

BULLETIN  
OF  
COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

MANFORD GEORGE GUTZKE, D. D.



PUBLISHED QUARTERLY AT  
DECATUR, GEORGIA

---

VOLUME XXXIII

SEPTEMBER, 1940

No. 2

---

Entered as Second-class Matter, May 9, 1923, at the Post Office at Decatur, Georgia  
Under the Act of August 24, 1912

An address delivered by

MANFORD GEORGE GUTZKE, D. D.

*On the occasion of his formal induction into office as  
Professor of English Bible and Religious Education at*

COLUMBIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

MAY 13, 1940

*Mr. President, Gentlemen of the Board of Directors, Members of the  
Faculty, Alumni, Students, and Friends of Columbia Theological  
Seminary:*

The subject I have chosen to discuss is rather general in scope, but I think both fitting and timely for the occasion. Having in mind the problems confronting our whole church, as well as the particular significance of these exercises, I beg your attention to this theme:

#### THE FUNCTION OF THE BIBLE TODAY

Doubtless each generation in turn experiences more or less of darkness and shadow as the forces of evil dominate the relations of men and the problems of living, but certainly our age is just now plunging into deeper gloom than any we have known. The foundations of social custom are being shaken and disrupted until it seems the whole fabric of civilization will be torn to shreds by ruthless destruction. Now is the time for us to remember that the armed violence in Europe tonight is not a thing apart from the history of man in past generations. The bitter truth of the matter seems plainly to be that the godless philosophies of vain and wilful men, who in the past have scoffed at Christian faith and virtue, and have deliberately inflamed the carnal thinking of sinful minds, have at last brought forth their natural offspring in that wanton cruelty which is shocking the whole world. As we glance back through the blood-marked, tear-stained, pages of human history, we must sadly admit that the tragic calamities of this hour have been all too common among men. Far too often have the hearts of the pure been broken to behold

*"Truth forever on the scaffold,  
Wrong forever on the throne."*

The whole order of Western civilization is not without responsibility in this day of horror. What we are seeing tonight in fearful war, has already been happening in moral, social, and spiritual collapse. In vain have careless men counted on "society" maintaining standards of conduct, better than the level of their own personal behavior. In vain have foolish men expected faith in God to remain steadfast, while they themselves practiced a doubtful tolerance in permitting harmful neglect and destructive criticism to sabotage the prestige of the Holy Scriptures. In vain have

selfish men given themselves over to secular pursuits, expecting "the church" to safeguard the morals of society while they took license to live in indulgent wickedness. "God is not mocked"! Many, many men, who knew better, have sown the wind, and are now to realize in blood and tears that we must reap the whirlwind.

But it is not my purpose tonight to keep your minds focussed on this darksome hour. This much has been said that we might have a realistic background for our thinking as we now turn soberly to our theme. What then is the function of the Bible today? Is the study of the Bible something for days of leisure and peace? Or is it true, that the darker the hour the more reason we should turn to the Scriptures? Is not this what the Psalmist implies when he writes, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path"? We do well to remember that the world has passed through fearful times ere this, and it has been the glorious testimony of Christians, that when the walls of society and of empires crumble before the onslaught of raw physical violence, then there is always an Augustine with upraised arm pointing the hearts of men to "The City of God." The heroes of faith have ever triumphed as they patiently ran their race, enduring "as seeing Him who is invisible." It has ever been true, and it is true now, that "God always causeth us to triumph in Christ Jesus." Earnest men have faithfully warned a sleeping church for years that the shadows were deepening in the hearts of men. Fascinated by material prosperity, and drunken with human achievement, multitudes have left their Bibles unopened, their knees unbent, their heads unbowed—they did not worship God sincerely, nor admit their own sins honestly. But God has not left Himself without witness. In every generation some have cared about God, have turned from their own sin to God, and have lived triumphantly by faith in God. Such men have glorified the name of Christ as they have been the salt of the earth and the light of the world. By their true, patient, worthy living they have kept the name "Christian" on something of a gold standard all over the world.

Let us first consider

#### THE PLACE OF THE BIBLE IN THE CHRISTIAN ECONOMY

The Christian is not so much a person of distinctive moral attainment or of superior ethical standards, even though his character is normally exemplary. He is a Christian because he employs a distinctive technique in living. He depends not primarily upon his own skill or power in manipulating himself or his environment according to his own wisdom or wishes, but essentially upon his understanding and faith in relating himself to the personal Will of the living God according to His revealed Word. Christians are men of flesh and blood, of like passions with other men, yet living on a plane unknown in the experience of the natural man. Where the natural man lives alone within the inner recesses of his own soul, and in that loneliness languishes under the burden of his own fail-

ures and the weight of adverse circumstances, the Christian is never alone. He lives in conscious fellowship with God, who loves him, forgives his sin, cleanses him, delivers him, empowers him, comforts him, and keeps him. The Christian is a man in whose heart Christ dwells by faith.

Men are not born of the flesh as Christians. They are "born again" of the Spirit and the Word. "Every man in Christ Jesus is a new creature." This new life, called "Eternal Life," is also known as "Salvation," with all that wonderful word implies. We shall not take time to remind ourselves of its manifold significance, but simply recall that it indicates everything, past, present, and future, which Christ Jesus secured for sinful men by His own Death on Calvary, His Resurrection by the Power of God and His Exaltation at the right hand of God. We do want to note that all these blessings are ours *by faith*, "not of works lest any man should boast." We remember that "all the promises of God are Yea and Amen in Christ Jesus," in Whom "the unsearchable riches" of God's grace are made available to all men, "Whosoever believeth on Him." Christians, then, being the true children of Abraham, are *saved by faith*, and during their earthly lives they "walk by faith and not by sight."

At this point we must take issue with a current fallacy regarding "faith." The idea has been widely spread that "faith" benefits the believer by some sort of benign psychological, reflex influence. In this view it would appear that "faith" is taken to mean something of an optimistic frame of mind, born of credulity, which spreads such a glow of hopefulness throughout consciousness as to warm the cockles of the heart, and thus to produce subjectively, the well-known "fruits of the Spirit," viz., "love, joy, peace, etc." Doubtless such attempts at living in an imaginary world of wishful thinking are made from time to time, though why anyone should admire such mistaken efforts as "noble" remains somewhat obscure. This is that "idealism" which so many of us find so ephemeral and so impractical, that we can have no confidence in its claims. Simply put, this is the notion expressed in such thoughts as this: "It makes no difference whom or what you believe, just so you have faith, that's all that counts." A more untrue and illogical statement is hard to conceive. Needless to emphasize, Christian faith, "saving faith" is something entirely different.

By "faith" we mean a functional technique wherein man appropriates to himself the revealed promises of God, so that he acts upon them as being philosophically real and pragmatically true. Such a man may recognize the actual situation in which he lives, and be aware of his particular plight and his specific peril. His eyes and mind may be wide open to the real truth of his own limitations, failures, and prospects. But he also recognizes that God is, and believes that God is "a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." Having heard from godly messengers what the benevolent purpose of God in Christ toward himself is, this man commits himself to God by faith in Christ, in acting as if God would grant the Salvation promised in Him. Here we see faith being exercised as the man

directs his course of action in line with the revealed Will of God. When the Jews asked Christ Jesus, "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" He answered "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." It is by such action of faith toward the Person of Jesus Christ that Salvation is achieved by the Christian.

Let us amplify for a moment what the Christian believes about God. God is recognized as the Creator, the Sustainer, the Sovereign, the Judge of all the earth. He is believed to be holy in righteousness, justice, and truth. This world is God's world, and in nature we can see the manifold wisdom and goodness of God. "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork." The revelation of God in the natural creation is true and plain. Only the fool can say in the face of the stars, "There is no God." But this is not all the truth God has revealed.

In Nature God has revealed His Law, and all the world knows that "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." The intrinsic righteousness and integrity of God is reflected in the order displayed in the whole universe. Further, in the very conscience of man, God has fixed a sense of moral equilibrium. All men that are conscious and sane are ready to expect that consequence should follow behavior in direct ratio. But true and holy as this revelation in Nature and in consciousness is, it is yet an inadequate revelation for our needs. It is notoriously true that the heathen have lived and died within sight of all the grand phenomena of nature, grovelling in filth and ignorance, cringing in fear and terror, burdened by the unrelieved guilt of their unforgiven hearts. Readily may we admit that pagans have oft identified true principles of living in morality and justice, but openly we must charge the whole history of mankind can offer no bit of evidence to challenge Peter when he says, "There is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

God is not only the Creator and the Judge, but—the Savior. God is just, but God is gracious. What the sinner needs to be told is not so much that God will judge sin and destroy it, but that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The human heart can naturally recognize the Law of God, but "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." Which is to say, science has not observed, philosophy has not recognized, nor have the poets ever imagined, the riches of grace which God has revealed in His Son. This revelation of the Grace of God is the particular burden of all Scripture, as it was the great work and mission of Christ, as it is today the cardinal truth of the Gospel, preached by Christians to the ends of the earth.

It is in this that Christians are blessed above all men. "The law came by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." The Lord Jesus said of Himself, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh

unto the Father, but by me." The Christian does come by Jesus Christ, confident that in Him he is acceptable to God. The Christian believes on Christ for redemption from his guilt, for deliverance from his sin, for the regeneration of his heart and the renewing of his mind, for the blessed presence of the Holy Spirit, and for his inheritance in the world to come. He believes that now in this present world, Almighty God through Christ Jesus by His Holy Spirit is working in him to will and to do of His good pleasure. Thus does the just man live by faith. He walks by faith. He prays in faith. He works through faith as a co-worker with God.

But whence cometh this faith? Paul gives us a plain positive answer. "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Faith is not magical, but logical in its origin. God has revealed His purposes in Christ in certain promises recorded in Scripture: "exceeding great and precious promises that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature." To be ignorant of these promises is to be effectually barred from entering into the blessings: "Alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them." Ignorance of the laws of nature and of society carries its own measure of disability for living. Ignorance of the promises of God is equally fatal.

We do not hesitate to fix our emphasis at just this point. "The entrance of thy Word giveth light." Where the Word of God is not known men live in the darkness of their own sin and guilt. Just as no unpardoned fugitive from justice will ever be a good citizen, so no unforgiven sinner can ever love God. "We love Him, because He first loved us." "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." Until a man sees and believes on Jesus Christ on Calvary crucified for his sins, he has no inner disposition to love God, or to obey Him from the heart. Such a man is still in his sins.

The Word of God became incarnate in Jesus Christ. The Word of God became literature in our Bible. Even as "no man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him," so it is true that apart from the Bible there is no revelation of God with power to convert the soul. The Scriptures contain the promises of God as they are in Jesus Christ. Hence the Bible is actually the Genesis—the Revelation of our faith, which we have seen to be the technique of our salvation, of our life in Christ.

What we have pointed out thus far as derived from the very nature of our Christian life and experience, is amply verified in Christian biography and Church History. Stong Christians have been men of strong faith. Great believers have been men who honored, read, studied, and loved the Bible. Those souls, whose triumphant testimony is the glory of the Church, have all been men who were great Bible students and humble Bible listeners. They have read, marked, and inwardly digested, the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God. They have had this hall-mark of true

blessedness: Their delight was "in the law of the Lord; and in his law they did meditate day and night."

The whole testimony of Christians may be challenged, and it has been. The basic views in Christian philosophy may be questioned, and they have been. But there can be no serious contradiction of this claim: Christians are what they are because of the Bible. We need to keep in mind that it is as true today as it has ever been, that the promotion of all that is vital and distinctive in Christianity is directly involved in the teaching and preaching of Bible truth.

Let us now turn our attention to

## THE SITUATION IN CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The term "Religious Education" is of doubtful significance amongst us today. We shall use it in these remarks as our General Assembly uses it, and shall mean thereby the whole range of educational work carried on by our Church. However much may be novel and strange in the current methods and procedures in the Religious Education program, the basic purpose involved is as old and familiar as the Great Commission: "Go ye into all the world and *teach* all nations . . ." The making and culturing of Christians has ever been the heartfelt purpose of Spirit-filled witnesses for Christ.

Modern Religious Education has a significance for our own times, because of new conditions in our social order. Many functions common to the family and to interested individuals in times past, have become the particular responsibilities of authorized specialists in our intricate social structure. The basic problems of shelter, of food, of health, for example, have been subjected to intellectual analysis with subsequent technical description, until the disciplines of engineering, of commerce, of medicine, require specialized training for those who would serve therein. Education likewise, both secular and religious, has become the subject of intensified study, in which theory and technique have been formulated and developed toward achieving the best results. Religious Education, as a formal technique, has developed as a child of our times, with an apparent fitness to meet the needs of this hour, but yet with certain grave deficiencies, which may be accounted for by circumstances surrounding its development.

What these circumstances are, and how they have affected the development of Religious Education technique, can be indicated best by recounting the historical background of contemporary educational thinking in America. For the past three centuries the intellectual views of the Western World have been dominated largely by what has been called "Science," but what was really materialistic philosophy at heart. The modern scientific Era began with men like Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, and Newton, who sought to discover the laws of natural phenomena by observation, both empirical and experimental. The tension which arose between those

independent minds and the authoritarian ecclesiasticism in the Church of their day, was temporarily relieved by the dualistic philosophy of Descartes. Accepting that view as a premise by common consent, the scientists pursued their study of the material world without further collision for some time with the dogma of the Church. The success of the scientific approach in the interpretation of natural phenomena and in the control of natural forces was so great that the intellectual life of the Western World was captivated by its methods and fascinated by its views. Being confined by definition and by inclination to material data, it is not surprising that the dominant philosophies of the intelligentsia became more and more naturalistic while often more or less consciously and willingly anti-Biblical.

Out of such a background have developed the social sciences and the modern theories of pedagogy. The dualism of Descartes, the psychology of Wundt, the pedagogy of Rosseau, the biological theory of Darwin, the philosophical pragmatism of William James, were blended in America by the experimentalism of John Dewey into an educational technique that has seemed admirably suited to train neuro-muscular equipment for living in the socio-economic environment of the material world, and by its own definitions and adopted limitations has been quite inadequate to deal with the needs of what Christians call the soul. Having begun with the Cartesian premise that man has both body and soul, and that only the body can be studied by the scientific method, and having studied the body in all its relations with the material environment in nature, the modern mind has formulated patterns of thought limited to the "natural," while exercising conscious deliberate discrepancy to avoid the "spiritual." Keeping these historical facts in mind it is not difficult to understand that any systematic philosophical basis for Religious Education derived from that intellectual background must obviously be inadequate for the teaching of the historic Christian Gospel, as we know it. It is not so much that any of the above mentioned concepts is untrue taken by itself, as it is that taken together they are not all the truth we need to have in mind when we would chart an adequate approach to the problem of education for spiritual life and experience. The perspective in such thinking is "localized" by arbitrarily focussing upon the "natural" alone. It is obviously logically impossible to arrive at adequate conclusions about that which was excluded in the premises.

We need now to soberly recognize that in adopting the general technique of contemporary Religious Education with its secular origin and materialistic backgrounds, our own Church has been in imminent danger of incorporating a far more naturalistic viewpoint in its educational program than our hearts desire, our convictions imply, or our Bibles warrant. The fact remains that our faith is derived from a revelation. It does "not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." That revelation in Christ Jesus is amongst us now in formal fashion in the Scriptures, in power of the Holy Spirit, and in testimony in the witness of believing souls in whom the grace of God is effecting the salvation provided in



Christ Jesus. It is because these two things are true: first, that current Religious Education derived from secular pedagogy is so largely dominated by naturalistic thinking, and, second, that our Gospel is at heart a revealed message of the supernatural working of the power of God in grace, that considerable tension has existed throughout our whole Church in this vital field of Religious Education.

This condition has been prevalent not only in our own denomination, but throughout the rank and file of American Christendom. In the opposite periphera the tension is negligible. On the one hand is a segment of contemporary Christianity that has abandoned the Scriptures as the authentic authoritative revelation of God. Among these there is much energetic seeking after "creative" methods by which wise educators may produce "Christian" character by expert manipulation of the factors involved in human personality. For them the "Jesus' way of living" is an ideal into which they plan to "condition" their pupils by intelligent control of environment and learning situations. On the other hand are those who have repudiated "Religious Education" as a "device of the devil," and who look askance at any modification of method or procedure, which looks different than that which was used and proven in the past. But in the main body of Christians of all denominations, among the people who want to exercise their intellect in grasping the meaning of the Gospel for our own day and circumstances, but who also hold to the Scriptures as "the only infallible guide and rule in matters of faith and practice" in which the Gospel promises are authentic and valid, there is this tension of which we speak. At times and in places conflict and controversy have troubled the fellowship of our own Church when sincere men have differed in honest opinion as to which particular view should prevail in the judgment of the Church as a whole upon matters of educational principle and policy.

This clash of opinion is reflected not only in contemporary religious literature, but may be heard from the rostrum as expressed by leading educators. It is not unusual to hear an address in which the speaker begins by accepting as valid the viewpoints and principles of naturalistic interpretation of life and experience to such an extent that the authority of the Scriptures as revelation and the reality of the Supernatural as a functional factor are reduced to mere figments of imagination and speculation, and then proceeds to ring the changes upon the historic Christian convictions by asserting that of course we must have salvation by faith, only through Christ Jesus because of Calvary, by the Holy Spirit, and all this reinforced by most solemn assurances that the speaker believes in heaven, counts on the resurrection, and is guided by the Bible. It takes very little acquaintance with logic or experience with duplicity to be convinced that there is a basic fault in the whole of such conglomerate thinking. Perhaps this much could be said: when we grant the personal sincerity of such a speaker we have a bonafide example of the tremendous forces opposing each other in contemporary religious thought, forces so powerful that a speaker may be swayed by each though they are mutually contradictory, being directly opposed to each other.

It would seem almost beside the point to underscore emphasis here about the course our own Church should follow, but the situation seems also to demand some such emphasis. The formal promotion of "Religious Education" as a new field of study has been dominated largely by men who have the general viewpoint of naturalistic philosophy. That this is so is brought into sharp focus by the fact that the International Council of Religious Education has recently taken cognizance of wide-spread criticism of its general philosophical approach on the part of the Church at large, and has appointed a Commission to study these criticisms and to report recommendations looking toward modification of the Council's program. Doubtless we should make whatever contribution we can to the cause of Scriptural instruction everywhere, but most certainly there is no reason why our Church should wait for guidance from the International Council. One needs but to call to mind the dominant influences that have prevailed in that Council to have a rather definite idea of what to expect by way of any significant change in the immediate future. Meanwhile a whole generation of youth stands in jeopardy of being deprived of just that Biblical instruction which our own leaders have always deemed essential. Our ministers and our elders must perform their duty in line with the intent of our Church Government to promote Bible instruction now. The matter is of sufficient import to warrant the attention of our General Assembly. It would not be the first time that action by our own Assembly has marked the direction which other groups have afterward followed.

There need be no diffidence as we grapple with the critical problems in the confused field of Religious Education Theory, as though we were prone to ignore some worthy discovery of science. Science is primarily and essentially a method of research employed by honest men whose attitude is one of humble deference to facts. Scientific minds employ speculative and philosophical reflection only by way of formulating hypotheses for explanation of observed phenomena, but such hypothetical conclusions are designed only to guide further experiment and research. While it is true that the form of such hypotheses may remain constant over some considerable period due to the fact that no further discovery has been made upon which to base any alterations of view, and it is further true that the human mind tends to accept as factual any statement that has not been successfully contradicted over a considerable period of time, still it is to the everlasting credit of the temper and spirit of the scientific attitude, that any ideas, no matter how firmly entrenched in the popular imagination or rooted in common prejudice, will be discarded by real scientists upon the discovery of new facts which make those ideas untenable. The past half-century has witnessed the most far-reaching modification of scientific thought, due to the genius and industry of enterprising individuals who have ventured to direct their trained research into old fields wherein they have discovered new facts. It is beside our purpose to dwell upon this amazing revolution which has taken place in scientific theory since the turn of the century, but we note that such is the case, only that

we might rid our minds of the naive impression that we needs must incorporate into our thinking every suggestion that has ever prevailed in the scientific views of the past. We would have ourselves free to reflect that since science alters its own concepts without hesitation, and openly acknowledges that it would not insist upon any current formulations of thought as being final, we are doing no violence to intellectual integrity if we humbly question the validity of such ideas as are apparently supported by the science of this hour but which openly contradict conceptions embedded in the Holy Scriptures.

We hold it to be pertinent to our interest to remark that while science is constantly scrapping as obsolete, ideas that have proudly held sway for centuries, and is even now deliberately reshaping molds of thought to accommodate data secured in recent discoveries, Christians have a Revelation to guide them in that spiritual realm of our particular interest, whose validity is unchallenged and whose power is unimpaired for those who believe. There is an eternal significance in the things of Christ which accounts for the unvarying impact of the Scriptures upon the human heart in every generation. When we remember that the formal educational technique of modern times has been derived from a systematic conception of man based upon the conclusions of natural science and not upon the Scriptures, we can understand even more clearly the fact and the nature of that constant tension between Christian Conviction and recent "Religious Education" to which reference has been made. We need not imply any necessary conflict between Science and Revelation, even though we may expect that conclusions based upon scientific research restricted to objective natural phenomena will differ in form and significance from insights derived from the Scriptures, which set forth truth about the whole of man in both material and spiritual aspects with both temporal and spiritual relationships. Such conflict, while not necessary, has nevertheless been actual in history, and the strain of the conflicting viewpoints within the Church continues with us to this very hour, marring the fellowships and reducing the power of our common Christian testimony.

In the particular field of our present interest this tension could be permanently relieved by an intelligent logical procedure on the part of Christian educators. Inasmuch as Religious Education with us is concerned with the whole man both for this world and for the spiritual realm, and since our whole confidence rests in the effectual realization in the believer of salvation by Jesus Christ made available through the Gospel by the Word of God, our leaders need but to fashion educational theory upon the premises of scriptural psychology and philosophy. Let it not be inferred that such theory or technique need be any the less technical or even intellectual in its form. But rather than seeking for clues about the real nature of man in the restricted, abstracted, field of the metrical phenomena of nature, let Christian educators search the Scriptures for those insights into human nature that will make possible such a conception of man as

will be useful to our specific Christian purpose, viz., the making and culturing of Christians. Some such reconstruction of Religious Educational theory and technique is an urgent need amongst us at this very hour.

What we have in mind here can be illustrated by briefly examining two grave fallacies in contemporary religious educational thought. The first we will note concerns the nature of man, arising from the positions of naturalistic psychology. The second involves the nature of learning, being derived from dominant pedagogical views so prevalent in secular education. Basically both fallacies can be traced to that arbitrary bisection of human nature already identified in the influence of Descartes. These conceptions we shall examine are so prevalent and sound so plausible that we shall need to look closely to detect their inherent inadequacy.

### 1. AS TO THE NATURE OF MAN

The view is commonly held that man is primarily and essentially a physical being, and that human personality is the outcome of experience with the objective material environment. With physiological psychology as a starting point, and the statistical interpretation of quantitative phenomena of overt behavior as a method, a conception of man has been formulated in which the individual is essentially "a gratuitous concourse of atoms" happening by chance within a fixed impersonal environment, and becoming willy-nilly just what that environment would determine. The classic terms of "soul," "will," "consciousness," and even "mind," which have seemed to imply some non-physical entity to be recognized apart from the physical body, are reduced to mere words without substance or meaning. Scarcely a generation ago there was presented to the world a novel interpretation of man which was logically consistent with the "recognized" facts and with the general attitude then prevalent among the investigators of human nature. Behaviorism was the natural product of American psychology, and at its initial pronouncement was hailed far and wide by our educators and philosophers as the only true conception of man verifiable by scientific observation. It is a striking tribute to the general balance of common public opinion, that when this view of man was once generally evaluated it was tacitly abandoned as inadequate. No logical demonstration was required to relegate behaviorism to the limbo of derelict systems of thought. When once recognized in its obvious implications it was simply left to sink by the weight of its own topheavy inferences. What concerns us now is that the roots from which this unacceptable conclusion was derived remain with us in our psychology and pedagogy to this hour. While the system has been abandoned, the motif prevails far and wide. Our educational psychology is behavioristic, and many of our leading educators were trained in behaviorism.

The general view persists that character is produced rather automatically as a quantitative result of the welter of experiences. A certain neuro-muscular-glandular equipment is accepted as given, but the develop-

ment of the personality is conceived as taking place by the conditioning of reflexes in that equipment. Attention has been so fastened upon the minutiae of stimulus-organism-response data, that the result in our thinking is that of a picture of a forest with major accent upon the leaves of the trees. For some time the building of character has been conceived as if it were similar to the building of a brick wall. The focus of study has been upon the end result. Description of desirable personalities consisted of listing the various habits, attitudes and skills, ad infinitum, which, taken together, were to constitute the goal of character education. Teaching was conceived to be something of a glorified animal-training forte wherein the purpose seemed to be very similar to the circus performer who is able to make his trained apes act almost human. In other words, nature provided the "raw material" out of which by socialization processes the acceptable personality was to be produced. It was only reasonable therefore that the given "raw material" should be esteemed alike in all people, and the whole process of producing "Christians" should finally be conceived to be one of methods of training, conditioning, and control.

The significance of this naturalistic view of man is a matter for our immediate practical concern. In our day every member of our church has been subjected for the years of childhood, at least, to the influences of the current secular educational system. Everyone knows that our public educational intent is deliberately restricted to certain aspects of the personality, with anything religious being scrupulously avoided. This makes it possible for the prevailing technique of that field to be designed to train, condition, control physical and mental reflexes exclusively, and to ignore by common consent anything that would grapple with the problems of the soul, the conscience, or the will. Our forefathers were not willing to delegate the education of the Spiritual to the State. This they meant to attend to in the home and in the church. It is beside our point to comment upon the sad denouement of this part of their educational plan, but we must note that it was not included in the public school program. That program has made great strides in educating our youth to use mind and body, but has been notoriously lacking in producing moral character. And in the course of promoting that program we have developed an educational technique so universally practiced that it has seemed by common consent to be true to the nature of man and adequate for all educational purposes. Thus we find ourselves attempting to "teach" Christian living and experience by the identical methods used in our secular educational system. Needless to emphasize, such conceptions as "original sin," as "total depravity," as "the necessity of regeneration," as the "personality of the Holy Spirit"; such distinctions as "law" and "grace," "faith" and "works," "flesh" and "spirit," "earth" and "heaven"; such principles as "the power of the resurrection," "the mediation of the living Christ as our Advocate," "the forgiveness of sins," "the communion of the Holy Spirit," "the power of the Blood," have come to sound so obsolete, to seem so unimportant, to imply something so overdone, that it has seemed wise to ignore, proper to omit, or even necessary to reinterpret and to

restate by way of correction, these outworn, outmoded "relics of the Middle Ages!"

Our texts on child pedagogy generally trace the dynamic for Christian living to such natural factors as "instincts." It is not exceptional to read through a whole treatise on "How to teach religion," offered as a study course to our Sunday School teachers, without finding any functional significance attached to the promises of God, the Atonement of Calvary, the infilling of the Holy Spirit, the exercise of prayer, or the hope of Eternal Life. Shocking as this may sound to our ears, the prevalence of these symptoms are all too common to be ignored. They do not necessarily indicate any deliberate intention on anyone's part to consciously denature the Gospel. But they are evidences of the influence of this widespread fallacy in the conception of human nature pervading our American educational thinking.

How shall we present in contrast a more adequate conception of man? We shall not attempt in the limits of this address to set forth such presentation with any systematic thoroughness, but shall offer simply a sketch of such a conception agreeable to implications in Scripture and apparently justified by empirical observation. Let us be reminded we need have little concern if we differ with current formal conceptions of human nature. There are many of them and they all differ, hence there need be no intellectual consternation if we exercise our "philosophical prerogatives" in setting forth a conception suitable to our own viewpoint. We conceive man to be, not an impersonal construct like a brick wall, but a unified living organism like a tree. The brick wall is built by a builder who has the design in his own mind and who arbitrarily and specifically makes the bricks and places them to suit his own purpose. The design is in his mind and the brick is helplessly "impersonal" in his hands. But the design of the tree is in the seed from whence it grew. How that design persists or where it is located in the seed baffles the biologist to this day, but that it exists is disputed by no one. The oak is in the acorn in mysterious fashion. Environment, conditions, culture, do not effect the *nature* of the oak, but the seed does. An acorn and a walnut can be planted side by side, and they will grow side by side, till they weather fifty years together, but the one will be an oak and the other a walnut as long as they live. Attention and culture may prolong the life and increase the spread of the oak, but it remains what the *seed* determined it to be. Out of all the various chemical elements in the soil and atmosphere, and under all the effect of the physical factors of sunlight, weather, etc., something in that acorn is and remains the dominating principle of design and identity in that organism. So it is with man.

The human being is not a conglomeration of residua out of a series of chance happenings. The human identity and personality is not some grotto that has appeared at this instance in the shifting strata of ecological movement in the structure of society, the helpless, hapless, product of impersonal factors in an impersonal universe. Students of human nature

have for twenty years or more been demurring against all such mechanistic interpretations of man. The function of the Will in not only organizing the personality but also in determining the character has been recognized in reputable psychology by some in this country and even more widely in Europe. The significance of purpose in the human being, never entirely ignored, has recently loomed much larger in the views of systematic psychology. The teleological aspect of deliberate conduct has been accented in Gestalt psychology to a point where it claims the attention of all. This much is mentioned to remind ourselves that the groundwork is being done in preparing for a systematic conception of man in line with our illustrative sketch already presented. There is a steady drift toward some such view of man as will recognize in him some dominant principle or purpose that serves to select from life's motley experiences, such impressions or conditionings as will serve a definite purpose determined from within the person himself.

With some such view our Gospel can be readily articulated. We conceive that the Gospel in the Word of God is a seed, which, when received into the human heart, takes root there and grows into a Christian. "Christ on Calvary for my sins" believed into my heart becomes a motif that serves as a selective principle guiding the growth of my personality throughout all subsequent experience and circumstance. By this view we might expect Christians to appear in any sociological environment, and despite any psychological native equipment, wherever the Scriptures are presented and believed. And this is just what in actual fact we do find. To be sure environment and nurture affect the development and fruitfulness of the Christian life, just as they do the growth of a rose or an apple tree, but they do not determine the nature of these organisms. The seed does that in the natural world even as the Word of God does in the Spiritual.

Enough has been said to make clear what we mean when we say that the conception of human nature which implies that Christian personality is secured by manipulation of the native "raw materials" by ingenious educational methods is fallacious in principle, and is definitely unacceptable as a basis for educational technique to be employed by the Christian Church.

Let us look more briefly at the second fallacy which is closely related.

## 2. AS TO THE NATURE OF LEARNING

In the realm of American pedagogy it is so widely held as to appear a truism, that ideals are adequate to motivate and to guide human conduct. I need not take your time to do more than merely refer you again to popular texts on Religious Education, for abundant evidence that it is the preponderant view in that field which is our particular interest just now. The production of Christian character is openly premised upon the principle of setting forth desirable ideals and then arousing instinctual drives

to supply the dynamic necessary to inspire activity toward the attempted achievement of those ideals. Just how long the modern youth can be thus inspired to work toward a goal which, by definition, he can never achieve; and just what ingenuity is required to secure his consent to sublimate the "lower" drives to promote the "higher" goals in a world that is so obviously crass and sensual, does not appear in the context of such treatises. Anyone acquainted with the power of the Gospel, the work of the Holy Spirit, or the present ministry of the living Christ, knows at once how character transformation can be affected, but we are not ready in our discussion to introduce these factors. The viewpoint we are now identifying has no place and no meaning for such things. In this, so-called "modern," educational technique the aim is to inculcate into the mind of the growing youth certain patterns of possible conduct conceived to be superior and desirable, and to magnify their superiority and desirability in some such way as to fire the imagination and to enamor the emotions to the point where the individual will attempt an imitation of what has been projected hypothetically before him. It is not difficult here to recognize the use of rewards and punishments as motivation, and to realize that this whole system is but a contemporary version of Salvation by works according to the Law. "You get what you deserve, so you had better deserve something good." The death of Christ is valuable in this view as an example, a pattern for us to follow. Virtue is to be its own reward. And if you want to be "nice" or "good," of course this is the way you ought to live and to do. We cannot refrain from reminding ourselves that Paul writes in Romans 7 that he found the law to be "holy, just and good," even while he stood condemned before it in his own inability to achieve righteousness thereby. But there can be not the slightest question that we have in this pedagogical principle something entirely out of place in New Testament procedure.

Not only is this idea inadequate for any application of the Grace of God, but it seems equally impractical in the very field in which it purports to serve. It has long been accepted that conduct cannot be judged by appearances. It is equally true that character is not procured by any imitation of desirable traits. The imitation of noble conduct remains just as it originated—it is an imitation. In the realm of material, physical and perhaps even social relations, a certain skill in adjustment can be acquired by adopting patterns of behavior suggested by the conduct of others. But in matters of qualitative significance, when the intention or the motive gives meaning to the act, imitation of overt behavior is something quite different from the sincere act being imitated. Ananias and Sapphira are on record as having imitated to appear as if they too were as generous as Barnabas. The secret of their tragic blunder can be traced to the fact that their motive was something quite other than that of Barnabas.

To motivate conduct by ideals means to present as stimulus to the individual a hypothetical possible pattern of behavior which if he would follow would prove to be eminently desirable or satisfactory. Before that



ideal could affect him he would have to imagine it in his own mind. In other words the individual is asked to pre-conceive a desirable course of conduct so stimulating to himself that he will discipline himself in self-denial to achieve it. No doubt everyone is familiar with the man who undertook to lift himself by his own bootstraps. Just how long educational theory will persist in fashioning itself upon this psychologically impossible principle, we cannot say. The greatest living American educational philosopher has put all the weight of his genius and the prestige of his fame into the support of just that idea, and does not hesitate to recommend it as the principle to reproduce whatever virtues Christians may ever have manipulated. But it is imperative that Religious Education in our Church rid itself of this fallacy without delay. The Christian Gospel offers the vicarious atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ in historical fact with eternal significance to the heart of the guilty sinner as the motivating factor that will be the dynamic involved in his regeneration and sanctification. The factual data of Christ's work on our behalf when received as true by faith on our part is used by the living God, by His Holy Spirit, to effect factual regeneration of our very beings. It is then that "the love of Christ constraineth us." Not merely the example of His love as a sort of idealistic pattern that we, sinful as we are, should imitate to be like Him; but the functional effectiveness of that love in the living Christ, then manifested on Calvary, now operative in the hearts of all who believe and are filled by His Spirit. "The Love of God is spread abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost." Christian living in purpose and in conduct is not fashioned in an attempt to achieve a righteousness we admit we do not have, but is fashioned in the desire to manifest to the Glory of God that righteousness from God which we do now possess in Christ by faith and in which we are acceptable before God "in the beloved."

The physical limits of this address will prohibit further development of this discussion. This much has been stated to offer some interpretation of the contemporary situation in Religious Education. What we would further say will be intimated now as we turn to consider

### III. THE PARTICULAR TASK CONFRONTING OUR CHURCH

The task of preaching and teaching the Gospel was committed to the Christian Church by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, placing all believers under a sense of obligation to carry the message to all men everywhere. No one is born naturally as a Christian. The natural birth produces the natural man. It is the New Birth by the Word and the Spirit that produces the spiritual man. As the natural birth takes place by blood, by the will of the flesh, by the will of man, so does the spiritual rebirth take place as of God, who begets believers by His Word. This makes the presentation of the Gospel essential to the salvation of men, to the begetting of Christians.

We have already noted that Christian life and experience issues from believing the promises of God in Christ. Those promises are set forth in the Holy Scriptures as the Word of God. They are eternal in significance and unchangeable in validity, being based upon the fact of Calvary in history and rooted in the nature of the eternal God in principle and intention. Our God is a living God, the Scriptures are His living Word. These promises were revealed "in times past unto the fathers by the prophets" as they have now been revealed "unto us by His Son," and they have been "written for our learning upon whom the ends of the world have come." The Holy Spirit was given to make that Word living and real to our individual hearts and lives. The Scriptures are no less valid because they were written centuries ago, than the Cross of Calvary which happened 1900 years ago.

But each generation in turn must be taught the Word of God. Doubtless the children of godly parents will be disposed to receive the Word gladly, but they are not born with any innate grasp of it. They must be taught. Moses made provision for succeeding generations to teach their children the Works of God in Israel. Throughout Scripture this responsibility for teaching the young and the stranger has always been placed upon men who knew God. Our Lord Himself was a Teacher, and in His great commission He specifically charged His disciples to teach all men. The Gospel is a revelation of what God will do in His power by His Spirit according to His Promises in and for "whosoever believeth." Inasmuch as it is the will, the intention, of a living Being, it would remain forever unknown to any study of the created world, while it would be known to anyone to whom He would reveal it. That He has so revealed it in His Word, and will so reveal it to anyone through His Word, is the plain teaching of Scripture as it is corroborated by the common experience of Christians.

With such considerations in mind we can indicate our immediate task very simply.

## 1. WE MUST STUDY THE BIBLE

It is not enough to have confidence that the Scriptures are the Word of God. It is essential that we have knowledge of what the Word of God says. The books of the Bible constitute a literature in which certain ideas and concepts are set forth in human language. The words used to designate these ideas have a scriptural meaning to be construed on the basis of their scriptural context and biblical usage.

Study of the original languages, together with research into the social customs of the times in which the Scriptures were written, can all be helpful to enrich our grasp of the meaning of what was written. But such philological, archaeological, ethnological and historical research can never be determinative in matters of doctrinal interpretation. The Scriptures say something as they are written. What they say and what they

mean is to be understood by comparing Scripture with Scripture in whatever language they may be studied.

Our missionaries in the Congo have translated the Scriptures into the Baluba language. Perforce they were obliged to use Baluba words, terms, idioms, thought-forms. The religious and philosophical conceptions of the Baluba tribes had been couched in and conveyed by these very words, terms, etc. But language students could study Baluba with meticulous care as extensively as they would, and never deduce the meaning of our Baluba Scriptures from Baluba literature. However the study of the Baluba Bible, comparing Baluba Scripture with Baluba Scripture, would enable anyone to grasp the message, as one might secure it from the English Bible, the French Bible, etc.

The context of the whole Bible is the source of the content of Scriptural statement. We mean the New Testament as it stands in the light of the Old, and we interpret the Old Testament as it appears in the light of the New. We approach our study remembering "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Just as one studies the literature of any language to become proficient in the interpretation of that language, so one studies the Scriptures to become proficient in their interpretation. It is usage that invests words with meaning, and it is usage in the Bible that invests ideas and concepts there with meaning. To understand common words we must be familiar with their common usage; to understand scriptural concepts we must be familiar with their scriptural usage.

Men get to know the Bible as they get to know any language. Both formal study and informal acquaintance and association contribute to the mastery of Spanish or Japanese. Even so in coming to know the Bible. Formal study under definite guidance will yield results. But living with it, reading it, hearing it, thinking it, until it becomes "second nature," until our thoughts couch themselves in its terms and use its ideas—that will give one a grasp of the Bible that will be truly powerful and practical in life and experience.

This task of studying the Bible as one would study any body of particular literature, belongs to every generation. It belongs to ours. The very exigency of contemporary circumstances wherein we need direct help and guidance from God from day to day makes it all the more urgent that everyone study the Bible with earnest practical purpose at once and as much as possible.

## 2. WE MUST INTERPRET THE BIBLE IN CONTEMPORARY LANGUAGE

Coupled with all that we have implied in emphasizing that the Scrip-

tures must be studied as they are to discover their meaning, we must recognize that in presenting that message, it is essential to do so in the language of the people to whom it is being given. Not only must the Gospel be published and preached in the vernacular of the common people, but it must be taught in the current phraseology and vocabulary of our times.

The rapid changes within our whole social order, physically, mechanically, ideologically, culturally, have been reflected in shifting variations in our speech. New words, new terms, new thought-forms devised to incorporate reference to new conditions, new inventions, new discoveries, new ideas, into our common language, have distinguished the present age. The vocabulary of forty years ago is woefully inadequate today, even as the speech of 1940 would be quite unintelligible to the mind of 1900.

Such changes have marked all human history but in our generation their completeness in extent and in thoroughness has been unprecedented. There is an intellectual cast of thought, a scientific bent of interest, a philosophical turn of mind abroad today, that we must not and would not ignore. In our own field the social sciences have developed a glossary of significant terms, and cultivated a taste for objective analysis and interpretation of human experience, that must be taken into account when we would address the public in the interests of our Gospel.

Inasmuch as our Gospel is a living message we cannot hesitate to present it in the language of the hour. Hudson Taylor made a distinct contribution to Foreign Mission technique when he adopted Chinese customs, language, dress, manners as a means to facilitate the presentation of the universal gospel to the Chinese. Since there is a 20th Century cast of mind wherein we live, let us not falter in "translating" our Scriptures into the 20th century "vernacular."

The intrinsic eternal meaning of our Gospel need not be impinged. The work of Calvary is as significant in Russian as it is in English as it is in Choctaw. It can be as vital in the scientific terminology of the 20th century as it was in the philosophic phraseology of the 17th century. A thousand years ago an infant was nourished at its mother's breast. The general understanding then of the physiological processes involved would seem most naive to us now, but the modern infant still is nourished in the same way. The technical information we have today has improved our practical understanding, but it has not altered the facts involved. With the widespread interest in social sciences and in personality interpretation, we have today an entirely new equipment of terminology with which to preach and to teach the Gospel of Christ. Our power and effectiveness in reaching this generation can be substantially increased by our diligent utilization of speech mechanisms familiar to our own contemporaries.

We do not imply condemnation of the language of former times, nor criticisms of other generations as they exercised themselves in effective

witnessing. We simply recognize that words, phrases, accents, emphases which may have unusual force and aptness in one era often become empty, formal, ineffectual in another time under different cultural circumstances. We remind our hearers that the content of our message is permanently set forth in a self-interpretative literature of Scripture, and are now saying that the form of our presentation should be native to our own times. What we need is fresh Bible study with constant Bible reading so that our own modern minds may grasp the meaning of the Gospel in the "containers" of contemporary thought-forms. There is no inclination here to make invidious suggestions as to comparative fitness. Things in time and space, in custom and procedure, do change in outward form: the essence remains. So let it be with the Gospel. And to this end let our generation take up anew the study of this inspired Word in the deliberate purpose to know it for ourselves and to give it to others.

### 3. WE MUST TEACH BELIEVERS THE TRUTH ABOUT CHRISTIAN LIVING

So much of our study of matters of Christian living in the immediate past has been descriptive in its approach. We have concerned ourselves to identify the outward forms of overt conduct as Christian or non-Christian, and in consequence there has been much mutual incrimination. Interminable controversies and heated arguments have disturbed our hearts as men clashed in their opinions as to whether a given conduct-pattern were "Christ-like" or "of the devil." Some shifting of the locus of this interest has taken place, from matters of social behavior, through public conduct, even into economic, national, and international affairs. Always there has been the same vague, uncertain, unsatisfying sense of being baffled to know anything for sure. The New Testament plainly instructs "judge nothing before the time." Yet how often have we been wearied by fruitless efforts to establish this deed as Christian, that policy as Anti-Christian!

What is urgently needed amongst us is an intelligent emphasis upon the origin of Christian living. We need to remember that the classic Christian virtues are the fruit of the Spirit, and that our major concern is to make sure that the seed has been inculcated which will produce that fruit by the Spirit. As gardeners we need not concern ourselves about the tinting of the petals, nor the perfuming of the rose, but we do have our responsibility in determining that the proper seed will be sown, and the favorable culture will be provided.

Our people want to know how to live the Christian life. It has already been noted how fallacious it is to attempt to help them by focussing their attention upon certain end conduct-patterns as ideal. What they need to know is the technique they must employ to achieve even those ends they themselves understand and recognize. Our Young Peoples gatherings are featured by earnest sincere souls who want to know and desperately need to know how to live with God.

The evidence is all too tragically conclusive that many of our Young People are earnestly attempting to approach the achievement of spiritual and eternal values through nature rather than by grace. The prayers offered, the songs selected, the thoughts presented in meditation, dwell predominantly upon the natural, and often are quite void, probably unconsciously empty, of any recognition of Christ's atoning death, His justifying mediation, and His sanctifying fellowship. There is something ominously omitted in the Religious Education of a group of young men who can lustily sing "This is my Father's World," but who probably would not even recognize the air of "There is a green hill far away," let alone sing such a song of praise with fervor and worship. Men have lived in the light of nature, and have loved family and friends, without ever gaining insight into the grace of God which saves the sinner. If the point is raised that the modern youth has no sense of sin, it would simply betray the utterly inadequate content of such religious educational program in which the modern youth has been nurtured. Surely we are not prepared to challenge the categoric statement "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God!" The blame rests not upon the young people, but upon their preachers and their teachers.

To be sure there is religion conceived from within the heart of man and shaped in the mind of man all over the world, but it is natural religion with all the limitations that term implies. In natural religion men select an ideal and try like Babel of old to achieve it. In revealed religion men believe into their very beings the validity of certain promises of the living God, and commit themselves to them with the result that they are changed from within by the power of God. We repeat that God is revealed in nature, but it is not God in nature that saves souls or produces the phenomena of Christian experience. It is God in grace, in the Gospel, in His Word, in Christ Jesus, by the Holy Spirit, who redeems, delivers and quickens men by Himself and makes them fruitful in Spiritual behavior.

Much has been said and written against "content" material, by which aspersion has been cast on the form of sound words, in an attempt to emphasize the function of experience in learning. But upon second thought it is quite obvious that any teacher has a "content," even the most radical experimentalist of them all. In any experience even the most physical, there is the "content" of the particular natural environment, native capacity, and personal heritage. The "content" of spiritual experience comes in the form of the promises of God reported to us by the writings of "holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," but valid only in being received, i. e. experienced. That was a rather naive betrayal of scriptural illiteracy when men supposed that emphasis upon experience as a function in learning was anything new to the Christian. The Scripture had plainly said "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth light." Certainly this did not mean the Spirit apart from the Word, but rather that the Word, taken only in letter is dead, but, received as the will of the living God, as the pattern of promise and the purpose of the

Spirit, is effectual in men's lives. Our Church has understood this from the Scriptures from the beginning. The only novelty here is that this practical truth was late getting into the stream of pedagogical philosophy and practice. We would reiterate however that experience as a means of discovering God's will in Christ Jesus is doomed to be fatally fruitless. There is a message to be found only in Scripture. However it may be presented its content must be true to the Word of God. "What God has promised He is able also to perform"—and it is believing *that* which makes anyone a true child of Abraham.

Our generation needs to be taught that salvation is of God by His grace. There is an ineptitude in human nature, a disinclination in the natural heart, an unfitness in the soul that disqualifies man as he is from fellowship with God. But Christ Jesus died for our sins, He was raised for our justification, He lives for our sanctification, He waits for our glorification. The Holy Spirit has been given to comfort, to guide, to teach, to show, to empower our regenerated beings in fellowship and communion with a living, indwelling, personal Christ. We can walk with Him, and we can talk with Him. We can pray to Him and He will answer us. The Lord Jesus is living now and our fellowship with Him personally should be intimate, personal and constant. "Christ in you, the hope of glory" needs to be etched into the consciousness of every believing soul. And to this task we must set ourselves with diligence and vigor at once.

For this urgent vital assignment we hold in our hands a divine Revelation that is adequate and authentic. We shall never be able to fully appreciate or to worthily thank Almighty God for this gracious provision for our spiritual needs. Enough that we do have it, and we do know its significance sufficiently to commit ourselves to its study and to its propagation. All men need this truth, and they need it now. We have it and are commissioned to take it to every one. Then let us prove ourselves worthy to this extent that we will be appreciative, receptive, obedient and diligent in the study and the dissemination of the Scriptures, our Holy Bible, the Word of God.