot help be somewhat suspicious of any belief in the value, the power, and the efficacy of human or Christian efforts" to improve the world. This pessimism of Europe is not without its reverberations even in this country. Pessimism has the edge on optimism even with many of us. Wilhelm Pauck in the "Crisis of Religion" reflects this pessimism in these words: "It is likely that at all times in human history many men and women have spent their lives unaware of the deeper meanings of existence. But surely there have been few historical periods in which men were so disillusioned about the meaningfulness of life as they are in our own era. A majority of our contemporaries seem to lead the existence of drifters. The worldwide depression is not primarily economic but psychological in character. The morale of presentday mankind is

not that of builders of civilization. There are comparatively few who can say *how* a civilization would be built and there are many who ask *why* it should be built anyway."

With this disillusionment and feeling of pessimism and frustration is mingled also religious doubt and indifference. The moral sanctions and virtues once associated with religion are now generally questioned or altogether denied. Religion has in the minds of many so long been identified with certain of these moralities and virtues now in question that now religion is treated with the same doubt given that which it so long supported. Says Barclay in "The Church and Christian Society": "Religion during long ages of scarcity and the rule of tyranny, insisted that man can live nobly and exemplify in his character the noblest virtues in spite of privation, destitution and crushing poverty, exalted as chief virtues such attitudes as submission, resignation, patience in suffering, humility, and courage in facing the inevitable. But what becomes of these virtues when, in an age of abundance, production constantly tends to outrun consumption, when privation and destitution are no longer inevitable? People to-day know that many of the old virtues in their traditional interpretation have lost significance and vitality." And with this conviction goes an ever increasing doubt and indifference to religion in general.

Another reason given for our present day religious doubt and indifference is modern secularism. Pauck writes thus on this matter: "Now another religious crisis has arisen. There has arisen a secularism which claims to represent the same high moral ideals that Christianity does, but without dependence upon the religious beliefs which are characteristic of the church. Christianity is now face to face with an enemy more dangerous than any of the past. It is an atheistic movement which claims to cultivate moral ideals of the same value as those defended by the church. The modern crisis of religion is therefore caused by the conviction of many of our contemporaries that man can lead the good life without believing in God."

III. IMPERATIVE NEEDS OF OUR MODERN WORLD

If our diagnosis of our modern world is anywhere near correct, certain imperative needs become apparent at once.

First of these needs is faith in the value of a good life. Out of the confusion in the realm of morals referred to above has come a doubt as to the merit of so-called virtue or the value of a good life. This need is expressed by an English writer who gives as the title of his book, "Why Be Good." This title was suggested by the questions young people raised when they came to him for consultation. Why be good? was in the mind and on the lips of many of his inquirers. Attitudes behind such a question reveal a great need. Men need to have assurance that a good life is in every way preferable to an evil life. There can be no progress in human betterment until men have an urge to move toward a good life because of its own attraction. Accordingly for our day need number one is faith in the value of a good life.

With this primary need there goes naturally a second, namely, a higher appreciation of human personality and its destiny. One needs a conception of man that is ennobling, inspiring, challenging. To think that man is no more than a first cousin to the monkey, or a combination of electron-proton complexes, or a cog in the wheel of industry, or a robot in his nation's army, can be a challenging thought to no one. He needs to be challenged with the thought that potentially he is of eternal significance, that there is something more to him than mere flesh and bones and a sensate existence, that there is something akin to the Divine in him in comparison with which the world has nothing of equal worth to man himself. Man needs to have a strong faith in himself.

With this belief in the greatness of personality must go faith in purposeful living. It is not enough to believe that there is purpose in history so that one can say with Tennyson, "Through all the ages one increasing purpose runs." One must also hold to the conviction that the smaller unit which contributes to the making of history also has a purpose. Man needs the conviction of St. Paul "that he is laid hold of by something or some one beyond himself; that he has a goal, a purpose;" and so commanding must this goal and this purpose be that no matter how trying the circumstances accompanying the effort to reach the goal he can and will say with the imperturbable Luther, "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise."

Man needs the further conviction that his individual welfare is inextricably bound up with social well-being. He must be made aware of the "indivisibility of personality and society." He must recognize the "social nature of personality and the personal nature of society." It is only in the working out of that relationship that the synthesis between freedom and discipline, which is the organization problem of modern society, is to be found. And this calls for a fuller knowledge of a better social order and a wiser and more consistent effort to construct the same.

Another outstanding need of our day is a better understanding and a keener sense of sin and evil. One can never deal effectively with opposition until one understands the nature and power of the opposition. An age that has lost the sense of sin and has promoted evil to the almost good will never deal effectively with its strongest and most deceptive foe, namely, sin and evil.

And finally, and perhaps urgent above all others, our age needs faith in God and confidence in His way of life. In the words of Georgia Harkness we may say, "The world needs many things, among them a new economic society and a new international order. But there is nothing that people need so much in these days as to know that the eternal God is our refuge and strength. If we have this faith we can bear anything and find a way to a juster world, without it all our acts are fumbles in the dark." Professor Pauck confirms this conviction when he says, "A new religious sense, built upon a new certainty of God, must bring the spirit of secularism into a crisis. When this event occurs, we shall be saved."

IV. AVAILABLE ASSETS

In the face of such needs one is challenged next to examine the resources available for satisfying these needs. What assets are these times of ours able to set over against these liabilities?

An examination of these assets makes it apparent that our civilization, whatever its present peril, is far from the final stages of bankruptcy. The resources are unlimited and more than able to meet the dire situation of to-day. A few of them we shall pass with a mere mention, taking time to enlarge on only one.

First among the resources of the modern world is New Knowl-

edge. Outstanding in this new knowledge is that which studies in the natural and physical sciences have produced. So prodigious has this new knowledge of the last half century been that want of time forbids even a brief summary of it here. And for the most part this new knowledge has been or can be made an asset to human welfare. Prof. Karl T. Compton in a recent article on "Science has but Started," points out very vividly how science has proved effective in providing the good things of life and in promoting "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." And the end of this contribution of science is not yet. Bruce Bliven in an article in the Reader's Digest on, "The World Shaking Promise of Atomic Research," concludes with these words, "In days to come history may say that the workers in atomic physics expanded human knowledge and benefitted mankind as much as any individuals that ever lived." Says Raymond Fosdick in, "The Old Savage in the New Civilization," "Life in the future will be speeded up infinitely beyond the present. Sources of energy will be tapped and harnessed far outrivalling what we have today. There lies in full view before us a realm of discovery in physical science till now untrodden by mortals even in their dreams."

Such predictions would lead us to believe that the greatest asset for the remedy of our present ills is to be found in the contributions of these natural sciences. However, this asset, valuable as it undoubtedly is, carries with it one great defect, namely, it lacks the power of motivation. It depends upon motivation whether or not this new knowledge will be for good or ill. Scientists who are enthusiastic about the possibilities of good resident in their new knowledge are also fully aware of the futility of the same unless properly used. Accordingly Mr. Bliven supplements his prediction quoted above with this proviso, "This is of course," he says, "on the assumption that man does not in his folly use his new knowledge to destroy himself in the last and most terrible of all wars." This new scientific knowledge which offers such great promise calls for an additional asset before it can make its desired contribution to the solution of the problems of our day. This needed asset is commonly termed religion, or the motivating power of life. Einstein expressed this need when he

said, "Science without religion is lame; religion without science is blind." The great electrical wizard, Steinmetz, several years ago was asked by a reporter in what realm he thought the greatest advance would be made in the next half century. Much to the surprise of the reporter the wizard did not refer to electricity, or physics, or chemistry, but to religion, and said that probably the greatest advance would be in that field because science has already gone so far ahead that it needs an advance in religion to keep the products of science under control for man's good. Professor Harry Ward on the occasion of the celebration of the 25th anniversary of entering the faculty of Union Seminary made this statement, "The working out of a broad collaboration for the continuous renewal of human life in which religion provides the end, the faith and the motivation, while science furnishes the means, has yet to come. Without this cooperative endeavor we shall not provide the economic base that is needed for further human advance."

So this great asset known as new scientific knowledge points to the need of the one asset which we shall discuss later, namely, religion, and particularly, the contribution of Jesus.

A second asset of no mean proportion is the means of abundant life. Our age has the means to produce all and more than is needed to supply the necessities of life for man the world over. This material wealth it not to be despised. It is a real asset for man's good. But once more, it needs the motive power of religion to make it effective for the good of all concerned.

Another asset of our times to be mentioned merely in passing is our realization of our present weakness and imperfection. There is a common awareness of the weakness of our present order, whether social, economic, political, or international. Such an awareness is necessary to provoke efforts at improvement. Out of dissatisfactions of life will grow movements for its improvement. A selfsatisfied order spells decay; a dissatisfied order is the premonition of the search for something better. Such a search is now on, and much to the credit of this chaotic age. And here again religion and particularly the religion of Jesus has a fine opportunity to make a much needed contribution.

One more of these minor assets is the present world's hatred

of war. Engulfed as we are in war to an extent unknown in past history, there is nevertheless in all of us a consciousness of the destructive evil of war such as has not been manifested in any previous age. The glory of war has departed, we believe, never to return. Out of such a hatred of war ways of peace may arise. And here too Jesus may help.

V. JESUS AND HIS CONTRIBUTION

And so we come to the last and greatest asset, namely, religion, and as we shall think of it, the Christian religion, and even more particularly, Jesus and His teachings.

One could easily quote quite copiously from statesmen, economists, historians, as well as religious leaders, statements supporting our contention that in the Christian religion is to be found that which best meets the greatest need of our time. We are frequently told that democracy, that precious heritage of ours which is threatened now as never before, can never be made safe by force, however necessary force may be as a temporary measure, but only by a spirit which has its roots in the Christian religion. We are furthermore assured that the much coveted economic order which will afford not only full and plenty but also justice for all will be but an idle dream until the spirit of the Christian religion can be made to prevail more generally in the hearts and minds of men so as to govern their actions and make them conform with principles of life commonly thought of as expressing Kingdom ideals. We are assured also that the so-called forces of evil now regnant in the hearts of individuals and in society at large will never be mastered and held in control until the spiritual power resident in the Christian religion will be given fuller release and wider application. We are convinced also that this dark hour of pessimism and despair will give way to a brighter day of hope and faith only when the basic truths and eternal promises of the Christian religion will again find a place of honor and devotion in the minds and hearts of men.

The Christian religion, therefore, holds the key that will unlock the portals of a better world-order. John C. Bennett in *Christian Realism* expresses his conviction on this point thus: "Christianity is proving its adequacy in facing a searching social test.

There seems to be no permanent human type from which it cannot elicit response. It preserves the balance between optimism and pessimism. It provides a perspective which keeps all ideals and achievements under judgment. It should lead to a Christian community beyond all existing communities."

On the basis of such a conviction we turn with confidence to Jesus and hail him as the great Liberator, the Savior of our modern world. The one person who by his teaching, his spirit, and his power can lead us out of our chaos, if not into the Promised Land in full, at least into a land more promising than now appears anywhere upon the horizon of time.

But as we thus accept him and proclaim him let us be sure that we do not make him just another dictator whose arbitrary word is absolute and final. Rather let us look upon him as a democratic leader who sets forth principles and ideals for us to follow and work out in our life situations. Let us look upon him as did the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, as the captain, the pioneer of our salvation. Let us measure him by the principles and ideals set forth in his teachings and his life and govern ourselves and our society by these principles and ideals. Professor Ward in looking over his twenty-five years of teaching made this observation, "I found that, whereas in the first years of my teaching I had continually to emphasize the need of students recognizing facts when they saw them, I now had to emphasize the necessity of understanding a general principle when they met it." This matter of recognizing general principles is important as we approach the Jesus of history with a view of seeking his counsel for our modern world. Not facts recorded in the Gospels and literally accepted are to be heralded as remedies for the ills of our day, but rather the principles and ideals which the facts warrant. The strict literalist is therefore not the best interpreter of Jesus. He may hold to the words but miss the principle, and thus become a Christian Pharisee. While on the other hand the liberal interpreter may, not necessarily will, but may more likely catch the spirit and principle of Jesus even though he may do violence to the strict literal application of the recorded words of Jesus. On this point J. H. Marion Jr. has an interesting article in the *Christian Century* of July 16 entitled, "Con-

science and Circumstance," in which he warns against turning principles into rules, and states as his conviction that the principles of Jesus are flexible and allow for a variety of applications in recognition of the fact that "new occasions teach new duties." Accordingly it ill becomes any of us who find warrant for certain actions in the teachings of Jesus to violently denounce others who profess to glean from the teachings of Jesus warrant for actions contradictory to our own. Let us remember that Jesus was not a law giver; he left few, if any, rules and regulations; but by both word and deed set forth principles and ideals of life, so true and so basic to high living that men of every age may well say with Peter, "Lord, to whom shall we go, for thou has the words of eternal life."

Briefly now, what are a few of the dominating principles and ideals Jesus offers our modern world?

First of all he gives us a God worthy of our fullest confidence and trust and our supreme love and devotion. The God of Jesus was an experiential God, not a metaphysical God. Jesus never argued the existence of God; he assumed His existence. He never philosophized about God; he communed with Him instead. Out of this communion and experience, augmented of course by Biblical and Jewish teachings in general, he presented to his followers a God who was first of all *sovereign*.

His God is lord of the world of nature. He is nature's creator, and controller. Nothing in nature is beyond His observation. He notes the sparrows' fall and clothes the lilies of the field. Jesus knows no law of nature; for him nature is God at work.

His God is sovereign also over man. For God all things are possible. He can change the hearts of men. He can destroy both body and soul. His control of man is unlimited. The notion of human free will does not bother Jesus.

But even though God is sovereign over man, He is also judge. He is, of course, a righteous judge, but severe. He is to be feared. It were better for a man that a millstone be hung around his neck and he be cast into the sea than that he should offend one of the little ones of God and so come under His judgment.

But Jesus' God is also merciful. Forgiveness is taken for granted, though seldom stated by Jesus. It is mentioned only

five or six times in the Gospels. But never more convincingly so than in that inimitable story of the Prodigal Son. Here, of course, it is not only forgiveness that is emphasized but the Fatherhood of God as well. Fatherhood was the most precious concept of God Jesus cherished himself and offered to his followers. By the term Father Jesus expressed both God's sovereignty and His affection. The idea was not new with Jesus. But it was never so basic and so consistent in the mind of anyone as it was in the mind of Jesus. For him God was always Father and always manifested a Father's love which always challenged and commanded filial love in return.

Faith in such a God accounts for the peace and joy in Jesus' life. And such a faith he deemed essential for all his followers. In the words of St. John he challenges his disciples even in their darkest hour not to let their hearts be troubled, but to continue to believe in God.

And here is challenge number one for the modern world,—a living vital faith in the God of Jesus who seeks to be sovereign, merciful, forgiving, and fatherly to us even as He was to Jesus, and to fill our hearts with the peace that passeth knowledge and which Jesus wished to bequeath to us when he said, "Peace I leave with you; my peace give I unto you." Faith in the God of Jesus is of prime importance to all who would pass out of Chaos into a well ordered life. As Weinel so well puts it when he says, "Faith in this Father God is the means of salvation. The proclamation of such a God is the true Gospel, good news for man. It assures us of the fact of forgiveness. It frees from worry and care. This faith also is the highest force for a better life. For the powers that lead to higher life are love and gratitude rather than shame and fear."

The second contribution Jesus offers our age is a high appreciation of the worth and dignity of man. He is always optimistic in his conception of man. He dwells upon man's higher aspects. He looks at the potentialities of man rather than his attainments. Hence he can see good in persons whom others look upon as outcasts. He can be optimistic about a man's possibilities where others see no hope. Man is for him of supreme value. He is of infinitely greater worth than animals for which God exercises

great care. The most sacred institutions, such as the Temple and the Sabbath, are looked upon, not as ends in themselves, but as servants of man. Even the last, the least, and the lost are of such worth as to challenge the best service of the Master himself.

Man has this value for Jesus because of his potential sonship. At his best, from Jesus' point of view, man is a son of God. This, of course, is the corollary of his lofty conception of God as Father. All men are potentially sons of God. But to claim this birthright they must strive after divine characteristics. This sonship is attained by adopting the ethical attributes of God. Some men realize this ideal very imperfectly, and some may even by their own will repudiate the filial relationship, but potentiality to sonship still remains. Men become more truly the sons of God by living the life of close fellowship with God. Such living leads to further likeness to God and therefore fuller sonship. The end of it is perfection even as it is found in God. Ethical likeness is the mark of true sonship.

Such a view of man puts a premium on a good life. When man has such a conception of his nature and potentiality, the question, Why be good? is utterly out of order. And when men accept Jesus' view of man the inhumanities now practiced in economic and international conflicts will not be tolerated.

Here then is our second challenge. Accept Jesus' view of the high dignity and worth of human personalities and take heed lest we offend one of these little ones so precious to God.

The third line along which our modern world needs direction is in its conception of human relationship. Jesus' conception of God as a loving Father and man as a potential son naturally calls for a relationship of man with man that can best be described as a Brotherhood. This relationship Jesus set forth clearly in his teachings on the Kingdom of God. This term as Jesus used it implied a twofold connotation. It implied first the sovereignty of God, God's rule in the hearts and lives of men. This idea is behind the Kingdom petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done." The term implied also the state of blessedness of men who submit to this Divine rule. And this blessedness cannot be experienced in its fulness short of anything but the brotherhood of man. Faith in the Fatherhood of God

calls for a conviction on the matter of sonship on the part of man. But if men are to become the sons of God they must also become brothers to each other. If they once become fully conscious of their common sonship they will naturally be drawn into relations of sympathy and brotherly love with each other. And nothing is of more importance, in the mind of Jesus, than that this social relationship on the basis of love should be maintained at all cost. He taught that even prayer and sacrifice to God must wait until this love relationship is attained. "If thou art offering thy gift at the altar and there rememberest that thy brother has aught against thee, leave there thy gift, and go and be reconciled with thy brother and then come and offer thy gift." This brother relationship is a part of the Kingdom life which Jesus represented as the highest good. And it still is man's highest good. Consequently man needs now as always to sit at the feet of Jesus and learn from him what it means to be in the Kingdom of God and how to live with his fellowmen in such a way as to assure the blessedness of Kingdom life.

If this modern world will profit by giving ear to the message of Jesus on God, man, and social relationship it must needs go one step farther and learn from him a true conception of sin and salvation.

Sin as Jesus conceived it is that which interferes with this relation of sonship and brotherhood. It meant for him the ruin of one's real self, sacrificing one's sonship to God and excluding one from the Divine community. It meant a failure to reach the higher life. It meant living with one's most primitive and outworn instincts, and not developing the life of the Spirit. Sin is antisocial conduct, a disregard for and an invasion of the rights of one's fellows. It is a repudiation of the ideas of duty, law and service, and an arrested development of higher living. Sin is then a perversion and rejection of man's real self. Jesus accordingly pictured the sinner as something lost, lost to God, lost to himself, lost to Kingdom happiness.

The way out of this lost estate is the way of repentance, the way of redirection, the way of finding oneself and being found by God. Fortunately from Jesus' point of view this door of repentance was ever open. While he taught the universality of sin

in the sense that compared with the perfection of God all men are evil, and therefore all men needed to pray, "Forgive us our debts," he at the same time emphasized the fact that none are beyond the pale of redirection. The lost may be found; the prodigals may find their way back to the Father; the outcasts may become penitent devotees; the violators of social justice, as in the case of Zacchaeus, may become social benefactors. Because sin was more of wrong ideals and dispositions than mere outward acts Jesus felt that sinners could be made over through the reception of new ideals and interests and a redirection of their lives. He never lost hope for anyone.

Of some such conception of sin and salvation our modern world is in dire need. It would have at least a twofold effect. First of all, it would bring the careless, indifferent child of God to his knees with the confession, "Lord, I have robbed myself of the high estate to which I was entitled; I have failed to make of myself what my potentialities called for; I have contented myself with walking in ways of life infested with treacherous inducements and devastating perils when I might have walked where angels love to keep one company." And with such a conviction indifference to the higher aspects of one's personal life, now so common, would take its flight, and men would again take themselves seriously and say with emotion and conviction, "A charge to keep I have; a God to glorify; a never dying soul to save, and fit it for the sky."

Jesus' conception of sin would at the same time bring this age to repentance because of its anti-social practices. Not alone the sin of keeping oneself from his own high goal but also the sin of frustrating the possibilities of one's fellowmen by one's own selfish practices menaces the welfare of our people and the peace of our generation, and hence calls for repentance and humiliation. Conviction of sin on this point will make the modern Cain admit the fact that he is his brother's keeper and will inspire him to give the cup of cold water to the thirsty and in so doing make more secure his own place among those entitled to the rating of sheep rather than goats in the Kingdom of God.

Thus Jesus stands at the door of the modern world and knocks. If his call is welcomed he will come in and bring with him a new

faith in a Father God, an assured confidence in the potential greatness and glory of man, a new hope for a brotherhood that will encircle the earth, and a new conviction of sin that will bring men to repentance and through repentance to a new life that will be rich with the blessings of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. The best that this perplexed and troubled modern world can do for its own salvation and for the glory of God is to take as its watchword the prayer of the early Christians, "Maran-atha," Come, Lord Jesus.

Lancaster, Pa.

SOME RELIGIOUS FACTORS IN A CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

DOBBS F. EHLMAN

Professional educators declare repeatedly that youth is in need of a Christian education. No one would doubt the importance of that claim. But since education is a process that extends across the entire span of our years, none of us ever gets beyond a sense of that same need. Every one of us is in the educational process so long as our experience is nourished and clarified by ideas that do not lead to disillusionment. Education is growth, regardless of age, in moral character and in the power to understand life through the application of reason and regenerated insight.

Youth, in its more generous moods, thinks of its seniors as teachers, either good or bad. Hence it is well for those of us who are in positions of leadership to ask ourselves what kind of teachers youth really has. In seeking an answer I am reminded of some words spoken not long ago by one of our most trusted Christian thinkers and leaders: "I have never known a time of such confusion of thought among Christian leaders, so much working at cross purposes." If this statement gives us an accurate picture of our condition, then the youth of today are unfortunate in their leaders. I am disturbed because I belong to that group of contemporaries.

Too much of what we have to read today in books and journals is a pure description of our dismal estate. For the most part it is very shallow in normative content. For example, there was a recent article published in a prominent journal by a well known author under the title, "Wanted: A Religious Education." I was thrilled to see the title, but to my dismay as I began to read, I soon found that it was just another brilliant but dismal picture of the sad results of an educational procedure that lacks philosophical equipment and moral earnestness. It was lacking in sound normative content.

Although quite aware of my own limitations and of the difficulties involved, I shall now try to sketch briefly some religious factors that must enter into a Christian education. The word

factor is a good one because a factor is more than a rapidly aging fact. A factor is an element or an influence that tends to produce a given result. The result we want is Christian character and thought in both young and old.

What, then, are some of the religious factors that produce the desired result? I shall mention six. The reader will think of others that might, or should, be mentioned.

I

The first religious factor in a Christian education is *honesty*, for honesty is the one thing without which we cannot live together and work together successfully. The late Dr. Richard Cabot once wrote a very solid book entitled "Honesty," and in the preface he called attention to the fact that very few books have ever been written on this subject. We have many books about truth but not many on honesty.

Honesty is the king of the virtues. It nourishes the genuineness of God and nature within us. It does not feign an emotion. It avoids overstating any case, even a good one. It shuns equivocal evasion, based on lucrative or political desires, or even the finest of devotional interests. It is not concerned with what is regarded as conservative or radical but with what is true.

Honesty uses few rhapsodies because exaggerated sentiment is not a wholesome form of excitement. It loathes panaceas and especially panaceaism. It is always temperate, repressing moods of discouragement, irritation, suspicion, and cynicism, when it knows that such moods are not truly representative of its soul. It sees that the measure of life is neither comfort, privilege, or success.

Dr. John Oman, shortly before his recent death, wrote some lines about honesty that we may reflect upon with both evangelistic and educational benefit. He said, "The churches are troubled, but it is about their numbers, their finances, their enterprises, and not about what matters gravely, their message and the embodiment of it in their own fellowship." Surely it is the latter that should trouble the honest mind.

Honesty is a difficult virtue. But fortunately we have other sources of salvation besides honesty. If that were not the case,

a lot of good people would be lost. Suffice it to say, that if we keep humility before God and charity towards our fellows, we shall succeed in good measure.

II

The second religious factor in a Christian education is what, for the need of a better term, I shall call *spiritual balance*. For example, Jesus said, "Love your neighbor as yourself." Paul taught that men should bear one another's burdens and that each man should bear his own burden. Obviously we have two responsibilities: one to others and one to ourselves. They must be kept in balance. Isaiah was a great prophet because he kept divine judgment and divine mercy poised in a good equilibrium. Jeremiah spoke of the drawing power of divine love and also of the Lord as being with him as "a mighty terrible one." In Scripture we have a superb balancing of the opposite, though not contradictory, aspects of truth. When this is not done, the doom of disillusionment is certain. And that is the fruit of bad education.

In thinking about human nature, we do well to keep in balance two Christian affirmations about man; and these are that man was created in the divine image, yet in a short time became, and still is, a fallen creature. It is confusing to ejaculate about an arch criminal as a child of God without at least intimating that he is a fallen creature. To sentimentalize about man's divine status apart from his fallen status is bad educational procedure.

Jesus used paradoxes repeatedly to illuminate the principle of spiritual balance. Frederick Knowles, in a poem "To Jesus The Nazarene," wrote wisely when he exclaimed, "O Christ of contrasts; infinite paradox, yet life's explainer. . . ."

Like every other good thing, the paradox can be used unwisely, and often is, yet it stands as a classic means of explaining life's duties and destiny. Today we are in need of some good paradoxes. Pascal once implied one when he said, "Justice without force is powerless; force without justice is tyrannic." Newton D. Baker once gave an opponent one to think about when he said, "I am so much for peace that I'm willing to fight for it."

For the purpose of spiritual balance, we have in addition to the paradox, what experts in logic call the principle of polarity

wherein we recognize the necessary co-presence and mutual dependence of opposite entities such as we have in the absolute and the relative in the rhythm of life.

Spiritual balance is a concept that forces us to see things in a context. Truth in a context has its roots in the historical and the contemporary, in reason and revelation, in justice and love.

John Dewey rightly says, "Events are sensational in the degree in which they make a strong impact in isolation from the relations to other events that give them their significance." This means, and rightly so, that education is sensationalism, unless facts are seen in a context. Panaceas are the sensational products of broodings apart from a context of interrelated facts. They lack balance.

Balanced thought then provides balanced spiritual insight and this is one religious factor in a Christian education.

III

In the third place Christian education depends upon *skill in the use of two kinds of words* in proper proportions. These two types of words are *the emotive* and *the referential*. This point is brought to my mind by the recent wide-spread interest in the subject of semantics which is simply a study of the meaning of words and of their power even when they have no meaning.

Hugh Walpole, in his fine book on "Semantics," tells us that there is a place for both emotive words and referential words. We ministers have never questioned this, although the scientifically minded person has always tended to ridicule the emotive words. So long as man is a living soul and not a machine, he will enjoy and respond to emotive words.

Emotive words express our feelings, and they are very necessary to stir the feelings of others and spur them to action. Referential words define objects and actions. They are much less mystifying than the emotive word, and less hypnotizing too.

We prefer to sing about "the faith of our fathers" rather than "the faith of our ancestors." Father is an emotive word. Ancestor is a referential word.

Emotive words make willing spirits. Referential words make clear minds. Roughly speaking, emotive thinkers don't like ref-

erential thinkers; and referential thinkers don't like emotive thinkers. For there is not much information in a book or address of emotive words; and there is not much inspiration in a book or address of referential words. A reconciliation between the two is needed, and it will be greatly needed when our troubled world settles down to establishing the new order.

The education of modern youth has been largely in the domain of referential words. We religious leaders may be tempted to call this sin, since we cruise about so largely on the sea of emotive words. A chasm is growing up between us. This chasm can be bridged only by skill in the use of the two types of words. This skill is a religious factor because both emotive and referential words are needed to comprehend divine reality. And the referential word is especially needed in the educational disciplines.

IV

A fourth factor in a Christian education consists in *regarding reformers rather than revolutionaries as our heroes*. If we must be hero worshippers, and most of us are in some degree, let it be the reformer in a great man rather than the revolutionary in him that we admire and emulate.

Here I confess having been influenced by Everett Dean Martin's book of a few years ago called "Farewell to Revolution." Dr. Martin attacks the glib usage of the word "revolution," and our careless praise of revolutionaries. We must admit that in the Protestant Reformation there was a revolutionary element that had no power over the rise of independent warring princes and nationalistic rivalries.

Dr. A. J. Muste's rather emotive book on *Non-Violence in an Aggressive World* has two chapters called "Pacifism as Revolutionary Strategy." Dr. Muste is correct. Pacifism is revolution, and the author fails completely to show, or even to try to show, that in the end it would not lead to conditions far different from those which we all desire.

It is wise to be suspicious of revolutions, for they have a way of opening the doors to new tyrannies. The pacifism of a reformation strategy is one thing, and the pacifism of a revolutionary strategy is another. Let us not be bluffed into believing that the latter is more Christian than the former.

To put it briefly, revolution depends upon propaganda, romanticism, and panaceaism. Sometimes it is very pious, but usually vicious and violent, sooner or later. Reformation depends upon deliberation, rational planning, and the control of evil by judicial measures promoted by an enlightened community conscience. If vigorous reformation fails, then revolution has no promise for us either.

Our missionaries in foreign lands have been reformers rather than revolutionaries. Revolutionary methods do not solve problems, however genteel they may be. There are other ways to minister to a crisis-conscious generation.

So, having the reformer rather than the revolutionary as our hero, is a religious factor in a Christian education.

V

Briefly stated, another factor in Christian education is the sense of community based on a corporate mindedness. In the New Testament the word is *koinonia*, representing a partnership, a fellowship, a sharing.

Democracy, upon which our national existence seems to depend, and churchmanship, upon which the Christian enterprise so largely depends, rely upon the cohesiveness in group life that comes from a sense of community. Moreover there is no true individual education apart from growth in what the psychologists call "the we-feeling."

The law of love should help to accomplish the sense of community. Religious ritual helps, for as William Hocking says, "Ritual is the vessel of communal feeling." The pressure of events may help if righteous men see that they must all hang together or hang separately. Faith will help, if men learn that they are members one of another, and that the good Father is both gentle and severe in His dealings with men.

We are almost pioneers in teaching, and probably in learning, the importance of the sense of community. Dr. Adolph Keller, the great Swiss apostle of the ecumenical movement in Christianity, tells with a smile about dictating an article to his secretary on the ecumenical movement in Christianity. When he read the manuscript for correction, he found that his secretary had taken

down his words as a discussion on the "economical" movement rather than the "ecumenical" movement.

VI

The sixth religious factor in a Christian education is a substantial degree of *comprehension of the meaning of the cross of Christ* in the history of the world and in the heart of God.

It has been said that the most difficult task in theology is to bridge the gap between faith and works. In the Cross, if we examine it with both referential as well as emotive words, we will find the gap bridged. Any Christian theory which has not grown out of a genuine consideration of the meaning of the cross of Christ is certain to be both a panacea and a rhapsody with a harvest of disillusionment as the fruit.

The Cross does not mean a renunciation of good things in the face of evil, for that is Buddhistic doctrine. It means sacrifice for good things, which, in the economy of God, may be denied to the one who has borne it. We are constantly faced with the danger of confusing Buddhistic and Christian thought when it comes to interpreting the Cross.

In the Cross we have a clue to the meaning of human history and human duty, of the divine purpose and divine love. Youth has missed much if it has never thought about that. Many of us missed it in our formative years.

The fact of Christ's Cross is a religious factor in a Christian education.

Honesty, spiritual balance, skill in the use of both emotive and referential words and ideas, the reformer rather than the revolutionary as our hero, the sense of community, and some degree of comprehension of the meaning of the Cross in history and in the mind of God—these are religious factors in the thoughts that nourish Christian character. There can be no Christian education without them.

New Oxford, Pa.

THE TIMELESSNESS OF PREACHING¹

GERHARD C. GRAUER

This afternoon we take for ourselves a much more difficult assignment. "The Timelessness of Preaching" is to be our theme. Of course that applies to more than the length of a sermon. In that regard I would suggest that you be timely rather than timeless. One can address a group of students for 45 or 50 minutes; they are accustomed to listen for that length of time. A group of ministers also are quite patient; but the average congregation, especially in "the Middle West," desires a sermon which is not too long. A member of a seminary faculty was in Cincinnati recently. He told us that we ministers were spoiling our congregations. They should be trained to listen to 50 or 60 minute sermons again. I did not have the courage to tell him that I thought that was mere wishful thinking, and that "those days were gone forever," but the practical ministers of our city did feel that way. I have also heard ministers criticized by others for developing the worship period in the morning service and therefore shortening the period for the sermon. Few laymen offer that criticism. Most people appreciate the priestly and the prophetic function of the ministry. May I suggest that it is wise to exercise care relative to the length of your sermons?

But surely our topic will take us deeper than the time element in preaching. When I was asked to deliver this series of lectures I had hoped to speak on "The New Emphasis on Theology in Modern Preaching," but upon closer examination I found that this emphasis was just beginning and would be difficult to trace. Yet there is such an emphasis today. The timeless quality is again found in much of good preaching. We know that if anything is only true today, it isn't true. "New occasions teach new duties; Time makes ancient good uncouth;" and yet truth has a timeless eternal quality.

Perhaps the best approach would be to discuss why the timeless quality was absent from much preaching in the not too distant past. Let us examine the shallow so-called "liberal preaching" of yesteryear.

¹ A lecture on the Charles S. McCauley Foundation delivered in Santee Chapel, Feb. 4, 1941, by the Reverend G. W. Grauer, D.D., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Man has ever endeavored to be a critic of history, yet history also is a critic of man. History passes judgment on our movements, our theories and our religion. For a while the world paid little attention to the church. The attitude was one of indifference. The recent discussions in popular magazines relative to the primary task of the church, why Pollock doesn't go to church and why Riis does, are criticisms of the church which a historical approach to Christianity cannot avoid. Something is definitely wrong in a world where another war is upon us. The Church is not sinless in this respect. It must indeed be repentant when it thinks that it has been active throughout the Christian era, and yet it is now making adjustments to accommodate itself to war psychology and the spreading of questionable propaganda.

Why has Christian preaching been so ineffective? This is an involved question which greater scholars than I haven't answered, but I would make some suggestions from the point of view of a preacher.

Not so long ago most preachers considered it a high compliment to be called "liberal" or "modernist." The liberal movement hoped to keep in perfect step with every advance of science and thinking. It preached a timely message and cared nothing about any timeless quality. Indeed it doubted if there was anything timeless. But this easy adjustment to every passing fancy, was its greatest strength and its chief weakness as well. Emil Brunner summarized the liberalistic movement in these words: "Biblical dualism was replaced by a progressive, monistic, optimistic idealism; the biblical doctrines of salvation and revelation by stoic and platonic ideas; creation became a process of evolution; salvation, religious behaviour and ethical betterment. Judgment and forgiveness were resolved into subjective values of a sentimentally religious kind. Modernism is partly idealistic and partly naturalistic rationalism derived from the Enlightenment which during the last 300 years has involved itself in Christianity, caused its inward distintegration and has generally weakened it." "Obviously" says Brunner, "present-day Christianity is only a form of disguised idealism or naturalism. We must distinguish between the Christian and naturalistic understanding of life."

That was an age of secularism. In that day of rationalism and naturalism, the social sciences came into being and the mental sciences as well. All of these were more or less hostile to orthodox religion. Therefore the ancient citadels had to be fortified by constant compromise. Adjustments must be made to fit into the world. Germany endeavored to counteract with pietism; America counteracted with a modernism that endeavored to remain intellectually respectable. Under those conditions it naturally had no theology. In fact it often claimed that it was above theology. If you were to read the sermons preached by some of our great American preachers during that day, if you were not already acquainted with historical Christianity, you would never come to the conclusions of our historic formulations of faith. Much of that indecision and weakness in preaching was traceable to intellectual groping. We may have to doubt, to believe; we may have to seek, to find. But preaching the Gospel is not expressing our doubts and our seekings, but our beliefs and our findings. Dr. Smart in the Lyman Beecher lectures of recent date stated: "We know a great deal more than our fathers knew, but we know it very much less certainly." Someone has said "We know less and less about more and more." In a secular society God is dismissed as non-essential. If a naturalistic explanation of the universe is followed completely then God is no longer a force to be reckoned with.

Personally many of those friends did not doubt God's existence, they merely bowed Him out of the universe. He wasn't needed. There was nothing left for Him to do since all things would be taken care of through evolution and natural law. In fact He could stand by and watch man, educated man, man freed from inhibitions and supernatural superstitions, correct evils God had permitted to exist in a disorderly universe. To such men who had no theology to speak of—and they never spoke of it—God in His heavens, could stand by and watch the League of Nations and the peace loving people accomplish things His spirit had never been able to bring about. When functions once ascribed to God are explained by a godless naturalism, God ceases to be potent in any actual situation of life. They substituted an optimistic anthropology for a theology.

In those days we heard that we could federate and unite relative to certain great social movements and cooperate in certain practical ways but we could not unite theologically. It is well to remember that when Karl Marx endeavored to bring forth his contribution to political and social economy, he went to various lands to study and think. He visited libraries and read books. He realized a deep truth, "that an adequate theology produces an adequate strategy." Surely as theologians we know that not only has our strategy been wrong, but our theology has not been applied or practiced by the peoples of the earth. Jesus, we remember, did not enunciate plans and programs. He was interested in principles, in a theology that would affect all of life.

In much of that preaching men considered all the important problems merely as problems. The question mark was used more often than the exclamation point. Men thought that by searching they might find God and were entirely unaware that Religion is not man's search for God, but the act of being found by God.

The liberal never felt quite so proud as when he was called "tolerant." Many of us heard Rabbis introduced as the greatest Christians of our city. All of us wish to be tolerant, but if the definition of tolerance signifies the absence of all convictions, of a theology and of any definite opinions, it is hardly a compliment. I think most of us have forgotten just how far this tolerance took us. For instance we have forgotten the theology of the Laymen's Missionary Appraisal Committee which created a furor among many people, and which the Secretaries of mission boards are still trying to counteract. According to that theology, "Christianity is one form among others that is in search of God. There is a uniqueness in Christianity, it is true, but there is also a uniqueness in every other religion. If God sent forth his son Jesus, then in other religions he sent forth some prophet." The revelation of God in Christ, and the quality of the love exemplified in a suffering servant, who knows no higher way of winning men than that of sacrificing, is almost entirely forgotten. Of course, in such theologies there are no absolutes. Life is made of relativisms, and man finds himself in the situation which Kraemer describes: "Man, mastering and conquering life on the earth and in the air, does not know how to master himself because moral

growth is quite a different thing from intellectual development or conquest of the world." The prayer that was supposed to have been offered by a liberal isn't as funny as it sounds, nor is it far-fetched either: "God, if there is a God, Save my soul, if I have a soul."

Our tolerance and our modern educational method of endeavoring to be scientific also brings another fact before our minds. Most of us could take either side in almost any debate. Moreover our tolerance tries to make us fair and sympathetic to such a degree, that our deep convictions are hardly in evidence. That is why some of the movements for church union leave us cold, though we all, I hope, are ecumenical in point of view. There are those who wish for church union by subtraction. Subtract from your faith anything that would not suit the low-churchman. Subtract from your faith anything that would not fit into the thinking of the Unitarian or Universalist. Yes, go a step farther and take from your faith anything that may be at variance with Reformed Judaism, for Judaism and Christianity have a common base and we do have certain basic beliefs in common. There was a great deal of that kind of thinking prevalent among liberals.

Gentlemen, I urge you to study theology. Become theologians. Let the deep truths of revealed religion lead you into a theology which will pervade your thinking and your preaching. You need a theory or philosophy of life which is theological. The younger Niebuhr in the great book, "The Church against the World," concludes by saying: "The revolters in the church are learning that without a Christian theory or theology the Christian movement must lose itself in emotions and sentiments or hasten to action which will be premature and futile because it is not based upon a clear analysis of the situation. They have learned from the communist that years spent in study are not wasted years, but that years spent in activity without knowledge are lost years. They have learned from history that every true work of liberation and reformation was at the same time a work of theology. They understand that the dependence of man upon God and the orientation of man's work by reference to God's work require that theology must take the place of the psychology and sociology which were the proper sciences of a Christianity which was dependent

on the spirit of man. The theory of Christian revolution is beginning to unfold itself again as the theory of a divine determinism, of the inevitable judgment, and of the salvation of men by the suffering of the innocent. But whatever the content of the theory, a clear understanding of it is needed for the work of emancipation, reorganization and aggression in the Christian Community."

Much of timely preaching by modern preachers has had as its primary thesis the theory of progress together with a sentimental, almost silly, optimism relative to the future. Christianity, first of all, challenged evolution, and fought it, but then it not only accepted it as a scientific law but it became a law of religion as well, applied philosophically. This law became a shallow, optimistic determinism. Day by day the world is getting better and better. A little more culture, a little more education, a little more religion, a little more good-will and trust, and the world would be perfect. Moreover that was bound to happen just as naturally as the lower species developed into higher species. It was inevitable. It was just a law of naturalism which applied in the field of morals and ethics also. The Kingdom of God, was just around the corner, and it was "up to us" as Luccock cleverly paraphrases it. Yes, this was an inevitable, continuous and progressive evolution. That theory was as utopian as communism and of course rested on the fallacy that man is good. Dr. Fosdick in his famous sermon, "Beyond Modernism," (and in all fairness there were others who awakened to what was happening years before he spoke of it, some of them teachers in this seminary), pointed out that one of the most characteristic religious movements summarized its faith (or lack of it perhaps) in these terms, "The fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of Man, the leadership of Jesus, Salvation by Character, the progress of mankind, Onward and Upward forever." That's a beautiful world, but that isn't the world which you and I know as we look at it in 1941. Needless to add, Redemption, Atonement, Forgiveness, Salvation, and Judgment are hardly needed in such a philosophy. We once heard a friend arise and read as an invocation this little poem:

"Some call it evolution,
But others call it God."

The theology of that day was very largely an anthropology. Man was the center of the universe and if there was a God He was merely an accommodation. Perhaps the term that is so often used in this connection can again be mentioned, God as spectator. Of course we had to study psychology. Everyone did. It helped us recognize that the only God there was, was man and by virtue of his many remarkable native and acquired endowments and abilities, he could and would redeem himself and perfect a society in which everything would be properly integrated, therefore, good. According to this theory, man has within himself, the power to change, alter, recreate, and refashion himself, unless he be damned by the original sin theory of the psychologist, or better said, the total depravity theory. Psychology needs a new Horace Bushnell to emancipate those damned souls from a hell created by the psychologists, from which no one, apparently, can be saved, I refer to the sin of heredity or improper environment. We need hardly remind ourselves that humanitarianism and humanism have hardly brought in a Utopia. "The dream of humanism has turned into the nightmare of Nazism" is a statement of Davies in his "Two Humanities."

In such an anthropocentric philosophy, the ethical and religious ideal of Jesus is misinterpreted and becomes a purely sociological and ethical ideal. It loses all religious significance. Jesus spoke of a Kingdom of God. That was an ethical-religious ideal. It was not only a kingdom of righteousness, for righteousness is the impossible possible. A religious theory would never permit us to be satisfied with the arresting of hunger, disease, crime, despair or war, important as that is, but challenges us to eradicate these public enemies from the face of the earth. And this religious-ethical theology would even admit, that if these evils were banished from the earth, it would not necessarily be a Kingdom of God but there would be something more involved, and that something more has been sadly absent in much of so-called "timely preaching."

Many men have begun to correct that tendency in their thinking. Many of them have now stressed worship and have become priestly. Congregations that formerly heard this liberal preaching, with its shallow social gospel, now see candles burn, vestments brought back, the prayer book reintroduced and have again

learned to recite litanies. Man lost faith in the inevitable evolution of man so he turned to worship. It is rather difficult to be prophetic in such an age as ours. I hope I never preach only a purely individual Gospel. I recognize the need of a worshipful, dignified order of service. I believe in the high church rather than in a cheap, popular, airy sort of a service. But worship can become a substitute for the prophetic element in religion, and you are not to be ordained, as I understand it, to the priesthood only, but to a well balanced ministry.

So much of that preaching and thinking was an outgrowth of our theory of the Immanence of God, as Coffin in one of his chapters in his "Religion, Yesterday and Today," points out. The old doctrine of Omnipresence magnified God; our new theory of immanence magnifies man and nature. If such a theory is accepted all life is miraculous. The opening of a bud is an act of God's love, the beauty of the sunset is like unto the beauty of God. Everything is miraculous, and when everything is miraculous, nothing is. Nothing is very bad, nothing is very good; it is all divine. Missionaries told us that they brought Christian culture and civilization to the heathen Chinese primarily and religion secondarily. Christian culture, education, improved sanitation, better agricultural tools and techniques were as important as the Gospel. Sockman is responsible for this rather amusing illustration: "An American traveler lost for three days in the jungles of India, finally found a missionary compound. This was the entry in his journal for the day: 'After those horrible jungle nights, it was good to sleep again in a Christian bed.'" Sockman then asks, "Is that what distinguishes our Christian civilization, Christian beds, refrigerators and elevators?" We can imagine that a Christian culture was the end in view for those who adhered to that theory. Christianity was a means to the end of a proper civilization. There were many adherents to that theory. We remember taking a course on "Sin and Salvation" at Union during a summer school. Sin was maladjustment. If one could be completely adjusted to the world in which we live, we would be sinless and life would be satisfactory. Dr. McGiffert in his book "The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas" shows that this is no overstatement: "We may fairly hope that . . . there will be

growing adaptation between Christianity and the world in which it lives. The church has commonly been slow to change, a great institution necessarily is. But in the end it has always adjusted itself to the ethical and intellectual tendencies of the age. Had it not, it would long ago have perished from the earth. That Christianity continues to reveal this adaptability to the developing mind of man is proof that it is alive and not dead, and is the best guarantee of its permanent influence and power." It is a long way from transforming the world, and changing men to this compromise with the world, and adapting of one's self to the ideals and wishes of the day. We need the reminder of Dr. Fosdick that "our modern world cries out not such much for souls intellectually adjusted to it, as for souls morally maladjusted to it, not most of all for accommodators and adjusters but for intellectual and ethical challengers." The peculiar fact is that so many Christians are almost entirely unaware of any tension between the world and the Church or the Kingdom of God. Perhaps that is the severest indictment against our day. Secularism is so prevalent and so few know it.

If God is immanent and only immanent, then the only God that exists is the God I know out of my experience. I create God in my own image. God is dependent upon my knowledge of Him. We become followers of Descartes, and base God's being on our being, and therefore on our knowledge of being. Other generations buried God in a creed, and sometimes lost him in worship of an institution. We have lost God in ourselves and made Him entirely dependent upon man. There are many Hegelians who do not know Hegel even existed.

That the only God that exists for me is the God I have learned to know by my own experience, may be a true statement yet it is also untrue. Perhaps the opposite is also true, that the only God there is, is one of whom I know nothing. Rudolph Otto and Karl Barth made a great contribution to modern thinking in this regard. They speak of the "Ganz Anders," the totally other, and it is a stress we needed to hear. It acted as a corrective, and I believe it has affected not only continental theology, but American theology more than our thinkers have ever begun to admit. Even Wieman, in endeavoring to define the school of Theological

Realists recognizes this influence: "The realistic theory of religious knowledge, posits a divine reality which exists, whether it is recognized or not, which may be directly experienced and known, and which may not only have qualities which do not appear to us but may also have, as presented in our experience, apparent qualities which cannot be taken as valid revelation of what the independently existing Divine Reality is." Of course God is immanent, and yet this kindly old gentlemanly God, is hardly the God whom Jesus called "Father," or one who sends us any great sense of tragedy in history.

What are we to preach about to such an age? What are we going to say to people who live in a world where Man is worshipped and governments are again asking for complete subservience? What is our message going to be to these confused people? Let me begin with a generalization. Let us offer them a Gospel, a Religion, a Faith, a God, a Christian concept of Man and his redemption and salvation.

The world in which we live offers us a problem not primarily in economics or sociology, but in religion. The basic doctrines of Christianity are not only being challenged. They are being forgotten. Doctrinal preaching is almost passé. Sound doctrine sounds too much like heresy trials. And yet sound doctrine has been translated as healthy teaching. I sincerely believe that most men, including some social as well as religious thinkers, do not recognize that our basic problem is really a Christian one, a problem or Religion. This is not a struggle between two political philosophies. Basic tenets of faith are involved. Was it just mere chance or a peculiar quirk in the makeup of the leaders of Communism that the church was closed when Communism entered Russian life?

My topic, as I hope you noted, is not "Ancient Truths" but Ancient Truths in Modern Terms. The old doctrinaire teaching was very largely an "otherworldly" emphasis. Its highest ambition was to lift men above the world and create at best a pietistic spirituality. The ancient truths, as formerly applied, also seemed to lack some very human qualities such as kindness and thoughtfulness. Ancient truths in modern terms would stress not only the "other worldly," but the "this worldly" as well. Its highest

ambition is not a pietism, but a social responsibility. Our statement could be put into simple language: "Jesus Christ, we maintain, is the only solution to *this world's* problems." We believe that to be an ancient truth, and yet it must be applied in modern terms and perhaps in a different manner than it was in the days of fundamentalism.

In former days the doctrines of the church were considered to be great truths which would save men. Truths were emphasized. To use a phrase oft quoted: "Some think of the love of truth as the highest form of Religion, whereas we believe that for Jesus, love was the highest truth." But in our day we need to remind ourselves that our primary task is not to preach a sociology, but a Social Gospel, and if there is no gospel, no evangel, no theology, in that social discourse, it should not be called "the Social Gospel." To quote Morrison's fantastic and yet fascinating book, "What is Christianity?"; "The social gospel can be safely proclaimed and implemented only by a church that is profoundly confident of its religious resources."

Let us examine some of those old doctrines and some of the ancient truths that we have not used as much as did the men of old and endeavor to find the great truths therein contained and also their modern application.

When the Protestant Church was born, an infallible book was to take the place of an infallible church as the final authority. Most theologians, though they believe in revealed religion do not adhere to the infallibility of scripture, and yet it would be well to re-emphasize the unique significance of scripture. A professor friend of mine told me recently that it was almost impossible to get his students to read the Bible. They would take any assignment no matter how long if it demanded reading some modern writer, but reading the Gospels, the epistles or the prophets just wouldn't be taken seriously. To prove his point that young seminarians know little of scripture he of late years has given an exam on just plain content knowledge of the Bible. Last year 10% of his class could give the name of Moses' parents. Now we are ready to admit that a man could possibly be saved without that knowledge but we also believe that the Bible is required reading for those who wish to preach timeless sermons, for we know

the scriptures live for us, because they speak to us in our own language of our problems of today and how others have solved them. A sophisticate reads the story of Genesis and smiles. He would say "How terribly naive!" "Why even bother reading it?" The man who searches deeply enough will find there an answer to some basic problems that still have not been answered. First: Why does man have to work so hard? Genesis answers: "Because he sinned, he was driven out of the garden, and therefore in the sweat of his brow he must eat his bread." Some people still look at work as punishment. What is our answer? Secondly: Why is it that the finest experience in married life, the birth of a child, is so painful? Can you answer that? Well the Genesis answer was that woman sinned more than man therefore she was to suffer more. Thirdly: Why do men die? The answer was simply that man sinned. We also note that according to that story, all sin is disobedience to God. Those may not be our answers, but, after all, it isn't just a silly story, just a fairy tale which is amusing. Someone has said, that the greatest words in the Bible are the first words, "In the beginning God." The reading of the scripture entirely apart from its doctrinal or devotional value will give you subjects on which to preach. Sometimes a text just shouts at you. Sometimes you find a text, but sometimes a text finds you. The reading scripture will also help you to variety in preaching. If you use a text merely out of respect for custom or because of habit, you easily over-emphasize one of your major points of view and lack variety. The definite reading of scripture makes us face the great truths and doctrines of Christianity. Practically speaking, it is well for us to preach expository sermons. It makes us preach on some great themes we would never think of, if we used the free text method at all times.

The basic teachings of the church are being challenged today. Doctrines were handed down to us in a catechism and too often they were safely kept there. But the issues that confront us today have to do with Christian teachings and elemental faith. Our world problem is a religious problem. Economics, theories of government, empire building ambitions and the holding of vast empires, are objects of study not only for historians but also for

the Christian theologian. If we were to ask the average man: "What is wrong with the world?" he would perhaps answer, "The war, and the economic situation." It would be far more correct to state that the war, the depression, unemployment, and the mushroom employment that is springing up almost over night during these pre-war days, are not the cause of our ills; they are merely the inevitable results of certain actions and theories of life. Men and nations are reaping what they have sown. God's purposes are always consistent with a moral universe. And may I add, that from my point of view, if this war goes on, and we enter it even to a greater degree than we already have, the so-called "depression" since 1929, will seem to have been the eleven fat years, not the eleven lean years we thought they were. I hesitate to even think much less to utter my thoughts relative to the conditions that will follow this continuation of the world war. You just can't sow the sort of seed that is being sown and reap a better world.

Of course, the basic doctrine of Christianity is the doctrine of God. The question of God is a timeless one, and is particularly timely today. We are still asking the same simple questions. What about God today? Doesn't He care? Where is He? When we speak of totalitarian governments and the ambitions of all government to become powerful, we as Americans speak of our constitution as guaranteeing certain rights to the governed. We are reminded that the framers of our constitution not only desired to unite to form a government and therefore wrote a constitution, but also wrote it for the express purpose of limiting government. The old timeless question of what belongs to the state, and what belongs to the individual and to God, has become a very timely question. That is no theoretical question for the class room. Samuel of old faced the same question, Why did he not wish to crown Saul, King? Not merely because of a whim or a personal opinion, but because he faced that basic question. Perhaps he thought that if given much power Saul would misuse it, but he also knew the deep theological problem involved, that ultimately the earthly kingship would challenge the Kingship of Jehovah. A Christian, if he has a theology, does not argue against totalitarianism merely because of a difference of opinion relative

to a political philosophy. To him it has become a definite theological problem. For a Christian, a totalitarian government cannot be condoned. If God is real, life cannot be lived apart from Him. Our timeless message would be an emphatic statement, There is a God. He does enter history. There are divine laws which must be observed. That no nation can be godless and continue is no mere opinion but a fact vindicated by a study of history.

Men have forgotten that God rules. Evil may seem to win battles, and God may seem to have departed to His heavens. God is still the judge of human history. He does not mete out punishment as some would wish Him to do. That has never been His method. God's judgment is always merciful judgment, but it is judgment. The doctrine of God has always made Christianity international and universal. Therefore, tribal blood interests, racial hatreds and racial superiorities are not merely barbaric and perhaps unscientific, they are contrary to the very doctrine of God. Therefore the problem of racial superiority as reflected in what should be done with Jewish refugee is not merely a practical question, but reminds us that men have forgotten our God.

I think many of us not so long ago, had difficulty explaining the second commandment to our children in confirmation instruction. Idol worship was a sin of the past. Of course, we pointed out that clothes could become an idol, or money, or success. We took the opportunity to speak of the Catholics with their saints and their many works of art, but we really thought that idol worship was a sin that we had outgrown. Well today that Commandment is a challenging, a timeless and a timely topic. For the very theory of God is being challenged. The state in many parts of the world has become a substitute for God. A Hero has been set up, whom peoples worship and adore. God has been politely bowed out of all situations, he no longer is a participant. But the world will never be saved by merely tolerating God. And by the way, we need not prove Him. The function of the Church in these days is not to help men find God, nor to save God, but to let Him save us in our terrible situation.

Timelessness also recognizes man. It looks at modern man. It

sees not only what civilization has done for him, not only what modern education has done to him, but looks deeply and finds that, basically at his best, he is a sinner, and at his worst, he is a saint, if he recognizes his predicament.

Pascal is the author of the classic statement often quoted: "The world is divided into two groups of people: Saints who know themselves to be sinners and sinners who think themselves to be saints." Our Christian doctrine, not merely our personal point of view, makes man more than a tool to be employed and used by some individual for profit. Man is not merely a competitor, enemy or friend. The equality of man is not only a teaching of American Democracy, but a basic principle of our theology. But it also recognizes man as a sinner. Much of modernism never mentioned that fact, and did not even know the meaning of the term.

Timeliness says that there is a natural dignity in man. It believes in humanity and its deep possibilities. Timeliness believed in man. But it often went too far, in that it became sentimental and permitted itself to be hypnotized. Listen to Rousseau: "Man is naturally good and our social institutions alone have rendered him evil." Timelessness, on the other hand, is realistic and emphasizes the old truth enunciated by Paul: "The good I would do, I do not; the evil I would not do, that I do." The fathers of old used the term "original sin." It was a good term. It had some peculiar connotations, but, basically, it was true. Perhaps we want to translate it into more modern terms but we want to emphasize it today. After all sin is not only the evil which we consciously choose. We lack a sense of humility. We lack pity. Sinners do not always love evil. Their greatest sin is that they love themselves. It was my good fortune to hear Dr. Niebuhr deliver his addresses at Eden last year shortly after his return from England where he delivered his famous lectures on theology, which we hope will shortly be published. He used a new term, so far as my knowledge goes. He called certain truths "absurdities." For instance: "We are born in sin, and yet are not; we are bound to fall and yet are not conditioned to sin. We are not only tempted by weakness, but even more by strength. Our weaknesses we have learned to know as sins, but

our strength takes from us the ability to see the weakness of strength. We can never forget ourselves. Often we try by worship or by an act of dedication to some higher purpose, but we are never successful; that is sin. Even Freedom, our greatest heritage from God, that in which we share with divinity, when practiced, is sin. The Catholic church, or any totalitarian government in a sense, or the pharisaical point of view in general has its own peculiar sin, for it says: "God is judge. He will mete out judgment. He judges men and nations, BUT NOT US." Isn't that the most horrible thing about war? In normal times we say, "God be merciful to me a sinner." In times of war we not only confess the sins of our enemy, but give to ourselves an absolute unwarranted degree of goodness, and take the place of God in meting out what we consider to be proper judgment on the transgressors.

That is the weakness after all of those who believe in apocalypticism. God will come to judge and separate sheep and goats, But I am safe. Of course its strength was that it recognized that God will establish justice and goodness not man. But have you ever noticed that the story of Christ's return tells us there are no righteous at all. There are no good. The king may say, "Well done good and faithful servant," but the minister better avoid it in eulogies even of an elder or a minister. Do you remember the question of the good people in the story of his return? "When saw we thee hungry and gave thee meat? When saw we thee thirsty and gave thee drink?" The righteous, the only righteous in that parable were those who did not know of their own goodness.

And yet there is another element to be added to the Christian doctrine of Man. Man as man is a sinner. But Man, possessed by something greater than himself, is not merely a sinner. Remember the rich young ruler? He had kept the commandments, but that didn't count. He wasn't even satisfied with formal observance of laws and conventions. He lacked something and he knew it. Jesus said: "Sell what thou hast." Man always has to do that. He must consider things in proper perspective and become interested in something greater than himself. We call Schweitzer a saint, not because of his personal morality, or any

mystical experiences. We know little of that part of his life. We call him a saintly man, because he is no longer his own. He has nothing of himself. He has sold to have. He is possessed. Isn't that what Paul has in mind when he speaks of that paradox: "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet I no longer live, but Christ liveth in me." That is an old message. And yet would not that timeless message be a timely message for our day and age? The Christian doctrine of man needs emphasis today.

But Man is also an object of redemption. We believe in revealed Religion. We believe that God wants to save men and the world. "The tragedy of Man is that he is in conflict with his Maker," as Homrighausen states, "The Bible is the 'Gotteskampf' for in it we find the record of God's struggle in and with and for his people." The Incarnation is God's method of Redemption. Throughout the Old Testament we feel that God wants to save His people. Israel sinned in that it made of a universal religion a national hope. It took particularism as a substitute for universalism. God's purpose in the incarnation was not to prove to us there is a God, but rather to show man he was the object of redemption. Sockman writes: "Every man is not only his mother's son, precious in her sight, but a Heavenly Father's child, bought with a price, the high price of sacrificial love symbolized in the cross."

These are ancient truths. They need emphasis today. They need to be stated in terms understood by men and applied to the situations of our day. We are thankful that men are arising who are helping us to find these deep truths and lead our minds in channels which will help us to properly apply them. We would but mention the Doctrine of Christ. For a while he was considered a beautiful example, a wise teacher, and an ethical reformer and that is all. The ancient doctrine is not only richer in meaning, but most of us see in some of the older terms great truths, which will outlast all this sentimental cheap patronizing that someone called "the modern viewpoint."

Ours is a historical religion. Of course other religions are historical for they all began in time, but as E. E. Thomas suggests: "Christianity is historical in a far deeper sense than this; she asks that the validity of her doctrine shall be determined by the

truth of certain historical events. Some religions can do without that historical foundation for they are based upon thought about God's nature and the relation in which he stands to man. The Christian theologian says: "If God relates himself to mankind then he must do so within history. Eternal nature and eternal activity that do not fling themselves into the cauldron of time can be none of man's concern."

The simple historic statement is: "The word became flesh." God and His word are one. It is Himself that His revelation reveals. Baillie claims: "Religion is not a demand, but a gift that is being offered us. A demand is indeed made, but it is a demand that we should accept a gift. It is not so much that we do something, but permit God to do something for us. We are not called upon to save ourselves, but to accept God's salvation."

When we face Christ we again approach an absurdity. Christ is grace to us. Grace is forgiveness. When we are forgiven our sins are not only forgiven, but we receive strength to lead a new life. And yet most of us do not accept the sanctification theory, nor do we believe that since man's sins are forgiven he is now good and perfect. We know he is decidedly not good. Our gift from God is not perfection, but mercy. In the "Christian Century Pulpit" not so long ago there was an interesting sermon on "Babel or Bethlehem?" The writer pointed out that Babel was man's attempt to reach God by human endeavor and rational activity, but that Bethlehem was God's method of revealing himself to man. He asked the question: "Can we be saved by the method of Babel or Bethlehem?"

We have confined Jesus to a few areas of life. We followed his precepts in the home, we observed his moral code after a fashion at least, but we left him out of national and international questions, we did not permit him to enter social problems. We have learned of late, I believe, that unless he affects all of life, he really does not affect life at all; that in our world the matter of converting people is not merely a matter of convenience. Today we feel that it is not a generalization to say, "the world needs the message of Christ to be true to its highest purpose."

We would mention the cross, in conclusion. It is an enigma which no one can ever fully explain. The only true victory is

defeat at times. The world crucified God. When God enters history the world always crucifies Him. What a timely message today! God punishes men by suffering for them. *He* suffers because of their sins.

And yet that doctrine needs a modern interpretation. There were many harsh theories, many theories that suggested that we were dealing with a harsh, wrathful, and angry God. That Jesus "paid it all," and was used as a ransom. There is a crucifixion on our street today. The cross is ever erected where Christ's way is laughed to scorn. We still reject him, when the Barabbas of Insurrection is set free, rather than the meek Master. Man cannot redeem himself. He is lost unless there is mercy and Love. The result of sin is suffering, but the suffering is borne by God, more than by us. In that great book of Dr. Richard Roberts, "That Strange Man upon His Cross" we find this classic statement: "God's punishment is pardon; God's retribution is restoration; forgiveness is the heartbreaking rod of Love." In our timely preaching on the timeless subject of Christ Crucified, we will speak not only of the moral failure and the inherent sinfulness of man but also of the hope and power of forgiving love. We will hold up the cross not as a symbol of the defeat of the good, but of the victory of the good. Christ chose the cross. He was not humbled. He humbled himself. If Christ believed he would draw the world to him by a cross, dare we fail to preach the Christ crucified? In a world gone mad, in a history which we cannot understand, the cross is the revelation of God's power and redeeming love. I cannot conceive of a God offering his son to any angry justice that demands retribution, but I can believe that the example of perfect self mastery by self-giving may cleanse men and show men God.

John Petrie points out that Emerson in speaking to the Harvard Divinity School, pointed out the dangers of the preacher. Pious phrases, tricky catch words, peptalks were among those temptations. But Emerson insisted "that all that was needed for young parsons was to breathe life into the old forms. Preachers should go directly to the Divine Source of all being and then transmit the result to the fainting hearts of men."

Jesus gave as his final commission, that his disciples should go

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE

and preach. He had a great deal of faith in the effectiveness of preaching. We are not only to preach. We are to preach the Gospel, the Evangel. We are to offer the world the redeeming Gospel of God's love in Christ. May God guide you as you endeavor to preach the Ancient Gospel truths in modern terms. But who is sufficient for such a day? And yet Christ depends on His Gospel to save men. We are to become the channel of his redeeming message to the world.

May I conclude these lectures with an illustration in Luccock's "Jesus and the American Mind": "In January, 1930, King George's speech opened the London Naval Conference. Just a few minutes before the speech was to come on, an official in the plant of the Columbia Network, Mr. Walter Vivian, discovered that something was the matter with the wiring. It would take 20 minutes to repair. What a disappointment to the millions of listeners. Without hesitation he grasped the two ends of the broken wires, one in each hand to restore the circuit. The shock was terrific and the leakage of current shook his arms and burned his hands, but he held on while there went through him the King's message of Peace."

"It's a costly task this carrying of a real message. It's a symbol of the only way in which God's message can be carried to the world. For after all that is what Jesus did, "this is my body which is broken for you." The disciple is not above his master. Only through human lives will there ever be found an effective medium to transmit the King's message to the world."

Cincinnati, Ohio.