DEDICATION

This issue of The Cresset is dedicated to Dr. O. P. Kretzmann on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his inauguration as President of Valparaiso University by the members of the University as a token of their gratitude, esteem, and affection.
FOREWORD

During the academic year 1965-1966, Valparaiso University presented a series of lectures on the theme “Toward the Year 2000.” The series of lectures was made possible by a generous grant by Aid Association for Lutherans. The Cresset is grateful for the opportunity to present the lectures in a double issue as a contribution to the dialogue of our time. It goes without saying that opinions expressed in the lectures are those of the lecturers. Since the lectures reflect a wide spectrum of thought and opinion, it is not surprising that the sponsors of the lecture series and members of the University find themselves in disagreement, on intellectual or theological grounds, with some ideas expressed in them.

During the year 1965-1966, Valparaiso University also celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the inauguration of Dr. O. P. Kretzmann as its president. Although the A.A.L. lectures had no connection with the anniversary, some of them contain references to the anniversary and to President Kretzmann’s contributions to higher education. It is very appropriate, therefore, that the lectures are published in the issue of The Cresset which is dedicated to Dr. Kretzmann on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his inauguration as President of Valparaiso University.

THE LECTURERS

Martin L. Kretzmann is Mission Study Director of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

George E. Catlin is an eminent British political scientist.

Tom J. Mboya is Minister for Economic Planning and Development of The Republic of Kenya.

Jaroslav Pelikan is Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Yale University.

William G. Pollard is Executive Director of the Oak Ridge Associated Universities.

George N. Shuster is Assistant to the President of The University of Notre Dame.

H. C. N. Williams is Provost of the Cathedral Church of St. Michael, Coventry.
When the late Walter Freytag, whose teaching and writing on the mission of the Church has placed not only his own generation but many succeeding generations in his eternal debt, celebrated his sixtieth birthday his friends throughout the world prepared for the occasion a *Festschrift* in his honor. One of the contributions to this volume entitled “The Thought and Practice of Missions” by Dr. Max A.C. Warren closes with these words, “Walter Freytag has brought to his companions in the missionary enterprise, above all else, ‘an understanding heart.’ This more than anything else has won our affection.” Since this lecture is being given in the year in which Valparaiso University is celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of his inauguration as President of the University, I should like, both as a fellow pilgrim on the way, and as a brother in the flesh, to pay tribute to O.P. Kretzmann in these borrowed words. He has brought to his service in the Kingdom of God and in his pilgrimage an understanding heart which has influenced the lives of many more people than we shall ever know.

My particular assignment in the “Toward the Year 2000” series is to discuss the future shape of the American Church’s mission to people in other nations. The selection of the overall theme for this series of addresses seems to me to be particularly appropriate in view of the special role which O.P. has played in the Church during the last twenty-five years. The theme “Toward the Year 2000” has the implication of a prophetic stance over against the Church in the world, and the world in the Church. The way of the prophet is always hard. His bifocal vision places upon him the responsibility of looking at and understanding the situation into which God has placed him, while at the same time seeing in the signs of the time the hand of God shaping the future. As he sees what can be and, under God, will be he must speak to his present generation in such a way that it will make the decisions which will eventually lead to the vision which he has of the future. As he stands in his own generation and speaks to it in language which they can understand, he must at the same time represent in himself the style of life which will embody the vision of what is to come.

In this ambivalent attitude toward life, the prophet is constantly open to the accusation of being “a dreamer,” or at best impractical. The risk he runs of not being understood, or of being misunderstood, is always infinitely greater than the risk encountered by those who are considered to be “practical people.” He does not operate according to letter and law, where there is always an abundance of safety and security, but commits himself to the risk of living according to the Spirit.

In fulfilling the assignment of these convocation addresses, we are engaged in a prophetic enterprise, which is indeed a fitting activity for the year during which we are honoring one who has so often filled a prophetic role in his generation. Those of us who have walked with him for any distance along the pilgrim’s path know that his obsession with the Manger of Bethlehem and the Cross of Calvary is not an effort to escape the harsh realities of the path to the eternal city but an evidence of understanding that the whole of man’s life has meaning only in the light of these events. The manger and the cross are not points in the long distant past to which the pilgrim returns but are rather part of the baggage which he carries along the pilgrim way. The pilgrim who carries the manger and the cross in his heart is not likely to become overly concerned with the penultimate questions in theology, questions concerning the nature of God, or of man, or of history. His eyes are always focused on the ultimate question, the intrinsic aim of existence.

To many of his fellow travelers, my brother O.P.’s love affair with Christmas has seemed to be a nostalgic sentimentalism. It is not that, but rather an unusually clear perception that, in the words of Paul Tillich, “the appearance and reception of Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ is the decisive self-manifestation in human history of the source and aim of all being.” (*Christianity and the Encounter of the World Religions* by Paul Tillich, p. 79).

We who have been asked to participate in this exercise called “Toward the Year 2000” must resist the temptation to divorce ourselves entirely from the world in which we live. I, for one, do not plan to be available in the Year 2000 if someone would want to check up on what was said in the year 1966. But if we understand the role of the prophet as it was described above, namely, to see in the signs of the time the hand of God shaping the future, then our predictions are rooted in what God is doing already, and we do not have to stare at the horizon of our century and claim that we can see what is on the other side.

What is said here concerning “the future shape of the American Church’s mission to those in other nations” grows out of the conviction that God has given and is giving us abundant signs in our time to make it possible for us to know beyond any doubt that if we do not read the signs correctly and are obedient to His leading there will be no mission of the Church in the world worth speaking about in the Year 2000.

The world in which the traditional understanding of the Church’s mission had its origin is gone beyond any chance of recovery. While we must freely grant that there have always been some who have understood the nature of the Church’s mission in the light of God’s total purpose for all of His children in the world, we would be less than honest if we did not admit that much of the in-
stitutional church's concern for missions has had its origin in sub-Christian motivation. The questions which are being directed at the institutional church concerning its motives for, and the validity of, its missions, not only by the men of other faiths but also by its own sons and daughters are sufficient evidence that the assumptions of an earlier age will no longer go unchallenged.

There was a time when the information about peoples of other nations which was available to those who supported the Church's mission would be channeled through the minds and words of those who had a particular institutional concern. We cannot be blind to the fact that this often resulted in the transmission of half truths in the interest, so it was thought, of arousing a concern for missions, and of distortions which engendered an emotional response unrelated to a proper understanding of the Christian's relation to men of other faiths. The presence of representatives of all races and peoples at the United Nations, the progress in inter-continental travel, and, most of all, the presence of students from the so-called mission fields in many of our institutions of higher learning here in the States, has made it impossible for us to maintain the traditional "mission image" of people of other lands.

It is extremely doubtful that we will ever be able to atone for the wrong which we have done these people for so many generations and for the harm which we have done the cause of missions through this kind of misrepresentation. As the sons and daughters of Western culture and civilization we have every reason not to be ashamed of our heritage and of those evidences of it which we see manifested in the daily lives of so many people. In this respect we can take our place beside any nations and peoples in the world. But there is also another side of our civilization, a side which glories in our so-called superiority, which develops instruments of infinite destruction, which excludes from its society those of another color, which marches ruthlessly across the world under the illusion that might is right.

Against this background, we have to ask ourselves what the Church must believe about itself and what it must believe about the world, and what it must believe about the religions of men, if it is to continue to be a mission to men of other faiths in the Year 2000 and in the generations to follow. If we can read the signs of the time, we can already discern the raw material out of which the Church will fashion its thinking and doing a generation from now.

I.

If the two decades which have elapsed since the end of World War II have taught us anything, it is that the long identification of the Christian Church with western culture finally led us to the point where we must either become a conscious and declared arm of that culture or must make it plain to the world that as the people of God the Church stands above and outside of every culture and civilization while at the same time being the heart and core of everything that is good in every culture and civilization. It is obvious that the Church which we know cannot do this unless it comes to a clearer understanding of its place in the plan of God for the entire world.

One of the most disturbing and shocking accusations which is made against the Christian Church in its mission effort of the past 20 years is that it has been engaging in ecclesiastical imperialism and colonialism. The accusation is shocking because of the large measure of truth in it.

A statement of this kind cannot stand without modification. All of us are acquainted with examples of men and women who have left the relatively comfortable circumstances of their life in their homelands to go out into areas of the world where they have literally offered themselves with the sole desire of sharing their greatest treasure with their fellowmen. And yet, precisely because we are all earthen vessels, there has always been this strange mixture of the human and the divine in all that we have done to share this treasure with our fellowmen.

Dr. Max Warren recently published a fascinating study entitled The Missionary Movement from Britain in Modern History, in which he made the following statement: "The story of the missionary movement can record countless missionaries who were resented as bringing with them an alien and uncongenial culture. Not infrequently this led to their suffering violence. Often they were in fact 'offered.' But their own self-offering was not in the name of their culture. It was in the name of 'Him Who had died for them.' To grasp that fact is to grasp the essence of the missionary movement. It is to discover one, and not the least important, of the many clues to the course of events in our contemporary world." (p. 44.)

No missionary has ever been able to leave the shores of his homeland as a pure spirit. In the words of Bishop Stephen Neill (The Interpretation of the New Testament, p. 268), "The missionary is completely immersed in history — not of course in the mere arid succession of the things that come and go. He is engaged the whole time in making history, divine history." At the same time he is the product of divine history which has been shaping his own life. Nor is he able to come into an entirely different culture and civilization and refrain from evaluating that culture in the light of what he has understood God's plan for the world to be. If he has been trained to believe that God's concern for and activity in the world is confined to those areas where the Christian Church is already in existence, then he will surely bring with him not only the message of God's reconciling love in Christ but also a great many other facets and aspects of the culture in which he himself has received this message. In such a case it is not unlikely that the charge of cultural imperialism will be made against him with at least some justification. But if, on the other hand, he believes that God's search for man and the activity of the Holy Spirit of God has been worldwide and continuous
since the beginning of the world then he will make every effort to understand what God has been doing in the culture to which the message of God's love in Christ has now come in his person. As he does this, he will understand more deeply the relative value of all cultures, not only for the physical aspects of man's life but also for his spiritual development.

It is not the intention of the above statements to make the preposterous claim that no missionary has ever gone to other nations without the intention of making them as nearly like himself in all aspects as is humanly possible. That this has happened, does happen, and will continue to happen, no one can deny; this is part of every man's sinfulness of which we will never completely divest ourselves. But there is in this aspect of the missionary work of the Church at least the possibility that the individual messenger will understand his role as an earthen vessel which must be broken in order that the fullness of the treasure might spill forth.

It is not easy to be optimistic about the role of the institutional church in the mission of the Church. Self-criticism is not the most common attribute of any institution. As an institution which has been shaped by sociological and historical factors the besetting sin of the Church has been its passion to absolutize the particular forms into which it has developed, and its unwillingness to re-examine these in the light of changing circumstances. This is particularly dangerous in a church body which does not distinguish between what is of the essence of its being and what is the accident of history and tries to find some Scriptural sanction for everything which it does in the world. This makes it extremely difficult for the Church to react to these changing circumstances and to strive for a new self-understanding. The havoc which this has brought about in the overseas expression of the Church's mission can never be measured.

The Gospel was preached in all its simplicity, it is true, but along with it we have also brought a great many other aspects of the life of the Church in a western culture which, if not intended so to be understood, were nevertheless accepted as being essential parts of the Gospel. Let it be said to the credit of most pioneer missionaries that when they faced the necessity of ordering the life of the newly born Christian community they could only respond to the situation with what they knew from their background. As they did this, they had the hope that when the new Christian community would grow into a deeper understanding of the nature of the Christian Gospel it would order its own life under the guidance of the Holy Spirit in such a way that the genius of its own culture would be expressed. But this hope has not been realized except in most recent years and in a very tentative measure. It was inevitable that those who brought the Gospel to these nations were looked upon as being the bearers of a higher form of communal living than had existed in those communities before the Gospel came. Whatever pronouncements they made, whether they were related to the message of the Gospel itself or whether they concerned the kind of furniture which should be used in the place of worship or the conduct of the voters meetings, were looked upon as an essential part of the Gospel.

If we understand the signs of the times correctly, a revolution is taking place in the thinking of the Church about itself. God has called us into service in His mission to the world at a time when change has become the one static and constant factor in every aspect of life. This has forced upon the Church the disturbing and painful task of asking itself the basic questions regarding its own being and its purpose in the world. As its Biblical scholars examine the roots of its being, they discover again that the sociological forms which the Church took in the days of its origin were in response to its understanding of the Gospel in relation to the particular society into which God had placed it. This was the Word which the Gospel spoke to that time. In order to be faithful to that Gospel, the Church must now again ask itself what this Word is to the world of the Year 2000, not to the Year 1.

As the Church realizes again what it means to understand itself as the people of God on God's mission to the entire world, it will realize that every form of the Church's life as an institution must be re-examined from the viewpoint of this essential character of the Church in the world. As God's people on His mission its concern will be focused entirely upon man as the object of God's love and not in any sense as one who can be manipulated for the concerns of the Church as an institution. The fulfillment of the Church's mission will be measured not by the growth of the institution but by its being the people of God and the Body of Christ in the world.

We can only dimly imagine with what astonishment the world would look upon the fact that in its midst was a body of people who were totally and unselfishly committed to the service of the world in a ministry which reproduced again in the Year 2000 the total love and concern for man in every aspect of his life which was demonstrated in the suffering servant who is now the Head of His Body in the world. What would the world say of a body of people which asked nothing for itself except the opportunity to be of service, and would offer to men not the prospect of withdrawing from the arena of life, but the prospect of enlisting in this ministry of God to the world?

Can this vision of the world in the Year 2000 be fulfilled? It can if we are prepared to place ourselves once more into the hands of the living God and find our security as well as our power not in the institutional forms which God gives us from time to time to meet the changing circumstances of the world, but in the abiding truth of the Gospel and the nature of God's people in the world.

II.

The second significant factor in the signs of the times as the Church prepares itself for the Year 2000 is that
the Church is rediscovering the world. There are probably other and better ways of describing one of the most significant developments in the years since the Second World War. It is difficult to find a book or publication these days which does not in one way or another scream out the fact that the Church has suddenly begun to open its eyes to the world to which God has sent it. This is not the world which for the last several hundred years has so deeply penetrated the Church with its distorted sense of values, with its power plays and its politics, with its persuasive efforts to make the Church more worldly and at the same time isolate it from any effective contact with the world outside of the Church.

The world which the Church is rediscovering is the world of God’s creation and His creatures. It is not only the world of the rolling fields of golden grain, of the soaring mountains, and of the lordly trees of the forest, but also the world of the asphalt pavement, of the skyscraper, of the steel mill and the factory, of the theater and the discotheque, of the laboratory and the machine shop, of the space center and Cape Kennedy, of the university, of the world of art and music and literature. It is also the world of politics and of government, of society and racial tensions, of Watts and Selma and Birmingham and Harlem and Suburbia and the Inner City. Whatever forces man may have had to muster to his aid, he has not been able to wrest the lordship of any part of this world from the hands of Him who is the second Adam, by whom and for whom all things were created and in whom all things hold together.

Although there are sufficient signs to make it possible for us to say that the Church has rediscovered the world, we cannot say the Church has fully explored it. The significant fact is not that the Church does not know the answers but that it is taking a different stance and is directing its sight toward the world in which God is carrying out His continuing purposes, and which has never been able to escape from His lordship.

As the Church understands itself as the Body of Him Who makes all things new, it will see itself as the new creation in the world which is to witness to the ultimate will of God for all those instruments and agencies which He employs for the fulfillment of His purposes. As the new creation which shares in the full humanity of the creature and at the same time partakes of the divinity of Him from Whom it derives its life, the Church alone is able to understand both the historical and theological dimension of every activity in which man engages: the theological dimension in which man’s motives and will have their roots, and the historical dimension in which his actions are shaped by the extent to which he cooperates with the Spirit of God or strives with it.

Let us not make the mistake of thinking that this understanding of and attitude toward the world is going to be achieved without a great deal of agony and pain during the last three decades of this century. No one whose span corresponds with the years of this century can by a decision of the will remove from his mind all the images of the world which have been planted there through countless sermons and the theology of many of our hymns. We are going to make a great many false starts. We are going to backslide again and again. But if we are sure that God is still God, we can also be sure that this is the time when He will do what He wills to do. There will be costly and bloody battles to be fought. Those who find their security in tidy and complete answers to complicated and indeterminate questions will want to run for the hills and hide in the caves, or at best raise the walls of the Church’s fortress higher. The Church will waste precious years discussing the wrong questions, and many cherished theological positions will find themselves under the microscope.

In a recent issue of the Lutheran World (Vol. 12, No. 4, 1965), Dr. Edgar M. Carlson, in writing about “The Two Realms and the Modern World,” has the following to say:

“The basic question is whether the world apart from the Church has any religious meaning. Is it the work of God? Is it an instrument for God’s purposes? Does it have an independent and original ground for such meaning and purpose? Or is such meaning and purpose derived from God’s redemptive action through the Church and the Gospel? It is becoming increasingly evident that if the role of the Church is only to occupy the balcony of life and to comment about the world and to proclaim to it an offer of eternal fellowship, the Church may become superfluous. The world may lose interest in what we have to offer. We must find ways of interpreting to modern man the meaning of the inescapable condition of his actual existence and his own status in relation to God in consequence of these conditions. The spiritualizing of religion makes it irrelevant to man who must live in the world, and the secularizing of religion makes it a part of the world from which man needs to be redeemed, and hence makes it powerless to help. Dynamic religion will avoid both alternatives.” (p. 383).

It is a healthy sign that the Church is beginning to ask these questions. How the Church will fulfill its responsibility as the mission of God to the world in this dimension of its mission will depend very much on the answers which are found to these questions. One thing, however, seems to be already fairly clear: namely, that the Church will not be able to fulfill this mission as long as it accepts the world’s evaluation of it as one sociological institution among many others of like quality and value. It will have to recover a deeper understanding of its essential character as the Body of Christ in the world, every member of which has the dual responsibility, on the one hand, of fulfilling his responsibility to the Body of Christ as the new creation and thus strengthening the Body for its service to the world, and on the other hand, of functioning in the world as that entity in which the entire Body carries out its function in that calling through which he accepts the world as a gift of God’s goodness, while at the same time he bears constant witness to man’s demonic
tendency to use the good things of God for purposes other than for God's glory.

The signs of our time are such that we can look with hope "Toward the Year 2000" when the Church will again speak to the world in language which the world can understand and the world will know that no area of its life is beyond the concern of that Body which is prepared to lose its life for the life of the world.

III.

There is one more set of signs in our time which make it possible for us to see a new era in the life of the Church in the world in the year 2000. This is the relation of the Christian faith to the religions and quasi-religions of man. We do not have to have exceptionally long memories to recall that the religions of men were frequently dismissed as being unworthy of our notice or study. The Occidental world's knowledge of the great religions of the Orient is only very recent. Much that is contained in these religions is still a mystery to Western scholars and even more of a mystery to the general Western public. But the fact that thousands of our men have come in direct contact with these religions during World War II and that popular material on them can be bought in paperback editions in any drugstore has lead many people to ask whether the religions of other people do not have a validity for them to the same extent that Christianity, viewed as a western religion, has for the Western world.

It is still possible to engender a large amount of enthusiasm for the support of the overseas expression of the Church's mission, but it is becoming increasingly clear that this is done largely for humanitarian reasons. There is nothing wrong with this if we understand the humanitarian activities of the Church as being the mission through which the love of Christ is expressed to all of God's people. But when these humanitarian impulses are indicative of an unconcern for the total life of man, or worse still, an expression of an unconscious feeling that, just as we have created Christianity to meet our particular religious needs, so also people of other lands have created a religion to suit their needs, then the Church should begin to concern itself about some very basic questions.

In his little book called Christianity and the Encounter of the World Religions, Paul Tillich speaks of the relationship between Christianity and other religions and describes the various ways in which one religion rejects another. The first way is the rejection of everything for which the opposite group stands. The rejected religion is considered entirely false, and so no communication between the two contradictory positions is possible. "Negation is complete and under certain circumstances deadly for the one or the other side. The second form is a partial rejection together with a partial acceptance of assertions of the opposite group. In this case some assertions and actions of the one or the other side are considered false, others true. The third way of rejecting other religions is a dialectical union of acceptance and rejection, with all the tensions, uncertainties, and changes which such dialectics implies." (pp. 29-30.) In Tillich's view it is this third form of rejection which has been predominant in the relation between Christianity and other religions. In the present state of our knowledge of non-Christian religions, in itself an unfortunate expression, it would be foolhardy to make any dogmatic assertions. We do know that the New Testament literature says very little about religions, but says a great deal about those who do not walk according to the will of God. Paul condemns those who distort the Christian message and says plainly that all men are under the bondage of sin and equally in need of salvation.

The key to our understanding of this very complex problem is the proper use of the term religion. Religion is the all-inclusive term which describes everything which man does to structure his relationship to God, including the forms of religion which express his worship and devotion to the deity, as well as the ethical principles according to which he lives his life. We are not yet at the point where we can accept such a definition of religion. Too many of us are still giving absolute validity to those forms in which we express our religious life. There has always been an inner Christian struggle in Christianity against itself as a religion. The Church has constantly to remind itself that the only absolute criterion by which it can be judged is its response to the unique once for all character of God's self-manifestation in history in the person of Jesus Christ. When the centrality of this event is lost sight of, we fall into the error of speaking of higher religions and lower religions, or of primitive religions and more advanced religions.

When we are able once more to understand both the particular and universal character of the Christ event, we will be able to understand that everything which man has written in response to that event is to be understood as man's own attempt, human and incomplete, to understand what God has done. On this understanding it will be possible for us to look at the religions of the world and to see in them evidences of God's Holy Spirit at work in leading men to an understanding of various truths about their life in the world and their relationship to God. The Scriptures do not support the belief that God has confined Himself exclusively to one people. On the other hand, there is sufficient evidence that He has at no time and at no place in the world left Himself "without witness." The charge that men have taken this revelation of God and manipulated it for their own ends can be made with as much force against Christianity as a religion as it can be made against any other religion. Man's innate inclination to hubris will always lead him to try to use the things of God against God and thereby glorify himself.

Paul Tillich rightly says that "If Christianity rejects the idea that it is a religion, it must fight in itself everything by which it becomes a religion. With some justification one can say that the two essential expressions of
religion in the narrower sense are myth and cult. If Christianity fights against itself as a religion it must fight against myth and cult, and this it has done. It did so in the Bible, which, one should not forget is not only a religious but also an anti-religious book. The Bible fights for God against religion. This fight is rather strong in the Old Testament, where it is most powerful in the attack of the prophets against the cult and the polytheistic implications of the popular religion. In harsh criticism the whole Israelitic cult is rejected by some early prophets and so is the mythology which gives the national gods ultimate validity. The God of Israel has been 'de-mythologized' into the God of the universe, and the gods of the nations are 'nothings.' The God of Israel rejects even Israel in the moment when she claims Him as a national god. God denies His being a god." (Ibid., pp. 89-90)

When we understand our Christian faith in this way, we will be made free to use whatever there is of truth and beauty in all religions.

In Psalm 42 we read, "As a hart longs for flowing streams, so longs my soul for thee, 0 God. My soul thirsts for God, for the living God. When shall I come and behold the face of God? My tears have been my food day and night, while men say to me continually, 'Where is your God?'"

Beside this, we can place the words of Kabir, a poet of the Bhakti School in Bengal in the 14th century:

"I would caress this day! It is dearer to me than all others: for my Beloved is a guest in my house to-day. My chamber is radiant with His Presence; my courtyard is blessed. Lost in admiring His great Beauty, my longings sing His name and are glad:

I wash His feet with my tears, I gaze into His face; I offer my body and soul, and all I have, to my Lord. My Beloved, my Treasure has honoured my house. What a day of joy is this! At the sight of my Lord all evils flee from me, and my heart feels the buoyancy of delight. Yea, to-day my Beloved is a Guest in my house: and this day is dear to me above all others."


The following plea for forgiveness is made by the poet Dadudayal:

"Before Thee I am guilty in every nerve and vein; a sinner am I every moment: Master, forgive me! In the wide world I stand trembling and alone, chief of all sinners, the black cloud of my errors is impenetrable and covers the whole horizon of my life. Evils without number, countless vices are within me; many strains are without:

Not a single good deed have I done; no virtue is there in me; no merit is mine.

Yet forsake not Thy sinful child, for without Thee where is my refuge?

Desire, pride, anger and falsehood have mislead me since my birth: O miserable man that I am!

Thou only art my help: Father, wash me with the nectar of Thy rich forgiveness and heal the mind that is sore."

(Tukaram, one of the Maratha Bhakti poets sings as follows:

"I am a mass of sin;
Thou art all purity;
Yet thou must take me as I am
And bear my load for me."

(Psalms of Maratha Saints, p. 65).

In the 16th century the poet Tulsidas sang as follows:

"Grant me, 0 Master, by thy grace
To follow all the good and pure:
To be content with simple things:
To use my fellows not as means but ends:
To serve them stalwartly, in thought, word, deed:
Never to utter word of hatred or of shame:
To cast away all selfishness and pride:
To speak no ill of others:
To have a mind at peace,
Set free from care, and led astray from thee
Neither by happiness nor woe:
Set thou my feet upon this path,
And keep me steadfast in it,
Thus only shall I please thee, serve thee right."

(Songs from Prison, p. 52).

The wealth of material of this kind to be found in the sacred books of the religions of the world is almost immeasurable. If God will give us grace to understand our faith aright, we will be free to listen to the voice of His Spirit wherever it has spoken to the hearts of men throughout the world, and will also be free to open their eyes to see Him Who is the goal of all their longing and yearning.

The Year 2000 does not frighten me. The third of a century leading up to it is not going to be an easy one. We will have to set aside our dolls and our toys and venture forth into the world with only our trust in God and our sure confidence in Him Who has said "Follow Me" and has promised to be with us. We can ask for nothing more; we can do nothing with anything less.
I am very happy to have the pleasure of being on your campus during the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the inauguration of Dr. Kretzmann as the President of Valparaiso University, and I am honoured to be included in the company of eminent persons of international reputation who are participating in this series of lectures. It might have seemed bizarre in any year taken at random, 1948, for example, to initiate such a series of lectures to discuss world prospects for the ensuing span of thirty-four years ending in 1982. That subject would not have contained the same degree of fascination. Yet on this day it seems logical for us all to assemble to speculate upon the thirty-four-year period that now lies ahead of mankind, each of us with some hopes or predictions to formulate.

The difference between the two periods, of course, can be found in the tidiness of the arithmetic. The terminal point now is not an awkward number, but the end of a millenium. The attraction of round figures is a very real thing. The phenomenon of 2000 holds out an intellectual attractiveness — as a target — and as an unknown that beckons with some element of mysticism, far beyond its mathematical potential.

Appraisals of the future can at best be tentative, never absolute. They can only be far-reaching and meaningful when regarded as relative, set against the background of what we now know, and what has gone before. But even what is relative nowadays must be geared to new speeds and to remarkable possibilities. A few centuries ago, the passage of thirty-odd years might have gone by as something unnoticed, devoid of any startling significance. But, in these modern times, whole new worlds of tumult or discovery can arise within thirty-odd hours.

As Minister for Economic Planning and Development, I have become more and more accustomed to looking at the prospects of my country in terms of the possibilities or prospects in periods of ten or even twenty or more years. For example, I have to concede that in order to produce a doctor or engineer there can be no short cut; the child must be given nearly twenty years from the day when he first goes to a kindergarten. Our manpower planning must conform to this harsh fact despite our impatience for development. Similarly, when we plan a major irrigation scheme, we must look for a loan repayable over a period of between thirty-five to fifty years. The theme of this series must not, therefore, be regarded as a mere academic exercise. It should include a very practical speculation over our actions in the affairs of our nations during the period of our lifetime.

Let me set out, first, to submit just a few of the broader philosophical concepts that must have bearing on this next phase of our future. Some of these must embody propositions that cannot be resolved, or questions to which there is no definitive answer. But, at least, by parading them, some chink of light can enter, exposing some fraction of that panorama of the future for which the intellectual and emotional make-up of man must now prepare.

Throughout this whole two thousand years of history, when it is completed, the grasp of humanity upon the indefinable spirit of purposeful life will have been precarious. In earlier epochs, mankind was challenged by great elemental forces — ravages of climate and disease, apart from the frustrations of ignorance, and the barbarities of war and conquest. But the dynamic spirit of man, his unquenchable curiosity, his adventurism and resilience, permitted the whole human species not only to survive but to spread, not only to endure a surrounding environment, but to wrest from it an increasingly complex aggregate of needs and satisfactions.

As we look ahead, from this assembly, over the remaining twelve thousand days of this millennium, the scene is most graphically changed. Many forces that were once elemental have now been brought under control. While pockets of profound ignorance remain, once unimaginable knowledge can today be found in all the libraries and laboratories of humanity. The motif of wars and conquests is becoming, however unobtrusively, not simply suicidal but morally untenable. The dynamic spirit of man has fundamentally persisted. But with increasing accessibility, now, to the most elaborate and even softening satisfactions — with welfare carried to extremes overtaking concepts of effort and thrift — even inhibiting experiment, with the present state of technology making an anachronism of toil — some elements of the material and spiritual incentive which once set a course for humanity must now have been frittered away.

I do not believe that, whether through man-made calamity or accident, this tiny planet — which itself is but a grain of sand on a million million astral beaches — will succumb to those destructive results of man’s control of the atom and vanish as a cradle of life.

I do not believe that mankind will fail altogether in arriving at this Year of ours: 2000. But in what manner will we reach this new zenith? This surely is the question. With what paraphernalia and forms of organization? Above all, perhaps, with what newly-evolved sense of purpose?

One comparative certainty, for which we are indebted to United Nations statistics, is that by the Year 2000 there might be seven thousand million of us to deliberate our purpose, and to share all the fruits of this earth. Looking as we can today over all the teeming areas, whether continents or individual nations or even provinces, the prospective doubling of the current population, within such a short span, must confront all mankind...
with perplexity. My purpose here is to develop this point. We have to consider — or someone must surely consider — whether more universal means can or should now be adopted, to rein back this race from a gallop to a trot. And the question will remain: how to support these new multitudes, in terms not merely of subsistence, but also of vocational opportunity, and indeed of the whole spiritual significance of what we mean by life.

There seems no doubt that developing technology will prove able to sponsor some further and very real increase in global food production. It is currently true that many of the developing countries of Africa and Asia have lagged behind in the widespread adoption of the recommendations or materials and equipment made available by modern technology. There are gulf yearning to be bridged by capital. There are problems involving literacy, distance, communications and time.

But one major factor still remains. Looking back over the past thirty-four years, we see that the whole mechanism of food distribution — on a global scale — has hardly progressed from a state which in those days was archaic. I feel convinced that we must utilize this forthcoming period, to claw down the whole appalling edifice of an outmoded system in which surplus and starvation — both labelled as disaster — can be present in our one world, side by side. In chemistry, I understand, there is a phenomenon described as osmosis, by which a strong weaker solution, until balance is struck and the point is evaporated by the jet plane. And the availability and administration of finance should surely not be either beyond the resources of governments or the wit of international institutions. Looking back over this century, it is remarkable how money in limitless quantities could always be found, or even simulated, for the purposes of war. Our task henceforth must increasingly be to make war on new fronts — on those still persisting enemies of poverty, ignorance, disease and all of their cruel allies.

Since the end of the last worldwide conflict, humanity has seen and drawn benefit from a vast expansion of various forms of development aid. Finance and technical assistance, and what might be termed as new crusades, springing from a sense of social obligation, have come increasingly to flow from the advanced to the developing states, and are supplemented by the work of many international bodies and voluntary agencies in technical and cultural fields.

I shall not seek to analyse today such elements of self-interest as may — at least initially — have untapped this flow. Neither do I want to underline the refusal of many African and Asian countries to accept any new kind of political paternalism as an associated string. It will suffice within our present context to regard this whole movement as being in the direction of a levelling-up factor in the overall direction of world stability.

I hope and believe that this productive pattern of material and technical assistance, and the social work among remoter communities which is giving new zest and incentive to individuals as well as institutions, will be greatly expanded and more carefully planned within these coming thirty odd years. But there must be some warnings or speculations on one or two points.

Time and time again, throughout a decade or longer of the wind of change, spokesmen of the developing countries have urged with all the affirmation at their command that there is no substitute, measured both by real economic progress and by self-respect, for a rational foundation of world trade. It is futile to condone and to perpetuate a system under which prices of manufactured and industrial commodities rise in monolithic steps, while the prices of many basic food products and raw materials, especially from tropical and sub-tropical zones, are permitted to fluctuate around an average which constantly goes down. The advanced countries of the world must understand that they will never in a thousand years, still less in only thirty-four years, compensate through their assistance programmes for the fundamental commercial injustice and unreason of this state of affairs. Leaders of the developed nations must come to realize that we too are prepared to work, and are anxious to pay our own way. But shoddy combinations of price blackmail and commercial banditry, disguised as international trade and tariff agreements, can undermine all the richest and most selfless foreign aid appropriations and gestures of social goodwill. This, of course, is not the only imbalance or dilemma. What will happen — for example — if and when increasing numbers of the organic raw materials on which the developing countries so greatly depend for economic motivation and foreign exchange are overtaken or supplanted by synthetics? This is the kind of problem for which all of us have to prepare. You cannot halt the pace and prospect of all technological progress. Yet, to what extent and with what consequences can we stand by and watch technological progress digging pits beneath the feet of our society? If we rid the world of its erstwhile demand for pyrethrum, for sisal, for cotton, for rubber, or for sundry minerals and timbers, what will the populations and the areas attuned to production of these things proceed to do? And how will the cause of mankind as a whole be advanced? Surely, humanity must use these thirty odd years, not to exploit or admire every marvel that the workshop or laboratory can bring within reach, but to give all conceivable progress its perspective in the human story. A child, armed with matches, may set fire to a house. We bring this behavior within the arena of discipline, education and understanding. Yet we watch, unmoved at times, while the conflagration of all the possessions and hopes of whole categories and communities of men is taking place.

But perhaps I ought to say a little more on the subject of aid. Developing countries constitute the world's most serious threat to peace. Here more than one billion hu-
man beings live in misery, poverty and degradation all the while they are in daily contact with the world of technology and science and see the vast wealth of the world and witness the life of luxury which only the few may enjoy! What is more, the division between the “haves” and the “have-nots” happens also to be a racial one. Despite the efforts to diminish the gap between the “haves” and the “have-nots,” it has in fact been widening. Here, in my view, lies the greatest challenge in the coming thirty-four years. Without an effective programme of aid from the developed nations there is no hope of a solution to this problem. In this context aid must include massive doses of capital and technical assistance as well as liberal terms for trade. Aid must not be manipulated to serve foreign policy requirements of donor nations nor should it be offered grudgingly only to whet the appetite of recipient nations. In such cases it can neither be effective nor serve the long term objective of redressing the balance between poor areas and rich areas. Unless this matter receives the undivided attention required, rich or developed nations will continue to live in the shadow of fear caused by the turbulence and instability in the developing countries, not to mention the enormous costs of the resulting eruptions such as the one now taking place in Viet Nam. It was Vice-President Humphrey who recently said that if such actions as I am now suggesting had been taken in Viet Nam a decade ago, the present crisis in which all of the great powers are now involved would not today exist.

It is almost impossible, at least for the layman, to predict how far — in certain fields — we shall see substantial technical advance. Currently, the most highly advanced of our human societies are allocating an appreciable quantity of all earthly treasure for the peculiar excitement of exploring space. It is always arguable — indeed, the point has been advanced elsewhere — that priorities have gotten mixed up. There could be a case for submitting that for all this wealth and genius some finer objectives might be sighted: the abolition of crippling poverty over the greater part of the earth’s own surface, the defeat of malnutrition and disease and the bringing of enlightenment.

Even so, as all recorded history has shown, the whole metabolism of man demands some outlet in the form of exploration. It merely seems discordant that in the light of a mounting awareness of the structures and perils of Space there should remain so great an ignorance, so sorry a neglect, of all the fruitful oceans on this planet. For these might yet be, both literally and almost metaphorically, mankind’s last ditch.

And when — let us ask the professors — will man control the climate? Apart altogether from personal rigors and disabilities, which I have known in many forms both in Washington and Moscow, we still live greatly at the mercy, in all our plantings and plans, of drought or flood, and extremities of temperature. It may not be too much to hope that, before the Year 2000, there may be in all our Governments a Minister for Statutory Rainfall, Sunny Spells and Cooling Breezes.

The mention of “all our Governments,” and the whole theme of man’s comfort and control of affairs, leads me to two other conceptions of a general, speculative nature.

Might there be a single World Government by the end of this millennium brought together through some international system of election and appointment, or by redesigning the United Nations? I frankly cannot see this happening, in so short a time, although this may well be — in such centuries as remain to humanity — the direction or the channel of advance. Theories of this kind are tied in fictional treatment, either to some new wave of altruism within the human race, or more often to some overwhelming outside threat which forces all mankind to close its ranks defensively. It would, I think, be imprudent to count on the former or anticipate the latter of these influences. And indeed it might be premature to contemplate World Government before some of the anomalies and evolutions within certain national Governments were resolved so that all the constituent states could at least be assembled on calmer and more predictable seas of progress.

Will a system of political parties still find favour by the end of this century? Many of us in developing countries have noted the flaws and the weaknesses of two or even multi-party design. Issues of the present day are such that, frequently, there is limited ground for objection or counter-maneuver between the two sides. And therefore on platforms, at election time, emotions and hatreds have to be whipped up, accusations must be paraded and distortions be devised, in order to split into slogan-chanting halves, the men and women of some homogeneous community. Yet, when the election is over, life goes on much as before, with both the parties committed, in much the same way, to the service of the state.

There is much in this that is a sham. In the United Kingdom, over this past year, the now-outgoing Labour Government has remained in office with a Commons majority of only two or three. In every confrontation this Government has represented the will of the people. But in its theory carried to logical extremes it has only represented half of the people’s will. Neither in concept nor in daily manipulation can this process be good for the State.

To say that in a one-party system there can be no opposition and therefore no democracy, is quite fallacious. There may be no paid Opposition — with a capital “O” — to manufacture hazards and strike attitudes and give more thought to confusion than to advance. But in countries like my own where the institution of Parliament is in ultimate command we have found criticism from within to be really meaningful and constructive, and far from timorous or discreet. This kind of opposition has, in our judgment, the very real merit of being tied to a given issue or subject, instead of being tactically inspired by the dogma of a Party.

There can, indeed, be very real democracy in a form...
that does not presuppose or require any multi-party arrangement within one nation. But there is a difficulty, of course in approaching such questions as: will democracy itself survive? — in defining with precision what this is. Westminster and Washington have institutions of policy-making Government and of administrative command which differ somewhat both in constitutional design and in mechanics. Yet both are presented as democracies. Most countries of the so-called Eastern world have adopted a fundamentally different set of arrangements and practices, presented again as the essence of “peoples” democracy. Over these past two decades many of the newer nations of Asia and Africa have fashioned compromise structures and institutions to incorporate within their own constitutional frameworks such ideas and efficiencies from any side as seem attractive together with such local traditions and approaches as will make the end-product or particular forms of democracy something that the people can accept and understand.

While on this subject I might pause to make a few remarks about the present divisions in the world. It is the popular thing to talk about the world as consisting of two blocs. But the term “two blocs” no longer describes the ideological, institutional and economic and social organizations in the former Eastern and Western blocs. There are no longer the monolithic groups that confronted each other twenty years ago. Take the Peoples Republic of China and the Soviet Union. Or, for that matter, the economic organization in many Eastern countries as compared to the society that Marx predicted 100 years ago! In the West a democratic revolution has swept out of existence the “laissez-faire” capitalism of Marx’s days. In fact, avowed capitalists, now live in welfare or socialist states without admitting to it.

Again, there is de Gaulle’s France to reckon with. Thus, looking thirty-four years ahead one must wonder what transformation will have taken place in this time. Could it be that Russia and America will have come together in an alliance to save the world from economic chaos as well as the threat of nuclear aggression?

When Orwell was writing of our future, he hit upon “1984,” while today we are probing ahead for sixteen years beyond that. But I cannot really agree, either with some of the earlier romantic writers, or with more modern authors of science-fiction works, that the still scarcely imaginable fulfillment of mankind’s scientific and technological destiny must be accompanied by rigid authoritarian control and the dictatorship of fear. The “Big Brother is Watching You” prognosis somehow does not feel quite right. But if it turned out to be right, there would be little hope left for humanity.

What seems to me to be more probable and more desirable between now and the end of the century is that the people, themselves, may demand more say in the conduct of affairs. This, I think, might be the useful product of better education and enlightenment. And, whereas, at one time many resentments were expressed all over the world, maybe at the trade union level or at the student level, about the idea of succeeding generations being reared as little more than cannon-fodder. I hope and anticipate that more and more people might resent being utilized as finance fodder for over-illustrious boffins. Over and above these twin points, I feel that the people might become increasingly inspired or impelled to seek more truly democratic command, in their own defence, against the unbridled powers and ambitions arising out of science and technology that are not prepared to be concerned with snowball effects, or even simple consequence.

We have to consider so many facets of this simple issue of consequence. Do we want a world entirely made of steel and polyethylene and concrete, entirely operated by power-switches and electronic gadgets and remorseless machines? How might it be for our children’s children — by the end of this millennium — to have no trees to climb, no marshes to explore, no birds and animals to wonder at, never to know the joy of scampering barefoot on a stretch of springy grass? This may seem fanciful, but a dispassionate survey of many of the world’s cities — take Chicago and Leningrad and Manchester as ordinary examples — gives the impression that much of congested humanity is moving quickly to this point.

We have to consider, I think, not as a classroom proposition in philosophy but as a terrible pending confrontation, just how every aspect of the environment and habits of mankind must be affected by the coming acceleration — which seems inevitable — in the ramifying welter of today’s outpouring of the new products of science and technology that comprise the Age of the Computer. There is the old and imprecise debate about whether mankind will be able to rule the machine, or if the machine will take over mankind. It seems to me that this alternative, as stated, leaves large questions untouched. This whole issue is not really one for the mathematical criteria of comparative energy or strength or will. I feel somehow that we are here in the arena of purpose, and that what is at stake is nothing less than survival of the whole significance of human life.

Where machines designed to suppress or supplant human creativeness and talent and flair are envisaged, there seems to be something in the very acceptance of such catastrophic innovations that marks the beginning of the end for purposeful humanity. Where electronics and scientific gadgetry (today, perhaps, in the pages of still-amusing fiction; tomorrow, who knows?) can serve up predigested food-substitute tablets, can arrange for push-button transmigration from armchair to armchair, can ensure the doom of literature by substituting daily cans of rationed entertainment, can make muscles obsolete, can simulate sensation to avoid the exertion of sex — where do we go from here? Is this how mankind can really want to live? And what will we do, when all the work is done for us in a world of sameness, for culture and for recreation?

Of course, this is vastly exaggerated. One’s concept
of the future is always of an exaggerated place. But let us not delude ourselves. It is possible, in these coming years, that the most extraordinary changes in capacity and attitude and in surroundings will make the past three hundred years seem like inertia. The doses to which man is exposed will need to be carefully calculated. Every government will end up dissecting this prospect. Like Colonel John Glenn at one time, we are heading for uncharted areas and our minds must be prepared to encompass or react to phenomena that even the most imaginative of our ancestors would have deemed absurd to expect.

What all this suggests is that whereas many new areas shall be conquered through science and technology, science and technology must in turn be carefully controlled. The doses to which man is exposed will need to be carefully calculated. Every government will end up with two Ministers for Science—one for its development and study and the other for its control and utilization. It will be both a blessing and a curse to be watched just as we now have to watch every program of automation.

Let me now seek to move away a little from the heading of broad philosophical concept toward some more practical speculations about my own Continent and its role in the prospect that lies before humanity.

Over these past few months, there have been incidents and happenings in Africa that I have described elsewhere as a "crisis of confidence." Today is not the time and this is not the place, for any reasoned and contemporary analysis of these events. The theme we are pursuing is: "Toward the Year 2000." And this theme is strangely appropriate in that the very title lends perspective to events that are in fact a passing phase.

I will only say this. Africa is a continent that for so long was oppressed and exploited. Suddenly, with an effect analogous to some geological tumult, the attainment of independence came swiftly to many new states. The landscape was changed, with richer possibilities for its development. Whole new promontories and vistas were opened up. There was feverish experiment and exploration. And now we are seeing certain consequential rumblings as all the new strata and intrusions and the fault-lines shake down and solidify. But when the dust has settled, real sovereignty and more meaningful national dignity can take its more permanent shape.

In past generations and centuries, what is happening in Africa today had its counterparts in many rich and venerable states. And let me just remark in passing that those who too readily despair of the African scene, that among the advanced and respectable nations such things as instability, civil strife, racial discrimination and even political assassination, are not unknown today. There is a most renowned quotation about motes and beams.

We can look ahead to the year 2000 with the hope, indeed with the assurance, that by that time, no vestige of colonialism will remain anywhere in Africa as a human affront. I believe that the world is becoming increasingly tired of the Herrenvolk philosophy, the delusion of racial grandeur that seeks to justify personal or political ambition and arrogance. It cannot continue. I say this not merely because what the remnants of colonialism are scrabbling desperately to codify are injustice and oppression and obliteration of the common dignity of man. There is the valid point as well that the challenges and problems of the coming period will be such that the whole of humanity may not usefully survive without the rule of law, without high international standards of conduct, without the unleashing of all mankind's talents and efforts and philosophies, and without some worldwide pattern of fundamental human rights.

As we begin this journey toward the end of our century, the eradication of colonialism must and I believe will be one of the earliest milestones. But there will be need in all this for some of the expediency and hypocrisy in public affairs to vanish with it. In respect to Rhodesia, for example, it makes something of a mockery of trust for a British Government to implore all the African States to stand aloof and to agree that military force or even a police action in defence of Her Majesty's interests would be improper and to accept that economic sanctions will quickly bring about a happy ending — and then for us to find, from published figures, that Britain was still buying products from Rhodesia — in January — to the tune of some millions of pounds; and for us to watch, as an obvious outcome of a much-vaunted oil sanction at the front door, a mounting flow of oil to Rhodesia through the back-garden route. There was a time in Britain's history when no one group of "small and frightened men" — as the British Prime Minister himself described the members of the Smith regime — could have flouted the Queen's authority, could have poured such indignities upon the seal and person of the Queen's Government, and could have held the British Parliament in such contemptuous disrespect. Those days are evidently gone, and we shall have to live with the evident reality of shabbier moralities and feebleer standards. But when the issue of mandatory United Nations sanctions is mooted again, one wonders what grounds there could be for British protestations now.

And, of course, there has been much hypocrisy in the case of South Africa as well. Whether from their own pinnacles or within international institutions, many of the relatively powerful and advanced nations, both of East and West, have condemned the apartheid attitude, expressing themselves as outraged by the hysterical legislation and the daily cruelties of the South African scene. Yet it is these same nations that have bulwarked and upheld the Verwoerd Government by their massive investments, trade, and substantial loans.

Africa is not naive enough to suppose that the language and motif of international politics, which has always been tortuous, has always compounded elements of self-interest and strategic survey, can rapidly be changed. But I do believe that, in the remaining years of this millennium, pressures will mount so tremendously — pressures on the obligations and capacities of men, on the understanding and discretion of mankind — that words
to be of value will have to be used more simply, that is, used to say just what they mean.

But before I leave this subject of race relations or discrimination, I must draw attention to the fact that here the United Nations has not performed as well as was expected of it when it was founded over twenty years ago. The U.N. has made solemn pledges to uphold human dignity and liberties and yet it has shown neither the resolution nor the ability to enforce these pledges! But the United Nations in this case must mean the big powers that control it. A casual glance around the world must immediately show why the countries that could have created resolution in the United Nations have failed to do so. America has still to cope with her Mississippi while Britain and France had or still have their colonies. And then there are the old friendships with Portugal and Spain which must undermine any attempt to act on the racially-based colonial problems in Africa. Thus it can be said that this is in fact a world problem and one which is so explosive and dangerous that it must take a large portion of our time during the coming thirty-four years.

There will be many new objectives and purposes in Africa, in a panorama of enormous change, as we move “Toward the Year 2000.” One early and most critical purpose will be to sweep aside the ultimate, hampering irrelevance of racialism, and to eliminate from the whole indigenous scene such tribal or sectional suspicions as remain. By heeding and adapting these teachings, we shall be able to create and to serve an Africa of genuine and inter-dependent nations all bent on their constructive tasks, and in which the true integration of human values and loyalties provides much of their strength.

The President of my own country, Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, has devoted his long life to the cause of African nationalism, merging as this must into a condition of unaffected unity among all those — irrespective of their racial or tribal origins — who prove by word and deed that they are truly committed to Africa.

It does not seem always to be fully appreciated by some nations which already lead the world in the measure of their technological and industrial structures just how untapped the countries of Africa are, and how great the potential of Africa will prove to be.

Whatever the outward signs may suggest — with traffic lights turning amber at road junctions here and there — Africa is progressing toward the solid strength of a practical unity. We have held many discussions, and arrangements are in hand for breaking down barriers and bridging such gaps as have existed in fields of language, internal communications, and law. Through such means of expanding and utilizing meaningful contact, the stage will be set for massive advance in all economic and social affairs. Deliberations within the Organization of African Unity, coupled with the initiative of such United Nations bodies as the Economic Commission for Africa and the Food and Agriculture Organization and the advice of the World Bank, are serving to promote the stages of a transformation that endured for so long as a dream, but will come to have impact in these years that lie ahead as constructive reality.

I have said before — in debates within such institutions as I have just mentioned, that much of the beckoning economic future of Africa in the coming period must be pursued by breaking away from an over-vulnerable reliance on traditional products and practices and markets. The point should certainly be repeated, and even be expanded, in justice to the terms of reference of a lecture series of this kind.

We have to prepare in practice, in all our economic thinking within Africa, for certain of the ominous outcomes or even probabilities in some of the more philosophical concepts that I earlier submitted.

Africa has traditionally been regarded as the venue of a peasant agriculture, calculated in a good year to turn out a bare subsistence food supply, and as the source of exotic foods and useful raw materials — agricultural or mineral — to serve richer markets and promote industrial development elsewhere. This cannot go on, partly because it would perpetuate in its effect the old colonial ideas of exploitation largely based on extractive industries, but mainly because it is very evident — in a hard assessment of present and future trends — that this simply would not work. We cannot, in all sanity, assume that the expanding production in so many new and developing countries of the same broad range of primary products can lead, in the long term, to commercial prosperity and a stable situation. And we have found no reason to anticipate any sudden contribution of wisdom or goodwill from among the advanced nations, calculated to encourage primary producers in their genuine efforts to trade.

There is a limit to the degree of economic reliance that we should place henceforth upon cash-crop agriculture. Apart from climatic and other perils and commercial disabilities there are ecological and land-use reasons in many African States making it wise to re-assess the whole perimeter in which an agriculture must play a still abundant but more carefully reasoned part.

The economic future of my own country — and of many similar countries I am sure — must be planned and built to a very significant extent along the road of industrialization. In this lies the challenge of a new era, and a vast opportunity. We have in Africa a considerable manpower capacity, substantial power resources, developing communications systems, minerals of many kinds, and a wide range of primary products and raw materials for processing and manufacture. And, so, I am convinced, (and this is far more than a vision) that poor relations of the past who were scratching with a hoe at barren soil will emerge as industrial colleagues in the counsels of mankind as we move into our future.

And apart altogether from materials and motivations, the developing economic strength of Africa will untap an almost limitless effective market for industrial and manufactured goods of all kinds. Herein lies both boon and boot to our industrialization programmes: intra-
continental trade in goods supplied by Africa to meet the growing demand of Africa, while making our links with traditional markets elsewhere in the world a matter of straightforward commercial reckoning, instead of on a disadvantageous basis arising out of vital need.

Of course we shall still need, and in increasing volume, our sources of foreign exchange. There are many natural products and industrial appliances and items of scientific equipment that we shall need to buy elsewhere. Our own range of manufactures can never be completely comprehensive, and we shall not seek to shield ourselves behind a ban on all imported competition. But I envisage as another transformation, to accompany industrial expansion, the economic generation in Africa of a tremendous tourist industry. On the international commercial stage at present, tourism rates as the world's most valuable commodity. There is no doubt in my mind that Africa will endure as the world's final and deliberately conserved stronghold of exciting natural splendour, the arena of recreation, the place of cultural and even spiritual perspective. Taken in conjunction with the fascination of a continent in which history will never be destroyed while all the pulsations of modernity are being fashioned, we have here the one contribution that Africa alone may be able to offer to the world — an escape from the smoke and filth of the crowded cities into the open spaces full of fresh air and nature's gifts.

Well before the end of this century, I envisage Africa as a totally integrated society, making both a vital and a vivid contribution to the stability that, in an ordered world, should distinguish the political and economic involvements of mankind. The very pace and potential of Africa's development must be calculated to narrow, most dramatically, the yawning vertical gulf that has separated for so long, and with the seeds of such hazard, the "haves" and the "have-nots" in our global society. For the world of the future will be able neither to contain nor to condone the persistence of flamboyant riches, over and above the due rewards of enterprise and skill, as oases in the desert of poverty and hopeless toil. This is not a thing of dialectic or of "isms". Neither does humanity cry out for a levelling-down. But it seems to me that the whole curious arrangement of mankind's being, a trifling incident perhaps in all the vast unknowns of ultimate eternity, cannot look to even a fleeting future without social justice for all.

But we in Africa will have more to offer to the world than economic advancement of some routine kind. Of our own volition and from our own resources, we too are standing on the threshold of new scientific and technological discovery. I ran somewhat musingly, earlier, over some foreseeable perils and conceivable consequences of uncontrolled research and gadgtery in this Age of Computers. It remains true that we need, in Africa, not so much desperately as decisively, many adaptations of the fruits of existing discovery. There are time-lags today, which may be likened to some missing threads, in every fabric of modern apparatus and production and human skill and national or continental opportunity. We need to catch up, and to this end our students are working in many countries of the world; our plants and laboratories are being equipped; our experts and committees are studying published findings or are travelling to scrutinize projects on the ground.

This is the era of science and technology, with Africa no longer as a place apart. Perhaps our approach will have a certain freshness. I believe we will be increasingly anxious to utilize those discoveries and contrivances which can serve to accelerate the kind of progress we are determined to achieve. But I am sure we will not be led into the brash assumption that the answers to all our needs can be found in work elsewhere. We must ourselves invent, create, produce, and adapt, and perfect. And we can ourselves offer in turn to humanity, especially in the biological and ecological sciences, much of value to the onward march of all mankind.

In the whole environment of sweeping change in Africa — and doubtless in Asia and Latin America as well — will be found the impulse. I am convinced, for the melting away of diehard approaches and attitudes to the whole range of international affairs. Mankind must be approaching some new plateau, not of universal sameness and the quenching of dynamic spirit, but of more universal human springboards and benefits: more widespread and intensive education, closer comparisons in all productive skills, the fraternity of science. In a shrinking world, reduced to the proportions of a county by performances of aircraft and astronauts, telstars and telephones, there cannot be room for arrogance, or paternalism, or patronage. We shall all be tax payers within this one country, and the survival or salvation of the country will depend on the best that everyone, in aggregate, can give.

Already in many spheres we are seeing racial prejudice collapsing, lack of familiarity becoming new-found fellowship, religious bigotry breaking down. A world that has in recent decades been striving for new conceptions and values is finding them, rapidly and fruitfully. And this process must mature if the end of this millenium is to bring its quota of new mystique and purpose to the long and savage saga of humanity.

I do not believe that the Cold War, as we have come to describe and experience this quite artificial phenomenon, will last throughout this time. Already, a separate — or mutual — consolidation of a nuclear deterrent has confronted both sides with the alternatives of military impotence or pointless total disaster. From this stage to mutual agreement on dismantling all these senseless stockpiles would seem a step not beyond the wisdom of the present leading spokesmen of humanity. And the shockwaves of such an agreement must rebound effectively into the highest councils of those precocious nations who claim to be serving their people by seeking to sail in this nuclear regatta.

The exploration of Outer Space, for whatever this may prove and provide, begun in the arena of national rival-
ries, has since been increasingly transformed into mutual respect. In this, perhaps, lies supreme opportunity for total human understanding; our one world toward or against the unknown.

All these profound considerations, set alongside a catalogue or span of new assessments, fundamental changes and sudden discoveries, make it clear that the world has been divided far less by whatever meaning can be found in ideology than by differences in development structure, in ethnic and strategic patterns, and by habitual pervasions of suspicion and fear. The world must — and I believe will — break through this habit. The intellect of mankind can produce finer arrangements and answers than the monolithic posturings of North and South, or East and West, in group hostility. There is far more in this forthcoming moment of time, these next thirty-four years, that can and must unite mankind than that can be permitted to perpetuate division. This is easy to say. No doubt, most rational men would agree. But, unless we achieve this fulfillment before the Year 2000 comes, then, instead of bringing mankind's hold upon life into the noonday of noblest purpose, humanity may find itself in the twilight of final futility.

There can be no summing up of all this. But let me end on this note: We shall all of us have great responsibilities and opportunities in the years that lie ahead. We must put our utmost exertions, and much may depend on the power for good represented here by my host country. And I will make just one prediction. When we all re-assemble, perhaps when the Year 2000 has come, to look back over what we said today, it may very well be that I shall pay a courtesy call in his office to a Negro President of the United States of America.

**The Key to a Lasting Peace**

*By GEORGE GORDON CATLIN*

When I accepted this invitation to speak, I had to consider what would be an appropriate topic within the general terms of reference of the lectures in this series. I thought that I would talk on a problem to which the attention of the whole nation was called in an address by Paul VI just a week ago at the United Nations—the problem of conflict, peace, and war. I remember discussing issues of the United Nations, issues of world authority, with an eminent British diplomat who had indeed been ambassador to Moscow. And his comment was that this was all very well, but that it was up in the air, and detached from the real stuff of politics, which was of an immediate and practical order. And I remember saying to him, "Sir William, it is quite true that if you are the skipper of a ship in a storm, you have to consult your navigating officer and your engineer as to how to get through that storm. Nevertheless, you would be an extremely poor skipper if you did not know what port you intended to make."

I recently came across a very interesting confirmation of what I then said to that ambassador, in a statement made by Dean Rusk, who was quoting Carl Schurz: "Ideas are like stars. You will not succeed in touching them with your hands, but like a seafaring man in a desert of waters, you choose them as your guides. And following them you will reach your destination." Speaking, as your chairman has said, as a political scientist, I would like to add a quite remarkable comment that was made by President Lyndon Johnson to Nikita Khrushchev in his New Year message of 1964. President Johnson cabled: "All the work of the chemist in the laboratory, the scientist in space, the agronomist in the field will be in vain unless we learn to live together in peace. No feat of physical science can compare with the feat of political science which brings a just peace to the earth."

It so happens that we are met here in the twenty-fifth anniversary year of your President, Dr. Kretzmann, and we are here to discuss not merely a dream, but something that has most definite practical applications, whether contributed by the political scientist or contributed by the politician. I might say in passing that I was listening the other day to a Deputy Premier of Israel, Dr. Abba Eban, speaking in Rome. He said, "I hope to win the next election. If I do I shall be Prime Minister; if I am defeated I shall be regarded as a statesman." The implication was that the statesman is somebody who gets defeated at the polls—not I think one generally acceptable to most politicians. Let that pass. As a young man, Dr. Kretzmann was concerned with the more profound fundamental issues—those of theology. He has also been concerned, in his middle age, with the activities of youth and the organization of those activities. And I am profoundly impressed with the importance of getting precisely this combination of fundamental ideas with practical application in the world of politics and the world of affairs. Here he has set a standard—standard I hope that all of you will seek to follow.

The topic of this set of lectures is "Toward the Year 2000." I so well remember in my own childhood my father turning the calendar—I might say in passing that there is some debate as to when the century began, whether it was January 1, 1900 or January 1, 1901: that depends on how you reckon up the complete century, but most people reckon it as January 1, 1900—and he said, "We are now turning the calendar, and the twentieth century has begun." And there are many, indeed most, of you who are here who will be able to turn the calendar and say, "We have now reached the second
millenium, the year 2000." Towards, then, the year 2000! What have we got to think about? The ordinary affairs of life; the affairs of birth, of marriage, of death; the ordinary routine and cycle of the seasons; even the cycle of the Church Year. But also not only our blessings but our problems. Oddly enough, three days ago I was in Harrisburg where there was a State Convention of the Blind. The desk clerk said to me at the time, "Those of us who have got our sight really have not got much to complain about." Therefore, one must maintain a certain perspective on one's problems. Life, life in the future is not just going to be welfare, but it is also not just going to be problems. Certainly not insuperable problems, but perhaps problems that offer a challenge.

One can think of what they are likely to be. There is the problem, for example, of health, mentioned by Pope Paul in his address to the United Nations. Strangely enough, there is an irony here—the problem many people feel almost overwhelmed by, that of the so-called population explosion, oddly enough, is not so much a problem of the increase in the birth rate but the result of the improvement of medical science bringing gifts of welfare and the decrease of the death rate. Nobody wants to increase the death rate; and yet the decrease of the death rate is the major cause, or one major cause, of your population explosion. That is going to be one of your great problems in the year 2000.

Another, of course, is going to be economic. I recently read a statement made at the International Banking Conference by eminent experts pointing out the alarm that must be felt because, although the richer nations, as a matter of statistical fact, are getting richer, the underdeveloped nations, as a matter of statistical fact, are getting poorer despite the present aid and the present efforts. The aid is swallowed up. These countries are at the present time not in condition either to lay on one side capital savings or to develop an export production which would put them on an even remotely competitive basis with their neighbors. I have not time enough to discuss that problem, though that is perhaps the number one problem for economists. The probable answer is that one has got—the developed nations have got—to spend literally millions of dollars in priming the pump of the underdeveloped nations unless you are going to get increasing poverty. Things are not going just to remain as they were. The only encouragement I can give you is that even those billions will be a very small percentage of the total national product of the highly-developed and rapidly developing nations. This, then, I must leave to the economists.

Another problem that confronts us is that of the wasteful use of the resources of the world, some of which resources are not capable of being replenished. They are the natural minerals—coal supplies and so forth—which, when used up, they will be finally used up. This globe has existed for millions, indeed billions of years; unless we are extremely foolish and blow ourselves up, this globe may last for many millions of years. But some of these natural resources are going to be used up in a matter not of millions of years or thousands of years, but merely of hundreds of years. And to turn from mineral resources to one rather striking case which has concerned international conventions, there is the catastrophe (which nobody does much about, we are so lazy), of the blue whale. The blue whale is the largest of all God's creatures; he is Leviathan. But owing to the appetite both of capitalist countries such as Japan and of Communist countries such as the Soviet Union, in order to make quick profits, the blue whale is being destroyed and will soon, in the present statistical course of things, become extinct. I do not think the Lord God Almighty will create a new blue whale to put in the place of the blue whale which our folly and greed has banished from the earth, never to come back again.

What I want to talk to you about today is the one remaining problem, most profound of all—that of conflict and peace and war. I have just come back from a meeting in Rome of an Academy whose establishment was inspired by Einstein and which has been under way only for the past three years—a very small academy of under two hundred members, of which about twenty percent are Nobel Prize Laureates. I suggested a topic for discussion there, along with the topics in physics like "The Desalination of Water" which they already had on their agenda. I suggested that, owing to the number of peace research institutes that already exist—although most of them are quite small, in Michigan, Toronto, Oslo, Stockholm, Amsterdam—the Academy might, in its wisdom, choose to take up this as subject for discussion with a view to further action. Our executive committee decided that this should be done—indeed, they asked me to chair that particular section of the conference, and we have turned in some kind of a report. On that I want to comment.

I might say this is no new interest of mine. I so well remember, after the First World War in December-January, 1918-19, in winter quarters 11 kilometers outside Mons, sitting and making jottings in a notebook on the subject "Why do wars occur?" "Why are there these malfunctionings of the body politic?" "Why do the historians give us so very little answer—tending to pass from event to event to event, from peace treaty to war, from war to peace treaty, without looking into the fundamental structure of the body social, the body politic, and discovering why these sudden fevers, these sudden malfunctionings occur?" It is, after all, the task primarily of the political theorist and quite peculiarly of the political scientist. That for forty years has been my job. To some extent, in reporting in Rome. I was reporting the result of forty years of study in this very thing.

Now let us see what conclusions we had to reach. My conclusions are of a very practical order. I think that all men of good will are concerned to obtain stable peace. The number of people who explicitly want war and say so is very few. Signor Mussolini was one of the few who expressed himself in that sense. He said that war is a
great medicine for humanity. There were certain rather mistaken philosophers, such as Nietzsche, who said the same thing. We may have what can only be described as “fool wars.” I think the present war between India and Pakistan is a “fool war”—both sides realize they cannot win; both sides realize the heavy economic loss of indulging in this war; but there are, nevertheless, emotions involved that roundly defeat statesmanship’s efforts to reach some compromise in commonsense conclusions. Not here, but sometime perhaps on your campus. I can give you rather full comment, because I know this Indian-Pakistan quarrel rather well. But broadly speaking, we may say that the problem is not that of the goal that we want to reach, a goal expounded so eloquently by Pope Paul exactly a week ago in New York and by his great predecessor Pope John. The problem is how to reach it—not what to reach but how to reach it. And I want, during the remaining time I have with you, to survey human attempts in my lifetime and indeed in the last twenty-odd years to provide an answer to that question “how?”

The old systems of the Balance of Power which we have seen since the day of Cardinal Wolsey of England— even the system of what was called the Concert of Europe that we have seen since the days of Talleyrand in 1815—have broken down. I might say in passing, as a comment on the Congress of Vienna, that guided by statesmen who were certainly adequately cynical—for Talleyrand was certainly that—none theless they arrived at that peace arrangement which substantially and internationally lasted for a century. The democratic statesmen of Versailles only succeeded in reaching an arrangement that lasted for slightly over twenty years—almost precisely twenty years—1918-1938. Their acts incidentally are a comment on method—it looks as if the methods of Vienna were better than the methods of Versailles in terms of producing results.

However, in 1945, as indeed in 1918, there was a proposal, identified first with the name of Woodrow Wilson and then with the name of Franklin Roosevelt, which was going to give us some assurance of peace. It was going to fulfill the hopes of the Taft Committee, which was called the Committee for the Enforcement of Peace. I was present at San Francisco. I remember the optimistic, very high-flown speeches of the statesmen, some of whose names are now forgotten: Padilla of Mexico, T. V. Soong of China, even Smuts of South Africa, even Eden of England, or Stettinius of the United States. Who remembers Stettinius today? But I also remember my profound sense of disappointment as it became clear that we were going to be told how valuable it would be to have the establishment of an Economic and Social Council to deal with the economic problems of the world; and others to deal with health problems, for what a great benefit it would be for human welfare. It seemed as if the crucial thing, namely an organization to maintain and enforce peace, was being left on one side. Indeed, I remember the attitude of Molotov and of the Russians, which was that of willingness to negotiate only with the Great Powers, a refusal to consider what comments smaller countries, of limited military forces, had to offer. I remember the arrangements made at Dumbarton Oaks, which Molotov insisted should be implemented at San Francisco without any serious change. I am afraid I wrote back a dispatch describing this as the Dumbarton hoax — and a pathetic hoax on the people of the world who expected lasting peace to issue. The basis of the structure was that peace would be maintained by the Security Council and by the harmony of the Great Powers—three Great Powers holding vetoes plus a veto given to France in memory of its past and to China in prospect of the Asian future—five veto-holding Powers and the belief that they would act in harmony! It ran indeed contrary to all of history to suppose they would act in harmony. And already, before the San Francisco conference had broken up, one noticed that the honeymoon was over. The length of time between the Russian acceptance of the invitation to come to San Francisco and the report by Averill Harriman that there would not be free elections in Poland (which was the beginning of the Cold War troubles) was literally a matter of days. So already the harmony was moving into discord.

I do not doubt for a moment that the United Nations offers a framework for peace. I do not think that any structure that can enforce peace will be built on any other foundation than that of the United Nations. Therefore, it behooves all men of good will to give it support. This, indeed, was the very essence of the Pope’s allocution, which was welcomed by the Secretary General U Thant. However, I did notice that the Pope used one specific phrase—and it was, to my mind, the key phrase of his whole address, although I do not think I saw any editorial comment to that effect. He referred to the need for the establishment of a “world authority.” Now, note that in the days of Sir Austin Chamberlin, Sir Austin described the old League of Nations as “a free assembling of sovereign states.” Some people thought that what was required was a sovereign assembly of free states. Anyhow, he by implication denied what, I must repeat, is the new notion of “world authority.” How much content is to be given—whether the teeth are to be real or artificial—all these things remain for discussion. At least we have moved, to my mind, to the essential phrase, the key phrase—the need for the establishment of world authority. Here, then, was phase one; the time when the hope for averting this Second Civil War of western civilization (for such it was), through the League of Nations, the hope, again, after the Second Civil War, that we should get peace through the United Nations. It was the hope that there might be born (only some people thought this; I do not know that the U.S. Senate thought this) a “world authority.”

However, two comments have to be made. First, a comment to which I will return. The world authority still depends on the cooperation of the Super-Powers.
That means that it is pivoted on the relations between Washington and the Kremlin and, in terms of natural resources, to a lesser extent on Washington, the Kremlin, and Pekin. These alone need be considered at the super-power level. Remember that politics is a matter of power. As my old friend, Carl Becker of Cornell, said, "all politics is power politics."

Secondly, a further movement—a second route—to assure the widest area of peace that seemed to be likely and practical at the time was a movement for the Unification of Europe. It had, of course, to some extent, a slightly naive side. I will always remember the story of the New York hostess who three times introduced the Swedish ambassador as the Swiss ambassador. He corrected her. She said, "Oh, I am so sorry, but I never could make out why all of you small nations do not join up." But, at a somewhat graver level, you did have an enthusiasm of youth for the unification of Europe.

I remember, in 1947 and 1948, going to the Universities of Heidelberg, Goettingen, Hamburg, and to other parts of Germany, and talking to student bodies there. And, although one could not talk about "democracy" because there had been too many rival definitions of what was meant by democracy, to talk about the unification of Europe immediately led to a sparking of a new flame—uncertain, hesitant—a new flame of idealism, a belief that here might be the way out, here might be the route. Could we but get unification of the old Europe, then the civil wars that had devastated certainly Europe and to some extent the world throughout the twentieth century, and in lesser measure the nineteenth century—and indeed between Bourbon and Hapsburg centuries earlier—could be brought to an end. And hence the great European union movement started, and the lights, the klieg lights, which have fallen on the United Nations at various places but ultimately in New York, fell on the endeavor for the unification of Europe with focus on Strasbourg.

I was myself quite deeply involved in this movement. During the War, indeed. I had been asked by the Polish Government-in-Exile to write a little book on the unity of Europe, stressing the cultural relations of Europe. It had, of course, to some extent, a slightly naive side. I will always remember the story of the New York hostess who three times introduced the Swedish ambassador as the Swiss ambassador. He corrected her. She said, "Oh, I am so sorry, but I never could make out why all of you small nations do not join up." But, at a somewhat graver level, you did have an enthusiasm of youth for the unification of Europe.

I remember, in 1947 and 1948, going to the Universities of Heidelberg, Goettingen, Hamburg, and to other parts of Germany, and talking to student bodies there. And, although one could not talk about "democracy" because there had been too many rival definitions of what was meant by democracy, to talk about the unification of Europe immediately led to a sparking of a new flame—uncertain, hesitant—a new flame of idealism, a belief that here might be the way out, here might be the route. Could we but get unification of the old Europe, then the civil wars that had devastated certainly Europe and to some extent the world throughout the twentieth century, and in lesser measure the nineteenth century—and indeed between Bourbon and Hapsburg centuries earlier—could be brought to an end. And hence the great European union movement started, and the lights, the klieg lights, which have fallen on the United Nations at various places but ultimately in New York, fell on the endeavor for the unification of Europe with focus on Strasbourg.

I was myself quite deeply involved in this movement. During the War, indeed. I had been asked by the Polish Government-in-Exile to write a little book on the unity of Europe, stressing the cultural relations of Poland with the West. After the War there were actually six, some larger some smaller, voluntary bodies which were involved in what was called the European Movement. Some of them had complete blueprints of a Federal Europe. Some wanted to insist that all the governments must be Socialist. There were various degrees of realism in these voluntary movements. But they did receive great support. and with time they received even greater support.

I was concerned with one of these bodies, perhaps the largest, called the Nouvelle Equipe Internationale. It was largely of French inspiration. The M.R.P. Party of France; the inspiration of such men as Robert Schuman, born in Alsace. Prime Minister of France, for long Foreign Minister of France; that of Maurice Schumann—different family. different spelling. later on a French minister—all contributed. I was on the International Executive Committee. I was present in January, 1948, their meeting in Luxembourg. It so happened that the obvious person to lead the British delegation, the Duchess of Atholl, was unavailable, and I was asked to lead the British delegation. The French delegation was led by Maurice Schumann. There was some dispute on the leadership of the German delegation because representatives of the old Centrum were there, but the German delegation, broadly speaking, was led by a fairly unknown man at that time, Dr. Konrad Adenauer. And, the movement prospered.

For those of you who are students of politics it is interesting to note just why the movement prospered. It prospered because people holding the key positions of power, a very limited number of people—in fact four in all and no more—were determined to put this program across. Since they were or had been or were to be the prime ministers of their respective countries and the leaders of their respective parties, they were able to exercise discipline on the rank and file and to shape public and democratic opinion. Certainly this was true of Konrad Adenauer, who made it clear that any member of his own party who did not fall into line could expect little political promotion; and in politics that is a very severe threat, and a very effective one. So the movement went forward, apparently from success to success—the Steel and Coal Community; an Atomic Commission; discussion of European controls of the fields of transport and of agriculture. But there came reversals. The reversal, for example, on the European Defense Community, which I have no time to discuss at length here. I think that British foreign policy was at fault there, and this was encouraged by certain sections in France. I might add that, of the four great men who really led the European movement, Sir Winston Churchill was the pioneer with his famous Zurich speech, which also advised cordial relations between France and Germany, and incidentally an international police force. But Sir Winston was the least effective because he could not carry with him even his own party. In relation to the European Defense Community, under Anthony Eden, that failure of Churchill's party to follow Churchill became very clear. However, the termination of this line of advance came on January 15, 1963—with the famous speech of Monsieur de Gaulle, which, as Harold MacMillan said, "brutally slammed the door" on the development of the European Common Market so as to exclude Britain.

There were two issues here which have to be distinguished. For one thing, de Gaulle made it perfectly plain that he did not want les Pouvoirs Anglo-Saxons, the Anglo-Saxon powers, brought in. He felt that six or thereabouts was the maximum that the plan could carry. If it were increased to eight, to twelve, to thirteen, it would not be the same plan. Hence, the proposals of the policy of M. de Gaulle became "exclusivist and inward-looking." But secondly, they changed the whole
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nature of the plan, for the policy of the old European movement, of such men as Jean Monnet and Walther Halstein, was a quite close integration of these countries. It involved a Union Européenne. M. de Gaulle made it clear that he did not share this view. The most he would be prepared to concede was a Union des Patries. It was to be confederate, at the most. The principle of nationalism was to stand, with perhaps only this major difference, that any country in the European grouping would be regarded as disloyal if it negotiated directly with Washington. The idea rather was that of a European loyalty to be indicated by canalizing diplomacy through the Quai d’Orsai—a position. I might say, considered quite intolerable in Westminster.

Here, then, you had a straight clash and an impasse. M. de Gaulle did not hesitate to refer to internationalists as Jean-foutres. I know it is French slang. I have not looked it up, and the French slang dictionary is perhaps inadequate. But it is not a term of praise. And if, incidentally, it is always well to look and see what people thought when they were young and wrote when they were young, whether it be Hitler or whether it be Ghandi, it is worthwhile turning out the book of 1932 by Monsieur de Gaulle, called Le fil de l'epée. The Edge of the Sword. There he quotes from Shakespeare. The original phrase of Shakespeare is not so emphatic. The French phrase, appropriated by M. de Gaulle from Hamlet, is "Etre grand c'est soutenir une grande querelle."

And now we turn to a third route, with which for forty years I have been peculiarly concerned. I remember that I wrote my first paid journalistic article way back in 1925 on this issue. Most people do not know that A. J. Balfour in 1909 wrote a memorandum for Theodore Roosevelt’s eye, which was entitled “The Possibility of an Anglo-Saxon Confederation.” It contemplated a joint Foreign Office, a joint Admiralty, and it stated, “If England (oddly enough, Balfour was a Scotsman) and America do not federate, the history of the world will continue to be one of warfare.” Well, nothing came of this memorandum. Perhaps if more attention had been paid to it, the story of 1914 would have been a different one.

But I myself well remember studying the map, the mid-line of which centered on Chicago rather than on Greenwich. It seemed that the strategic importance of the Panama Canal was central rather than that of the Suez Canal, a point underlined heavily in recent years. Then I remember later taking from a very great man, my friend Professor Gilbert Murray, a representative to the United Nations and one of its founders, the following phrase: “there will be no pooling of sovereignty where there is not community of values.” And I wrote a book which, incidentally, was first given as a series of addresses in Washington, D.C., called The Anglo-Saxon Tradition.

Then a very odd thing happened. And I wish I had time to tell the story rather more fully; but to put it briefly, my very good friend, Dr. Raymond Buell of Harvard, was chosen to act as advisor to Wendell Willkie, and he wrote to me, asking me to send certain memoranda about strategic affairs, or, as he put it, “Britain’s needs and powers to resist.” And this memorandum was chiefly on the question of the fifty old destroyers and of convoy duties, which are very important for food. But, constitutionally, the proposal of a loan had its legal difficulties. Well, I suppose I can now tell the story—in fact. I have told it several times—of getting into Kansas City; of finding that Raymond Buell had gone to a hospital with an illness that ultimately killed him; of handing these papers over to the campaign manager of the Republican campaign; and of, to my surprise, being invited by the campaign adviser to the honorable Wendell Willkie on campaign—which I did from Kansas City to San Bernardino. Lest anybody think there was some subtle plot in this, I might say that I reported this to the Foreign Office on my return to London. They laughed loudly—and never sent me to America again until the end of the War... So nobody need think there was any deep machine in it.

What is true is that I found, in Wendell Willkie, a man who was promoting this same ideal with which I was concerned. He was to publish One World. But, in January, 1941, in a statement to the press—and this must indeed be put against Winston Churchill's offer of common citizenship with France, an offer not taken up—Wendell Willkie advocated a social and economic union of the United States and the British Commonwealth. He even threw in common citizenship, proposals concerning education, and other matters of like character. This was a remarkable and bold proposal—not, as you will see, a new one, but a bold proposal coming from the titular leader of the Republican Party.

Well, little came of it because, as I have already said, as the War drew to its end, practically all of Roosevelt's efforts were concentrated on the notion of the United Nations. Such people as Archibald MacLeish were insistent that there should be no priorities, and that every country should range, from Albania to Venezuela, in strictly alphabetical order. And I have already commented on that movement.

What I want to point out to you is that the Atlantic Movement is actually older than the other two. It is quite true that Victor Hugo, in the century before, suggested the unification of Europe, but he was a novelist and a poet. But the proposals of the kind that I have been outlining were suggested by Andrew Carnegie; they were suggested by the great strategist and naval historian Admiral Mahan. He was not quite as narrow-minded as Barbara Tuchman suggests: it was a misfortune that it was the Japanese who listened to him, just as it was the Germans who listened to Liddell-Hart.

(It is the misfortune of strategic theorists to be listened to by the enemy.) As I pointed out to you, proposals were put before Theodore Roosevelt by Balfour. It has got to be remembered that, in 1941, you could talk in
terms of a tripartite arrangement; of Washington, Westminster, and Ottawa; you could not at that time, patiently, talk in terms of Berlin or Bonn; you could not talk in terms of Rome; you could not talk in terms of Paris, which was not only under Nazi occupation but also run by the Vichy government. They talked therefore in the only practical terms of their time. Well, with the end of the War there was naturally a shift, and one was able to broaden these things. One was able to talk in Atlantic terms, which do include “Bonn” and “Paris” and “Rome” and “The Hague” and “Brussels.” Nevertheless, perhaps the focal points of power remained the same, in terms of Washington, Westminster, and so forth. It is interesting that the London Times, in an editorial, has stated that the President of the United States is necessarily the President of any Atlantic political organization—a remarkable phrase, but a phrase that I do not think is liable to any challenge. And so, quite recently, since de Gaulle’s speech of January, 1963, this whole proposal once again becomes practical politics of the first order.

You will notice that this plan is not as wide-ranging as the United Nations; but, on the other hand, it is not as narrow a matter of “little Europe” as the European movement, unfortunately, has now, for the present, become. And it is my lever for the object of a worldwide authority. I repeat, you will only get a world authority if you can get some kind of cooperation between Washington and the Kremlin. But you will not, in my view, get cooperation between Washington and the Kremlin if the West itself, if I may make a pun, is crumbling. You will only get this if you have a strong and integrated and organized West. I will not now—and I have not time to—discuss the merits of NATO. I think, however, that M. de Gaulle can be described—and he was so described—four days ago by President Eisenhower—as “a wrecker” in his attitude on NATO. But what we are discussing, after all, is something much broader than NATO, with its economic, as well as its strategic and its political and its cultural side.

In conclusion, I want first of all to quote you a statement by President Johnson in his press conference of November 30, 1964, when he said, “The ultimate essentials of the defense of the Atlantic community are the firmness and the mutual trust of the United States and Europe. The United States is committed to the increasing strength of the cooperation of the Atlantic community in every field of action—economic, commercial, and monetary.” Well, I have not time to elaborate his position further. I am, I think, in fairly close touch with the views of the British government or, at least, of the recent Foreign Secretary, Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker. My views are also known to the Prime Minister and to the present Foreign Secretary. I do not want to exaggerate on this matter. But I say with complete confidence that the proposal that we have been making for forty years—the proposal that is older than the United Nations, the proposal that is older than the United Europe proposal—is now the most practicable proposal to put before citizens today.

The making it effective will turn on a very limited number of men in key positions, granted that there is a tide of public opinion giving them general support. I am convinced that only through this regional integration that I have called, in a phrase that Walter Lippmann was kind enough to pick up and quote in his U.S. War Aims, an “organic union,” will one advance to the position where, without humiliation, without sacrificing of principles of freedom and justice, one can come to practical working terms with, at least, the Soviet Union. Some joint action operates even today, at this moment, in India. And from that we can see, having climbed that height, coming onto our horizon that practical possibility of a World Authority that was stressed one week ago today, and that is, to my mind, the key to a lasting peace.
Science, Technology, and the Doctrine of Dominion

By WILLIAM G. POLLARD

The account of the creation in the first chapter of Genesis concludes with a sweeping summary of what God intended and accomplished when man was added to the creatures inhabiting this planet. This summary occurs with considerable repetition in verses 26 through 28. A condensed version would go like this: “So, it begins by way of definitive summation, ‘“So, God created man in his own image and blessed them and said to them: ‘Be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth.’” I should like to use this summary in this lecture as a means for gaining some theological insight into the meaning of the scientific and technological revolution of our time.

The first and really quite remarkable observation to be made about it is that it is just now being fulfilled. All during the intervening twenty-four hundred or so years since this summation was written it has not been really descriptive of man’s status in the earth. Vast areas, even whole continents, of the earth’s surface were only sparsely if at all settled by man. Man thought consciously of himself as a minority species among many other species. Human settlements were for the most part tiny islands in the midst or on the edge of vast forests or jungles in which the wild beasts held sway. He exercised a limited dominion over his own flocks of sheep, herds of cattle, horse, and dog. But always there was danger and uncertainty as ever watchful tigers or wolves lurked in the shadows ready to pounce at the first opportunity. He exercised essentially no dominion over two basic essentials, the world of micro-organisms and the fertility of soil. Pestilence, plague, and famine were ever present threats periodically actualized in terrible scourges before which man stood helpless. Earthbound, the birds of the air remained beyond his reach. For all his cleverness as a fisherman and sailor, the sea remained vast and alien in which creatures large and small disported themselves oblivious of man and his ways. The dominion over the earth exercised by man was token and symbolic at best, and he was very, very far indeed from having subdued the whole earth to his purposes.

Man had been fruitful, but disease and pestilence prevented him from multiplying. At the beginning of the Christian era there were about 300 million human beings on the earth. It required seventeen centuries to double this number of 600 million. Then in 1820 for the first time the world population of species Homo sapiens passed the 1 billion mark. By 1930 it had doubled to 2 billion. Just two or three years ago it passed 3 billion. By 1977 it will have reached 4 billion, by 1990 5 billion, and by the end of this century in the year 2000 it will be well beyond 6 billion, and the world will be just twice as crowded as it is now. Clearly our century, the twentieth, is the one in which the biblical injunction to “be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth” has at last been fulfilled. It is true of no other time in history. To us and to our generation the lot has fallen to experience the fulfillment of God’s purpose and design when He brought man to this planet a few hundred thousand years ago; namely, that he should in the fullness of time multiply and fill the whole earth. It is a startling thought.

But the same century, the twentieth, marks the fulfillment of the rest of the injunction as well. There are many living today whose childhood was spent in the first decade of this century before the advent of either the automobile or the airplane, electric lights or appliances, radio or TV. In just the span of a single lifetime they have seen the whole face of the earth transformed by the phenomenon of technology. A jet flight over almost any part of the earth today provides striking evidence of this transformation. Everywhere the fields and highways, factories and cities of man stretch endlessly in every direction. The great primeval forests of the earth are rapidly shrinking and by the end of this century will have essentially disappeared. This is true not only of the developed portions of the earth—Japan, America, Europe, and Russia—but of those areas we consider underdeveloped as well—Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Even where the people continue economically depressed, technology in the form of steel mills and factories, highways and airports, dams, power plants, and machinery is everywhere in evidence. In this century man has not only filled the whole planet but he has subdued it as well and taken effective dominion over every creature.

In recent years wilderness and wildlife societies have been formed with a sense of panic about them. Even in Africa, which we still think of as a continent teeming with wild and exotic animals in a natural state, the true situation is one of the rapidly approaching extinction of many species. With the best that these societies, or any of us, can do, by the end of this century the only wild animals left on the earth will be found in zoos or scattered national parks maintained by man for their protection. All the rest of the planet will be devoted directly to man and his needs: to the production of his food and of the water and energy to do his work; his vast cities and the system of highways, air lanes, and seaways linking them together; his recreation and pleasures, foibles, fancies, and vanities. Occasionally he will visit a zoo or a wildlife preserve and sense the pathos of a vanished world before man took his God-given dominion over it, and feel a sharp nostalgia for the earth as it was before man filled it and subdued it. Over all
the rest of the earth every square inch of arable land will be devoted to human agriculture in which all that grows and moves will be specially selected crossbreeds far removed from the wild varieties which covered the earth before man began to exercise his dominion over them. All that lives will be specially suited to the needs of man; any creature which fails to meet this standard will be bred out of existence. Yet this vast change in the status of living things on this planet is the work of but a single century in the whole 4,600 million year history of the earth.

In the hundred years since Darwin it has been customary to emphasize man's continuity with the total evolutionary process. Man was seen as just one species of animal among many animals. There was a tendency at first to look for the steps which produced him among the present day primates so that a sequence from monkey to great ape to man was postulated. Currently the tendency is more and more to emphasize the discontinuity and the explosive character of man's evolution. The steps leading to him were much more complex than originally thought. Modern monkeys and apes leading to them, as with the steps leading to man, no longer exist. There have been man-like creatures with some human traits on the planet for about two million years. But our species, Homo sapiens, entered explosively on the stage of history all over the earth only thirty-five thousand years ago. Prior to that for some seventy thousand years there had been the neanderthaloids who used fire, flint implements, and buried their dead, but they would really not be considered human if they were encountered today. Only when our species was produced did the ominous possibility of dominion of one species over all others and all things hover over the earth like a gathering storm.

Pierre Teilhard de Chardin makes this point most forcefully in The Phenomenon of Man. Describing the earth as it was at the end of the Tertiary just before the emergence in the evolutionary process of a creature made in the image of the Creator, he says,

"A great calm seems to be reigning on the surface of the earth at this time. From South Africa to South America, across Europe and Asia, are fertile steppes and dense forests. . . . And amongst this endless verdure are myriads of antelopes and zebras, a variety of proboscidians in herds, deer with every kind of antler, tigers, wolves, foxes, and badgers, all similar to those we have today. . . . Except for a few lingering archaic forms, so familiar is this scene that we have to make an effort to realize that nowhere is there so much as a wisp of smoke rising from camp or village."

Then silently, stealthily, and like all else in its beginnings, invisibly man evolved, and was introduced to the earth deceptively as though he were just one more species among many being developed and introduced into the already teeming life in the great primeval forests and wind-swept steppes of our present epoch, the Pleistocene. At first he appears in southern Africa in scarcely human form as Homo habilis about two million years ago. Out of this rather bestial primate developed in the next million years two main branches with many strands within each. One of these constitutes the Australopithecines with brains too small for tool making or other man-like activities, but with broad pelvis and upright posture. This branch evolved away from man and became extinct about 300,000 years ago. The other branch consists of a hominid called Homo erectus with a larger body and a larger and more effective brain than his habilis precursor. He had smaller teeth and a better shaped jaw and an easier upright posture with bipedal walking. His freed hands became dexterous and with the help of his more ample brain he made tools and used fire. He spread widely from Africa to Europe and Asia where his remains have been found in China and Java.

Then about 100,000 years ago a new development occurred out of the steady biological diversification of Homo erectus. He is called Neanderthal man and many fossil remains of him showing a considerable variety in form and structure have been found. He was skillful at making tools and weapons and at fire building, and he buried his dead. But his brain capacity was small by our standards, and he had a low forehead with thick orbital ridges, protruding heavy jaws, and short arms and legs. If we saw one today we would not consider him human at all. Then explosively out of one of the developing strains within Homo neanderthalis, modern man developed about 35,000 years ago. He came on the scene as the ice was retreating from Europe after the last ice age. Biologically he had a greater brain capacity made possible by a soft cranium at birth with a very rapid growth of head and brain after birth and a greatly increased blood supply to the brain. His skull was high with straight forehead, flattened face, well formed chin, and agile arms and hands. He is Homo sapiens and he is obviously one of us. He suddenly arises before us, complete and modern and yet already so complex as to be divided into the principal races of modern man. He not only makes tools and buries his dead, like his predecessors, but he learned to make fires and he draws, paints, and carves. How delighted we are with the pictures of mammoths and reindeer, of men wearing animal skins as clothing, masks and jewelry, which he left on the walls of caves in southern France!

Now at last a creature has emerged in the slow evolutionary process whose uniqueness is best described by saying that he alone is made in the image of his creator. Can we doubt it? This overflowing of the inner life into artistic expression, this evidence of imagination and thought, and perhaps play, is indeed something entirely new on the earth. Without realizing it at that time, this new creature already possesses the capacity to fill the earth and subdue it and take dominion over everything else in it. As soon as he appears, the remains of neanderthal man disappear, swept away by the superior prowess of Homo sapiens. Perhaps before him one could have said of neanderthal man that he came closer...
than any other creature ever had to reflecting something of the image of God. But had the creative process ended with him, there would have been no literature or art, no science or technology, and thus no dominion. With Homo sapiens we know at the outset we are dealing with the imagination and spirit which makes all of this ultimately possible. With him God has at last elaborated DNA codes in the long evolutionary process to the point of bringing into existence a creature made in His image.

Yet the striking thing in man's creation is man's complete continuity with all that came before him. We cannot put our finger on any specific point which separates man from non-man. There is no Adam and Eve in the process. Even Homo habilis is, compared to other primates, already human. Biologically and anatomically there is a slow continuous progression toward man which moves slowly for the most part but is interrupted now and then by short periods of rapid and decisive change. Still in its ultimate significance for the whole earth, the step to Homo sapiens is seen in retrospect to have been an immense discontinuity in the history of life. Teilhard de Chardin expresses it forcefully.²

"... how utterly warped in every classification of the living world in which man only figures logically as a genus or a new family. ... To give man his true place in nature it is not enough to find one more pigeon-hole in the edifice of our systematisation or even an additional order or branch. With hominisation, in spite of the insignificance of the anatomical leap, we have the beginning of a new age. The earth 'gets a new skin.' Better still it finds its soul. ... This sudden deluge of cerebralisation, this biological invasion of a new animal type which gradually eliminates or subjects all forms of life that are not human, this irresistible tide of fields and factories, this immense and growing edifice of matter and ideas—all these signs that we look at, day in and day out—seem to proclaim that there has been a change on the earth and a change of planetary magnitude."

In order to properly express the planetary scope of the phenomenon of man, Teilhard de Chardin introduces the term noosphere. Just as the bio-revolution which separates the pre-Cambrian from the Cambrian in the history of the earth can be described as clothing the earth five hundred million years ago in a "biosphere," so the introduction of a new species, Homo sapiens, a mere thirty-five thousand years ago has resulted in clothing the earth in a noosphere, a sphere, that is, which glows with the florescence of thought, imagination, and spirit. The impact on the planet has been just as fundamental and just as revolutionary in each case. As the divine energy worked through the chances and accidents of evolution to develop the full florescence of the biosphere over the earth, we know that God looked upon the teeming blanket of life which began to clothe the earth and saw that it was good. Now just recently when he clothed the earth in its noosphere at the point when Homo sapiens emerged from Homo neanderthalis, we

---
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The true role of nuclear energy for man becomes abundantly clear when we consider the post-revolutionary status of man on this planet in the twenty-first century. With the earth then supporting a total population in excess of seven billion human beings, we are forced to contemplate a radically different world than the one we knew before the revolution in the midst of which we now find ourselves began. It is a world which Kenneth E. Boulding in his fascinating study of the character of the revolution, The Meaning of the Twentieth Century, calls "post-civilization." In it two elements will play an essential role—energy and water. To support such a population in a continuous and stable way will require an immense consumption of energy on a scale far greater than any we have seen so far. It will also require vast quantities of fresh water mainly for irrigation of great desert areas of the earth not previously required for agriculture. Some thirty million acres of new land must be developed each year and supplied with 10 to 20 billion gallons of fresh water per day. Both the requirements for energy and water can only be met with nuclear energy. We have already reached the danger point with water, and soon it is inevitable that we shall see more and more large nuclear powered desalination plants constructed along ocean shores all over the earth. Whether we burn the rocks (by extracting uranium for nuclear fission reactors) or burn the sea (by extracting deuterium for thermo-nuclear power plants), adequate reserves of nuclear fuels are available in the earth for many millenia. Coal and oil will be carefully husbanded and burned as fuel only for small mobile power systems, such as automobiles and airplanes. For electric power, desalted water, and space heating, nuclear power will be universally used. There is no other long-term alternative.

Thus by the end of this century, nuclear power and sea water desalting plants will be commonplace in every country of the world. This is an essential requirement for the maintenance of the population which the earth will then be sustaining. Considerations such as these show how essential to human welfare it is that man should now be exercising his God-given dominion over nuclear fuels. In retrospect it is providential that the key discoveries which make it possible for man to use nuclear energy were made just when they were. Otherwise we would be facing the gravest problems of human survival on the planet for a period just a few decades away from the present. The blessing which man derives from his exercise of dominion over nuclear fuels is far greater and more crucial than has been generally realized. On the other hand, the corollary widespread distribution of nuclear fuels among all countries large and small is charged with terrifying possibilities. By the end of the century nuclear fuels are bound to be as common and universal as coal is now. In such a world any country large or small can fabricate these plentiful fuels into nuclear weapons at any time it wishes to. The problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons which so concerns us now will appear very different then. The specter of vast destruction in a nuclear holocaust can only grow more acute as time goes on. This too is an essential aspect of man's exercise of dominion over nature. We cannot have the possibility of blessing without the possibility of curse. Since it is man who exercises the dominion, it is man alone who determines whether it will be made a blessing or a curse. Hydrogen and uranium are inert. Like alcohol, dynamite, or morphine, they can be applied to either end by him who exercises dominion over them. This too is of course a strictly biblical insight:

"I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and curse; therefore choose life, that you and your descendants may live, loving the Lord your God, obeying his voice, and cleaving to him; for that means life to you and length of days, that you may dwell in (the earth)." 5

In the twenty-first century man will have adjusted to exercising his promised dominion over the whole earth which reached its fulfillment in the revolution of the twentieth century. As Boulding has emphasized, he will more and more have come to see his planet, the earth, as a space ship in which he is making a long journey through the tractless reaches of space and time. The occupants of a space ship must have stocked it with precious supplies for all their needs throughout their long journey. Every supply must be carefully conserved. All wastes must be reprocessed and carefully controlled. A strict oversight of the inventory and management of everything aboard must be maintained at all times. For the teeming billions of the twenty-first century the earth will be just such a space ship. Now that it has become commonplace for men to completely encircle the earth in less than two hours, it has come to seem to us small enough and compact enough to be thought of as a space ship. Indeed, it is a space ship prepared billions of years ago for man's dominion. It has already been stocked during the long pre-human period of its preparation with a wealth of supplies and treasure adequate for all of man's needs. When finally just a short time ago, geologically speaking, man was introduced in the earth by Him who intended all along that man would in time fill it and subdue it to his own purposes, it was already foreordained that it must in time assume its proper role as the space ship on which this new creature, made in the image of his creator, would thereafter make his long journey through space. Now that this is coming so rapidly upon us, the atmosphere, our rivers, the land and fertile soil, and its precious buried supplies of coal and oil and metals become of really vital significance. In the twenty-first century the management of all of them in accordance with the rules of a space ship economy will have become the dominating concern of science and technology.

There are profound theological implications in all of this. First is the assertion that man is a creation of God.
If we think of creation as we know it in human terms in which a great sculpture, symphony, drama, or mathematical theorem is produced slowly with much human strain and stress working on intractable materials, then the explosive evolution of our species out of its primate precursors bears all the marks of a creative act. Theologians often speak of divine creation as though it were a completely discontinuous act whose only human analogy would be found in something like Aladdin's lamp or a magician pulling a rabbit out of a hat. But if human creativity is in any sense an image of divine creativity, then man, in common with all the other strange and marvelous fruits of the evolutionary elaboration of DNA codes, is a phenomenal creation of the divine Author of the process. The creation of man is like that of a great masterpiece of literature which begins with scattered notes, goes through several drafts, and finally stands the test of centuries of appreciation before its true greatness is recognized. Indeed, Homo habilis, Homo erectus, and Homo neanderthalis are like successively improved drafts of the final perfected version of the manuscript which appears in Homo sapiens. Such a myth as this is a truer analogy to the mystery of man's creation than the ancient myth of Adam and Eve.

Secondly, the uniqueness of man among all the other species produced in the evolutionary process is to be found in the assertion that he alone bears the image of the Creator. One of the most striking testimonies to this remarkable fact about man is to be found in the conversion of the biosphere into the noosphere which has occurred through him. The florescence of thought and spirit which now blankets the earth has its key in the doctrine of the imago dei, and in the amazing correspondence between the mathematical constructions of his mind and the constitution of the pre-existing universe in which he finds himself; a correspondence to which the whole mighty fabric of modern science bears striking witness.

Finally, the central meaning of the revolution of our time is to be found in the fulfillment just being achieved in the twentieth century of the destiny of man inherent in his initial introduction among the creatures of the earth to be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the planet, and subdue it, and take dominion over the whole earth. The realization of the relevance of this biblical doctrine of dominion to an understanding of the twentieth century revolution places it in a cosmic perspective and gives it a planetary scope, depth, and magnitude which otherwise might escape our apprehension. Yet no other view does justice to the really fundamental character of this revolution.

The dilemma which man faces in the exercise of his dominion over an earth so subdued to his purposes as to have become the space ship for his journey has been put very succinctly by Boulding in the book to which we have already referred:

"There is danger both of the bang of nuclear detonation and of the whimper of exhausted overpopulation, and either would mean an end of the evolutionary process in these parts. If man were merely capable of destroying himself, one could perhaps bear the thought. One could at least console oneself with the thought of elementary justice, that if man does destroy himself it is his own silly fault. He is captain, however, of a frail and delicate vessel, and in the course of destroying himself he might easily destroy the vessel—that is, the planet which carried him, with its immense wealth and variety of evolutionary freight and evolutionary potential."  

Loren Eiseley is even more pessimistic than Boulding about what it means for the future of the earth that man has subdued it and taken dominion over it. In a remarkable book, The Firmament of Time, he views with considerable horror the vanishing of the primordial order of nature under the thundering engine of modern technology:

"It is with the coming of man that a vast hole seems to open in nature, a vast black whirlpool spinning faster and faster, consuming flesh, stones, soil, minerals, sucking down the lightning, wrenching power from the atom, until the ancient sounds of nature are drowned in the cacophony of something which is no longer nature, something instead which is loose and knocking at the world's heart, something demonic and no longer planned—escaped, it may be—spewed out of nature, contending in a final giant's game against its master."  

Perhaps there is something fundamentally unstable about the production of a noosphere anywhere in the universe. It may be that for a planet on which it happens, the birth of thought is a dark and onimous cloud which by the time the planet is subdued becomes a black and terrible storm which engulfs and ravages it, destroying beyond repair its long accumulation of evolutionary achievement and evolutionary potential. Perhaps man, as he crowds closer and closer together on a shrinking earth and as the noosphere intensifies and compresses, will inevitably make of it a curse rather than a blessing, death rather than life. Certainly the one element in all creation over which man was not given, and does not exercise, dominion is himself.

Yet this is to speak without hope. It is, it seems to me, to ignore the divine providence which so clearly was involved in producing the noosphere to begin with. In a summary of his thought a year before his death Teilhard de Chardin, too, takes note of these terrible dangers which seem to be inherent in the compression of the noosphere. But he then sets out to rebut such a view with all his strength. He is sure that the evolutionary process which led to man has a profound and wonderful purpose which will not be thwarted by anything which man will do. Taking portions of two passages, his conviction runs something like this:

"For in the course of this unprecedented biological operation of a whole species 'imploding' on itself, we stand at this moment precisely at the sensitive,
'equatorial' point; here the evolution of Homo sapiens, having hitherto been expansive, is now beginning to become compressive. Inevitably this change of condition, at its onset, gave us a kind of vertigo. But enlightened at last by a little more knowledge, now see that we can face the high pressures of the upper hemisphere, which we have just entered, without fear. . . (Yet) a hominisation of convergence can only end with a paroxysm. Even if consolidated by the final awakening of consciousness of its common destiny, humanity will probably undergo tomorrow, either by its efforts to define and formulate the unity awaiting it, or in the choice and application of the best means to attain it, inner conflicts more violent than any we are familiar with. But since they will develop in a human milieu much more strongly polarised toward the future than we can yet imagine, these phenomena of tension will very likely lose the sterile bitterness peculiar to our present struggles.®

Teilhard's optimism is deeply rooted in his Christianity. He had a vision of the cosmic Christ filling and empowering all matter. To him the risen and living Lord, through whom and by whom all things were made, is the central force in the noosphere. The life-giving power of love which emanates from that center charges the whole noosphere and will in time after the paroxysm of its convergence become the central force in welding it into a true community. For Teilhard as for St. Paul and St. John, Christ is the creative force, the divine logos, operative throughout the whole of evolution in bringing spirit out of matter and clothing the earth first in its biosphere and then in its noosphere. The Incarnation came at just that moment in history when man was ready to begin actively cooperating with God in his own evolution, when he was on the verge of creating the civilization which in the twentieth century would achieve the purpose for which he was created. Now that the Jesus of history has become the living Christ, a loving person has been injected into the heart of the noosphere. In this person the noosphere becomes not an abstract collectivity of thought and spirit, but it assumes a face and a heart. Christ becomes the attractive center drawing man's subsequent evolution toward union with him. However agonizing the transition may be, this loving person at its center will ultimately, as Teilhard expresses it, "unamnize" and "amorize" the noosphere and bring it to that "mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" about which the Epistle to the Ephesians speaks (4:12).

Any such vision of the role of Christ in the future evolution of the noosphere will, I know, seem entirely unbelievable to the great majority of informed persons today. They see Christianity merely as an inherited institution from the medieval past which has become quite irrelevant to the mighty forces loose in the world today. In one sense they are right. Not only is the twentieth century the moment in his long history when man is suddenly fulfilling the destiny given him when he first appeared on the earth. It is also at the same time the century most uniquely marked among all others in the history of man by an all-pervasive secularism. In its passion for subduing the earth, the spirit of the age has rejected all religion as being irrelevant to its task. Perhaps the passion for dominion and the zest for participation in a revolutionary age of such scope and magnitude makes such a single-minded concentration on the here and now inevitable. But whatever may be the reason for the phenomenon, we see the evidence of it on every hand. In Europe and America it manifests itself in the disappearance of Christendom as a cultural phenomenon of western civilization and the resulting alienation of the Church from the dynamics of contemporary history. In Russia and China the complete secularization of life and society is a primary objective of the State. In Africa it manifests itself in a large-scale abandonment of history and tradition, along with religion, in order to plunge unhindered into the dynamics of the scientific revolution with its promise of dominion. The result of all this has been a planetary tide of secularization before which all religion—Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, Moslem, and Confucian—is rapidly disappearing. By the end of the century it seems to me almost certain that none of the great religious institutions which have informed and inspired all the human civilizations of the past three thousand years will play any significant role in the new planetary society which will then clothe the earth.

But let us now make an effort to visualize the world as it will be when the revolution is over and men are settling down in the twenty-first century to a long adjustment to the thickly populated world of perhaps ten billion human beings. Man's dominion over the whole earth will then no longer be something still in process of achievement, but something already accomplished by earlier generations in the preceding century. The earth will already have been filled and subdued. From then on he can only endeavor to accommodate himself to the fact of this situation and continually endeavor as best he can to stabilize the new world society to a space ship economy organized for an endless trip through space. What will then happen to the secularism which characterized the earlier revolutionary period? What will have become of the earlier passion for this world and its conquest by man? What do the occupants of a space ship which will never return to any home port require? What is to draw them on and challenge them when they must be totally absorbed in applying their best science and technology to the maintenance of the food and materials supply of their ship and above all of a stable population on it?

If we really visualize the post-revolutionary world which is so rapidly coming upon us and think through honestly and deeply such questions about it, it seems to me that the role of Christ in it becomes clear and inescapable. No doubt we Christians are now in one of those remnant situations so familiar from the biblical
prophets in other very different revolutionary ages. In a time when all the traditional religions of the world are rapidly dying out, Christians too are called to the vocation of a Holy Remnant. But that remnant when the revolution is over will, I firmly believe, have become unified again into that one Body, the historic Catholic Church of the West, which has been the genius of that civilization which gave modern science and technology to mankind and permitted him to fill the earth and subdue it. It will not be a powerful institution, but it will be a spirit-filled, purified, and exciting one. Moreover, because Christ is the attractive center for the future evolution of the noosphere, this Church will be the central axis for its convergence and the spearhead of its evolution. The Church will then again grow and flower in a world from which all other religions will have died out and with no viable alternatives other than a sterile secularism with no place to go contending against it.

The stabilized crew of a space ship being operated on a stabilized economy of energy, water, food, and materials has only two ways to go. Either downward into the great black whirlpool which sucks both crew and space ship to final destruction or else upward toward Christ, drawn toward that loving person at the heart of things who came into the world that we might have life, and have it in abundance. I for one share with Teilhard the conviction that the integrity of the whole evolutionary process which in two billion years has elaborated DNA codes so amazingly as to carry simple one-celled organisms into the remarkable phenomenon of man guarantees that Christ will be victorious in the end over the whirlpool. Along the way there will be terrible conflicts of an intensity more violent than any we have seen so far. The unification and amorization of the noosphere will probably not be achieved without a paroxysm in the end. But that of course is the way of the Cross which Christ Himself has shown us. But after the Cross comes Easter. After the paroxysm comes the next great step in the long evolutionary history of the earth. The noosphere will converge upon itself in Christ to produce a new form of universal human society and community as different from that which we now know as *Homo sapiens* is different from *Homo habilis*. We cannot really conceive what this will be since it will be a new creation. But Christ is our guarantee that we are moving toward it. Let us proclaim this good news to the world which shrinks in horror from the sight of the whirlpool.

2. Ibid., pp. 182-183.
Toward the Year 2000 in Christian Higher Education

By GEORGE N. SHUSTER

This address is being given in the year in which we are observing the twenty-fifth anniversary of your President, a man who long ago seemed to me one of the genuinely significant servants of American higher education. Some words I found in a biography of Stonewall Jackson seem curiously appropriate for the parallel they suggest: "The mystery in which Jackson's operations were involved, the dread he inspired in the enemy, his reticence, his piety, his contempt of comfort, his fiery energy, his fearlessness and his simplicity aroused the interest and enthusiasm of the whole community." In Dr. Kretzmann's case, the enemy has been Satan, with all his works and poms. I cannot believe that he has had any other foe. As for the mystery in which his works have been involved, one can find no better commentary than some words of Jaroslav Pelikan: "At . . . Valparaiso University, a large and vigorous department of theology has been engaged in historical, biblical and philosophical investigations and discussions significant enough to attract nation-wide attention from both Roman Catholics and Protestants and to stir up some thunder on the right."1 If anyone does not feel that this achievement involves a good deal of mystery, we must, alas, conclude that his theological camera has caught little of the real world. Being of ripe and ancient vintage, I can also recall what Valparaiso University was like when he took it over. Despite the liturgical reform in my own communion, I may still be permitted to say in Latin, de mortuis nil nisi bonum. It is unnecessary to do more than refer to the comeliness of the new structures erected here and recall with personal satisfaction that in the beautiful university chapel the Third Person of the Trinity is still addressed as the Holy Ghost. This fidelity to traditional English might draw some thunder from the Roman Catholic left.1

My assigned purpose is to explore the educational terrain, with special reference to what for lack of a better term we call Christian higher education. It is of course clear that the proper formation as distinguished from the education of the Christian does not have at the core of its concern matters like Botany, Anthropology, or even Mathematics. It must be governed by the implications of the Biblical epigram, he who loses his life shall find it. Our institutions are blends of Martha and Mary. Nor are they birds of the air or lillies of the field, except in the sense that they never have enough money in the bank. But they do try to do as well as they can with the modern equivalents of the Trivium and the Quadrivium.

At any rate, broadly speaking, there are two kinds of Christian higher education. The first is exemplified in the German University and in its British counterpart. Here the secular subjects go their own merry ways, but there are Faculties of Theology, Catholic and (or) Protestant, doing lip-service at least to Newman's Idea of a University. The second kind is unabashedly denominational, and of it this university is an example. Catholics have created a great array of such institutions, in the United States and Western Europe (I include Poland in Western Europe), in Australia and South America, in Canada, Japan and Africa. These are uneven in achievement and diverse in pedagogical orientation, but in their totality they form the largest and most influential private higher educational venture in the Free World. Only in the United States does it have a significant counterpart, in Lutheran, Protestant, Anglican and Jewish institutions. The German pattern, however, seems a very good one, too, and it also has its replicas in this country.

In a sense higher education as thus described is the Western World. Despite the moats which sunder one form of allegiance to the Christian Gospel from another, the deep rifts in Judaism, or, perhaps still more seriously disruptive, the varied forms and tendencies within Theology itself, ranging all the way from an untenable literalism to a myth-doctrine so far removed from the texts of Revelation as to seem dangling in post-Hegelian air, this is what can be taught in the Western World, is taught, and cannot be taught in that part of the Eastern World under communist dominion. Everything else in the spectrum of human concern, even the Social Sciences and the Arts, are gradually, sometimes painfully, being emancipated from suppressive controls, at all events in Russia and the lands immediately to the West.

If one considers the past half-century as a setting, this was of course formed by the rise of the totalitarian ideologies and their at least partial decline. It is already difficult to reconstruct, if one did not personally confront it, the awesome and mysterious power latent in those ideologies. The Pope, Stalin said correctly, had no battalions. But the totalitarians did. They massed armies and secret police almost as mightily as armies. They controlled every instrumentality of expression, all forms of assembly, each kind of school. Their intellectual arsenal was an amalgam of every anti-Christian idea of hypothesis formulated since the middle of the eighteenth century. Marx's dialectical materialism was theirs, a pseudo-biology of the human race, deviously derived from Darwin and Nietzsche, the myth of Science—a myth because it can solve no fundamental problem of bird or death—as well as seemingly the Reality of Science, a Reality because it can virtually determine the character of the here and now. It was a formidable arsenal, though it lacked, in purely human terms, everything which is human—everything of the little freedoms which are dear to the heart, the liberty of a boy who has
earned some money to buy a ring for his girl, liberty to follow the church bells to the place where they ring, liberty to call the man who governs you an ignorant pterodactyl, because in this way you can express a sense of personal superiority in which you do not really believe.

The Jewish people were, as we all know, turned over to the demon of destruction. They died as white mice do in a laboratory, but with no protection from any humane society. And Christians? Had they not become the “frozen people of God,” to borrow the title of a recent book? It was not merely that in terms of Theology they were tied to formulations of creed and liturgy congealed since the Reformation and Trent. We cannot conceive of anything congealed as being alive, but Christians tried. Other handcuffs held them even more tightly. They appeared to be locked within the culture. One could count on one’s fingers the islands in Western Europe on which the worker had not turned away from the Christian commitment. He subscribed to a Marxism which even few intellectuals can understand and turned away from the Gospel the essence of which any child can grasp. The truth was that Christians had possessions they did not want to give up, which they sought to hang on to by every conceivable ruse. And so when the paraders paraded, they did so too, although they were inwardly ashamed. In the end what was saved of their honor, whether in Germany, France or Italy, was given them undeservedly by a tragic and heroic few.

It was therefore with an irony tinged with bitterness that one looked about in Europe, after the massacre was over, at what seemed to remain of Christian education. Could one conceive of it as anything more than an esoteric catacombian exercise in restating a frayed eschatological theme? In an effort to revive the German economy, we and the British began to build, in 1947, comfortable hotels amidst the ruins. In their cellars were night clubs, to serve as an added lure to visiting and presumably not so tired business men. One such edifice stood in a kind of mockery of isolation on a street across from Cologne’s cathedral, the roof of which had been bashed in by bombs. Who on that spot felt optimistic enough not to suppose that the hotel and its night club, out of which echoes of jazz oozed feebly over the rubble outside, were the symbols of the brave new world to be, or that the cathedral, even if presumably it was to be rebuilt, could hardly be more than a respectable landmark reminding those who perhaps wished to be reminded of still another antique culture?

But it was soon clear that a great deal of Christian education had survived, and had been cleansed in a sense which doubtless only those who have had some experience with the grace of God can understand. Wisdom emerged and with it scholarship. I knew a professor long intimately identified with the University of Bonn, not drinking a drop of Nazism into his spirit, who never went to a bomb shelter because a book which could not have been published while the Third Reich lasted needed his full time and attention. When it finally appeared it did not set the world on fire. It was a solid, rather awesome, study of a problem in metaphysics such as German professors are given to producing. Meanwhile two men of whom he had probably heard very little—Dietrich Bonhoeffer the Lutheran and Reinhold Schneider the Catholic—thought probably only dimly conscious of their mission, were preparing the way for that measure of reconciliation between the great creeds of Germany which one can say, almost with certainty, was the source from which the Second Vatican Council sprang. For this quite revolutionary resolve to give Christendom back its youth, and to think of Christian unity in terms of freedom and mutual respect, had to draw its strength from martyrdom endured, not by one creed but by some Christians in the name of all Christians, from the agony and the terror of Dachau and Auschwitz, from the devastating of Europe, and from a life-kindling awareness of what heroism means.

Had there been no Christian education no Pope could have found out how to formulate his good intentions. The university was pitted against the Curia, and it triumphed I think because it had grown accustomed to discussion, not merely in terms of texts and documents, but also in terms of the time. But I shall not try to comment further on the new climate in theological studies. Sometimes it leaves me, probably as a result of the decades I cannot deny having seen, a bit non-plussed. This will not be easy to explain to you, since most of the changes I know about have occurred in my own lifetime. Liturgically speaking, it often seems to me that what we have gained in terms of a sense of community we have lost in terms of what the Germans magnificently call Wuerde. My mother, who transferred her allegiance from Lutheranism to Catholicism, would have been deeply shocked if, had she lived into this time, she would have been asked to sing Luther’s famous hymn. After all we had said about him and his ink-well! My personal trouble is, being a humanist many of whose years were misspent studying the language of poetry, that

Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott

is not the same thing as

A mighty fortress is our God.

But at least no one can quarrel with the last two words. The distress is greatly intensified when one turns to Latin. Since the second person singular is anathema to those who interpret common speech in a fashion Wordsworth, who invented the term, never had in mind, becomes,

Lambda of God, who takes away the sins of the world.

But quite apart from the awkwardness of the verb, tolis means and does not mean “takes away.” Some of the more exasperated among my antiquated colleagues refer to the Holy Rollerism of our current Liturgy. I do not join them. Doubtless we shall get round sometime to capturing grace and beauty. Fortunately the younger generation, never having studied Latin, is not at all
disturbed when a beautiful Latin choriambic in the creed, "lumen de lumine," turns into a flat radio announcer's "Light of Light." This phrase, it is hardly necessary to point out, means nothing either theologically or humanistically.

If we have our work cut out for us liturgically, it is a sweet yoke compared with the new agape theology. I listened to a young exponent of this preach a few Sundays ago. He said: "Every time you eat a pork chop, think of how happy the pig from which it came would be if he knew that through you, through man as mediator, part of him was being given back to his Creator." What he had in mind was really not undeserving of praise. But the collective ignorance of all the pigs which have lived, and their consequent inability to sing hymns of praise which might have risen from their lips, is a phenomenon which can only serve to remind us of the ignorance of the human race. Please do not misunderstand me. Having waited most of my life for the new theology to come into being, I feel like an initiate into bliss. But there can be little doubt that we need not merely a new language forged on the linguistic anvils of men like Rahner and Barth, but also a new and sufficient orientation to reality.

It is the function of humanistic and scientific studies to help provide both; and I think we can for that reason in particular be grateful for this university and its president. And so for the brief time which remains I shall discuss these studies as they concern Christian education. Seen in the context of a century ago, theologians and philosophers—who whether we wish it or not do constitute the core of Christian education—generally thought of science in terms of apologetics. When they were perceptive, as were Newman and Blondel, or later on Max Scheler and Teilhard de Chardin, they saw that the sciences were digging a path to the constitution of the cosmos which would lead men from older routes, among them that taken by deductive thought, and might by-pass the central concerns of theology. This insight proved to be correct. We are the heirs; and in a country like Russia one encounters young men, competently trained in the sciences, who no longer know even that Jesus Christ lived on earth.

But perhaps, I speak tentatively, we have come to a place where science is not any more what it seemed to be during the age of Newman or the post-Kantians. One may describe this as an area of daring, of hypothesis, of what the Germans call Wagnis. That is, except in so far as the quest is concerned with applied science, the investigator proceeds according to the standard logic of his method only when it is posterior to the flash of insight, the stretch of the imagination, which gives birth to his formula. And therewith there comes about a certain consonance with the mystical approach to the Divine which is of course not immediately corroborative of it. There is a rather remarkable aspect of science so considered which is perhaps worth noting, for a reason which will become more apparent as we proceed to the creative act in humanistic terms. This is: a relatively few feet in a relatively few parts of the world suffice to enable investigators to alter profoundly the character of man's life. And so one can find a likeness with Julian of Norwich in her cell, or indeed, more augustly, with Jesus wrestling with the power of Evil in the desert.

And no doubt also important advances in generating humanistic activity—which Newman called literature, therewith making excellent sense—also seem to require little more than something like a county or a shire. Wordsworth did most of his mature writing in a small house in the Lake Country, the Pascal known to philosophy and religion advertised the merits of spending twenty-four hours quietly in a room, and Shakespeare seems to have confined his travels to a patch of space including Stratford and London. Florence and Ravenna, and Rome once seen briefly during a pilgrimage, were all the cities Dante knew. May this not be due to the fact that insight into the mystery of human nature—a mystery increasingly recognized as different in character from and even more baffling than the deep riddle of the cosmos—is concerned with the permanent universal realities of tragedy and comedy? You may argue that Goethe gained much from his travels to Italy. But, alas, it sicklied over the second part of Faust with a misty cast of thought. The substance of the play was sucked out of Frankfurt and the Harz Mountains, what lives in it is medieval German lore. We may add that the truly distinguished humanistic scholars of our time, C.S. Lewis and Douglas Bush, for example, did not have to travel far from their campuses and libraries.

At any rate, when humanistic insight lessens there is always a danger that religious vision will flag as well. The great and beautiful English theological literature of the seventeenth century—a more widely diffused knowledge of which may prove to be one of the fine fruits of the ecumenical spirit working in our time—was the sibling of great and beautiful verse. Shall we not go on to say that Literature is prophecy while Science is anticipation? Science is of course not merely a detective story of man's collective pursuit of the daimon of being. It cuts into the hard rock of fact for the gold of truth reverence for its own sake. And what is meant by prophecy? Only that it is recognition of what human nature is capable of achieving, with the Grace of God or without it. The most haunting examples in the modern age were doubtless provided by Dostoievski. But there is much more—Eliot's Murder in the Cathedral, for instance—so startlingly foreshadowing, against the background of The Waste Land, what resistance to tyranny in the name of conscience was destined to be in the totalitarian years. And so—who knows?—the nihilistic and acrid writing which is the fruit of the present hour may foreshadow a hunger for redemption that just now so often seems not to exist.

Christian education, therefore, is when considered in its essence—it must of course do what Newman attempted and concern itself with the common chores of educa-
tion in its everyday totality—an almost heroic attempt to foster the art of contemplation, the gift of prophecy and the activity of love. I have said before that it must always fly at its mast a banner bearing the Christian mandate, *He who loses his life shall find it*, because in this the true character of contemplation, prophecy and love are contained. But it is best conceived of perhaps also in terms of Chesterton's line, describing the hero of Lepanto, *He whose loss is laughter when he counts the wager worth*. In contemplation one puts oneself apart from, in this sense loses oneself, from the world that is too much with us. It is Kant looking at the starry heaven long enough to discover, for himself at least, the moral law which rules the conscience. It is Socrates standing side by side with death freely borne because only so could Eternal Beauty be clearly revealed. Prophecy is at one level the other side of ethics—namely that which foresees the outcome of conduct. And on a second level it is a cutting through of the veil of the merely human, the anthropomorphic, so that the nature of Divine truth and affection can to some extent be foreseen. This it has become for us all in Dante's *Paradiso*.

The longer one lives the clearer it should become that only out of contemplation and prophecy can love be born. One must know, in every sense which honesty can make plain, what one is, in order to become able to see the other one, the neighbor. The Scriptural mandate that I am to think of him as I do of myself is complex and puzzling. Only when we have stripped ourselves of the last vestige of false pride—have recognized the laziness and the libido, the self-righteousness and the trifling ambitions, which make us living illustrations of how easy it is to blend in ourselves the Pharisee and the Publican can we approach the other one. The neighbor may be one who has strayed, perhaps quite unconsciously, down a path which we have not gone. She may be a woman from the rural South, wandering into some diseased and decrepit part of a northern city, whose almost continuous pregnancy, by what man she may not even remember, and now living in a state of nature which no primitive culture any longer exorcises is on our hands. That one can achieve a dim recognition of her potential dignity by equipping her with a contraceptive coil may in some oblique way be an act of scientific kindness. But in isolation it is not kindness to her but to society, which can thus rid itself of responsibility for her children who sometimes become drug addicts and little more. It will not take her out of the so called culture-pattern in which she is immured. It will not give her a household which is a holy place. She will be a prostitute rather than a spawning machine. But then the statistician can say that his demographic problem has been in part solved.

Of course Christian education must not cut itself off from the Social Sciences. These can in all truth prove to be instrumentalities which love can use. The overarching purpose of Christian education must never mean that it is put asunder from the common tasks of education. It too must serve to provide breadth of view, accuracy and judgment. It is not to create a monastic school or a Wittenberg. The young men and women who ask guidance from it must be steered into the world as that now is. I think that in this sense Christian education still has a great deal to learn. And indeed one form of it can profit a great deal from the experience of another.

So therewith I come finally to a note of jubilation which is the real reason for my being here. Nothing about this festive year is perhaps more worthy of note than that at last the Lutheran university which Dr. Kretzmann so ably serves and the Catholic University which I in some sense help along the road it must go, have to a great extent foreshadowed what is so new and startling, namely recognition of the fact that we are friends in thought and deed, in affection and even laughter. Perhaps nothing I could say about my own institution is so wonderfully true as that it has so glorious a tradition of recognizing the imperfections of human nature as well as the perfectibility of that nature. There people can still, thank God, laugh at themselves and each other and then forget that they have laughed. The fact that we play football so zealously instills into our intellectuals a special kind of chagrin, which they compensate for by padding the student's reading lists still more. But if we stopped playing and became like unto the University of Chicago they would be filled with a quite poignant nostalgia for the past.

Into all this Dr. Kretzmann and some of his colleagues have fitted as does filet of sole into the menu of a French restaurant. When he has spoken to us the spirit of poetry has hovered over his words, giving them an oddly whimsical yet deeply moving savor, and there has also been a sense of humor akin perhaps to that of the friar in Schiller's *Wallenstein*. In short, if he ever tires of being here we shall be glad to welcome him as a boon companion. But what has doubtless been deepest and best in this relationship has been the struggle—the hard hours spent in wrestling with the world that is so overwhelmingly about us—for the boon of ministering to the spirit of youth. I shall hope that when during the years that lie ahead what is called "dialogue"—just why in a time which wants to get rid of Latin, we should fasten on this Greek word is another mystery—between Lutheran and Catholic takes on an umbra of affection which can now only dimly be foreseen, there will always be cherished the memory of one who started it in this area, with no pretense or stiffness but with a good earthy friendliness festooned with the necessary paradoxes. To this university my own should like to offer a bouquet of rosemary, for remembrance, in recognition of comradeship and in hope for the future of our country and of all the kinds of people, queer each one, who live upon the earth. This is as close as I can come to the year 2000.
Towards the Year 2000 A.D. — The Church

By H.C.N. Williams

In St. Paul’s Letter to the Christians of Ephesus, he speaks of the Church as a building whose corner stone is Jesus Christ—a building in which we become “fitly joined together.” A corner stone is not a monumental, symbolic, ceremonially-laid foundation stone. It is the key stone by which the growing walls are bonded together. The word used for the building in this connection is a corrupt Greek word which means a building complete and established or a building in process of construction. The context in the Epistles is always the latter—a building in process of being constructed.

It is because this is the true image of the Christian Church in any age that I dare in this lecture to trace trends in the Church in a spirit of convinced hope and not of frustrated despair. For if the building were complete and established, then the traditional, inflexible, passionately self-preserving Church, fixed in its structure and character in the first century, or in the age of Constantine, or at the Reformation, IS the Church, and to change it to meet the challenges of the ongoing secular world would be a blasphemy. And lest such a proposition should sound ridiculous, I ask you to estimate the tenacity with which the Church defends the shibboleths and taboos of its own historic traditions, and to ask whether it is not because subconsciously we believe that the building is already complete, and not a being-constructed—building, that it is rightly charged with obscurantism and irrelevance. To use a meteorological metaphor, there hangs like a Heavyside layer over the life of the Church a fear of change which inhibits progress, and denies us the adventure into new vistas of the Truth into which our gloriously changing world is leading us. There is no more insipid heresy than the line of the popular hymn: “Change and decay in all around I see.” If one prediction about the next 35 years is certain, it is that the whole structure and mission of the Church in the world will undergo a change amounting to an agonising revaluation of its treasured structures, a penetrating criticism of many of its dogmatic positions, and overall a crucifixion, leading, if we have faith, to a Resurrection.

In the influencing of change, there are always three alternatives:

The first is the way of the Reformer, who seeks to improve and tidy up existing structures;

The second is the way of the Revolutionary, who seeks, like Karl Marx, to destroy and start again;

And the third is the way of the Radical, who seeks to go down to the roots, and to encourage new growth from the old roots. In this sense, the true traditionalist is the true Radical. And this is the sort of radicalism that will be required of the Christian Church if it is to meet the probing challenges of the next 35 years.

The basic change of the present day which must, whether we like it or not, be accepted as the hypothesis of re-thinking, is the fact that the area of the supernatural is being continually circumscribed. The knowledge explosion and its channelling along lines of scientific and technological advance is leading to the disenchantment of the newly educated young generation with the supernatural. Religious belief is being forced to rediscover the basic and valid sanctions for its assertions in a way which accepts the rationality of the secular world as a natural part of God’s revelation, and does not “dig in” around a blind fundamentalism which tries to explain the secular world away. The survival of the Church as an influence on the life of man depends on our preventing a separation between the Church on the one hand, and the secular world on the other. Harvey Cox in The Secular City points out that secularisation is the legitimate consequence of the impact of Biblical Faith on history. That is why secularisation, particularly as it affects learning, art, industry, and commerce, social welfare and the rest, arose first within the culture of the so-called Christian West, in the history within which the Biblical religions have made their most telling impact. The rise of the natural sciences, of democratic institutions, of our judicial system, of our educational and social values, cannot properly be understood without the original impetus of the Bible. In this sense of secularisation—as opposed to secularism, which isolates this world from the world as religion defines it—in the sense in which secularisation means greater justice, social equality, the proper distribution of wealth and efficient management, the problem is not that the world is secular, but that it is not secular enough. It is indispensable to the survival of the Church into the next century that the Church should see in the secular world, and direct in the secular world, the proper application of the human values which the Bible has made explicit, and not see in the secular world a scale of values opposed by definition to the values of religion.

The dilemma of the Church in feeling that it is being deserted by the supernatural will only be resolved by absolute honesty, and by an honest sifting of its traditions, so that in coming to terms with change, we do not tear up our roots.

Let me at once give you an example of an area of creative challenge: The analogy of the as yet undefined religious propositions of the technological age, now well advanced, is provided by the science and technology of cybernetics. The potential of this Science has not yet begun to be grasped. An example of the sort of dimensions we shall have to accept is provided by such a comparison as this: accepting as a definition of intelligence the ability to correlate coefficients existing in and fed
into the brain, it is likely that a normal correlation—such as, for instance, this sentence—might involve 200, 300 or 500 coefficients. Russia is perfecting a cybernetic artifact capable of a billion and a half calculations per second. Already perfectly valid claims are being made for cybernetic efficiency from solving a railroad strike to making a judgment as between a Picasso and a Rembrandt from selecting students into a university to planning a nation's economy. By such enterprises the machine is making judgments until now made by man, and making them more efficiently. But the coefficients which programme the machine are the values, reactions and responses of a man. It therefore becomes important beyond our imagining that unless the machine is to select human values and therefore to set human values in the future, and to condition human response, that human beings should look more responsibly and critically at human values. Norbert Wiener, the founder of the discipline of cybernetics, felt this passionately when he asserted that cybernetics calls us to a better understanding and use of human values and not a lesser. He warned that unless this were understood and acted upon, it was soberly predictable that within a generation, the machine would be cleverer than man.

If then it is possible to programme a cybernetic artifact with "a man," the question which cries aloud for an answer is the question of the Psalmist: "What is Man?" and what could be more radical than that? And if the Church of the next thirty years is not to fail in its responsibility to respond to the challenge of technology to a greater understanding of "human being" and not a lesser, then it will have to have a close and searching examination of its theology of man. And while no such theology can ignore man's capacity for sin and his need of redemption, the restatement of the doctrine of man which can hope to evoke a positive response from man in a technological age will have at least to have some statement to balance in positive terms of hope the gloomy negativeness of the 39 Articles which asserts that "every person born into this world is deserving of God's wrath and damnation."

If every heresy is an exaggeration of a neglected truth, then the heresy of humanism is an exaggeration of the belief in the hope that is in man. None the less, neglected by Christian dogma though this may be, a truth it remains, and the Christian Church will, in its searching examination of the doctrine of man have to come to terms with man's longing for hope, to prevent him from "writing himself off" as a responsible, moral being with a confident hope of redemption.

And should you say that this hope is in Jesus Christ, none would gainsay you. But to say so begs the question of our ability to speak of the incarnate Jesus to a generation which has neither appreciated nor understood its own humanity.

One of the hopeful features of our present Christian age is a feature which has in every age of trial and confusion characterised the activities of the Church, namely a rediscovery of the Bible. Because the Bible is an instrument of God's Truth, particular dimensions of that all-embracing Truth have been unfolded at particular times to meet the searching of each generation. It is likely that the Bible will more and more be studied as a whole book, revealing truths about the university of God, the universality of human responsibility, the universality of human guilt and the need for universal forgiveness and redemption, with a consequent adjustment of the 19th century emphasis on personal sin, and the particularising of Biblical insights to support this emphasis. Incidentally one hopes that this may lead to a rich harvest of new hymns to replace the sickly introspection of most of those we now sing to tunes of doubtful musical merit.

It is likely that Bultmann will be seen in an altogether more generous light in this context of whole study, and that, as Bonhoeffer said of him, he is likely to be criticised in his technique of de-mythologising, not because he went too far, but because he did not go far enough.

It is likely that fundamentalism will cease to obscure these greater truths as it has persistently done in the past, and will at the same time cease to be the refuge of the obscurantist in the face of the probing challenges of science. In a deeper understanding of the nature, and therefore of the needs of man, there will come a fresh urge to study the nature of Jesus Christ, and through him to be led to a definition of the doctrine of God which will take account of the insights of Paul Tillich in such a way as to mark him as a true prophet of the 20th century. The massive authority of the teaching of the Word of God in such a tradition as the Lutheran Church may find that it has to forsake the objective heights of Mount Sinai for a time, and accept that the Word of God was also made flesh in the streets of Capernaum, and the modern Capernaums of our cities, research laboratories, computer programmes, seats of government and the rest.

Such a return to the Bible is likely too to take the understanding of God out of the narrow historical and chronological definition of it in which we have limited it—to the progressive isolation from the mission of the Church of that increasing number in the modern world who are outside the formal borders of the Christian Church, but who none the less carry the greater burden of leadership in our society. We are all familiar with the dilemma consequent upon the exclusiveness of our doctrine of the Church which excludes from acknowledged membership the great company of men and women, who, while bearing honestly and well great responsibilities in our society, nevertheless never "go to church." The Church will find itself obliged to come to terms with this situation. It can do so, not by compromising its theology of the Church, but by expanding it to a dimension to which a more intelligent understanding of the Revelation of God and the compassion of Jesus Christ will lead it. The formal definition of the doctrine of the nature of the Church is deserving of profound re-exam-
ination on the part of every Christian discipline.

These questions therefore arise: Are we correct in assuming that God's revelation to Man was a progressive historical sequence, and that the Old Testament is something that happened in history without any relevance apart from a historical preparation for the events in the New? Or are the truths of God's revelation such as to enable us to see both Old and New now at any moment, in any given situation? And if this is so, are there not countless men and women living and believing in a “B.C. Church” situation, who are not regarded as “belonging” because they do not qualify by all the tests that the Church imposes on them in an “A.D. situation?” And if the Church’s concern should be formally expanded in this way, would it not transform the whole pastoral and teaching ministry of the Church, and expand the Church’s relevance, because it would expand the Church’s concern?

Furthermore, whether we like it or not, the Christian Faith will be compelled to adopt far less patronising attitudes to the great non-Christian religions of the world. And it will be under this compulsion because we are being driven together to a deeper appreciation of the atheistic menace to the mission of Almighty God to His world in which we are God’s servants. Certainly we may expect that under pressure of atheism and secularism, God’s representatives—of whatever discipline—will be drawn more and more together in concerns of morality, and in the service of humanity, without any being required to be disloyal to his own allegiance of Faith, but held together by a greater charity. It could well be that within this context, the world missionary movement of the Church—and not the Churches—could become its lifeblood.

One of the pressing needs of our time is a re-examination of the doctrine of the Church’s ministry. The debates about the “Ministry of the Laity” tend to miss the real point of the ministry of the whole people of God by starting the debate from the standpoint of the “Ministry of the Priest.” There are no grounds for optimism while we hold these two ministries in antithesis. I confess to having been driven to ordination by a passionate idealism to serve the cause of racial harmony in my homeland of South Africa, because it was manifestly the most effective and theologically secured way of performing that particular act of service. Others have in the past been led into ordination by a passion to serve in education, in the Youth Service, in social relief, in medical care, in the crusade against poverty. Now all these social services are taken over by the secular state. In consequence, many who in former days would have sought ordination as the most effective way to social service, see no point in ordination, and the trend to a shortage of clergy will continue to a point of grave administrative concern, unless we can broaden the Church’s acknowledgement of “ministry” in a way which embraces these non-ordained ministers in the secular world, and makes them aware that their vocation is of God, and in the direct tradition of Jesus Christ.

This is not to say that the particular pastoral ministry of the Church, both ordained and non-ordained, will be of diminishing importance. Quite the reverse. The advance of our increasingly impersonal society, with its massive tendency to depersonalise man, will lead to an intense problem of loneliness, of loss of hope, of bewilderment in the upbringing of our children, and much else. Forty years ago a French philosopher wrote with bitter cynicism, that society can expect nothing of the Church, “unless it be a half pathetic ambulance stationed in the rear, to pick up the wounded deserters in the fratricidal battle of God’s united world.” It may be that cynicism could be answered by a proud boast that the Church is in fact just that—a far from pathetic ambulance rescuing and restoring those growing multitudes who, without compassion and love, would fall wounded in the fratricidal battle of a world which has lost its sense of unity, because it has lost its sense of the love of God.

The rediscovery of the person in an age of colossal organisations and collective institutions, and the desire of multitudes for small manageable personal relationships in an age of super organisations was seen by Bonhoeffer to be an area within which the Church of the future would be called upon to play a directing part. The Church is moving slowly—too slowly—from a rural concept of society, entrenched in the system of parish and congregation—to a concept of a society of massive organisations, with all its consequent personal problems. Into these organisations—industrial, economic and scientific—the Church will go, led by the Spirit, to find there questions which will be common to more and more. But under the sheer pressure of human need for the protection of the person, the pastoral ministry of the Church will find a new authority, with a consequent emphasis on competent pastoral training, which at present can hardly be said to exist.

A good deal of apprehension has been expressed about the survival of the person in an age of cybernetics and automation. Automation is seen by some as the great solution of all problems, and by others as a great disaster. But automation is seen as one concerned with the proper use of leisure. This I believe to be a superficial definition of the problem. There is no evidence so far that greater leisure has resulted from automation. Quite the contrary. More people are employed because production breeds production, and quickens the pace of the rat-race. The problem created by escalating production is more likely to be a greater urge to escape from the pressures of the production centres, to resign from involvement in the greater communities, and to make the great metropolitan centres progressively more impersonal. The Church could pursue the escaping multitudes to the resorts and the suburbs, and tie itself more and more to a society which has no interest in, or involvement in the centres where policies are made and destiny is shaped. Or the Church could make a massive effort to discover at the heart of our administrative, industrial,
and technological society the fundamental questions affecting human life and values which the secular world is throwing up which is the clear objective of Scheme 13 of the Vatican Council. Among other effects of that orientation could be a loosening of the Church's captivity in our social systems, protected by the rigid and largely meaningless framework of our social conventions.

Paloczi-Horwath, the Hungarian physicist, says that we may expect that all philosophical thought today, political, social, and religious, is under pressure from what he calls the “Rebellion of the Facts”—the facts of economics, of technological controls, of over-population, of world hunger, of the North-South division of the world and so on. And he claims that at present these philosophies are incapable of dictating the course of the rebellion of the facts, and therefore world leadership is confused and weak. The Church's greatest opportunity for providing leadership—maybe for survival in its present form—will come from our readiness to hear the Spirit of God speaking to the mind and the will of man through the secular world as much as through the historic Church, and to interpret the voice of the Spirit as an invitation to be guided into deeper dimensions of the Truth, wherever the Truth may lead us.

And in this search for the new relevance of the ancient truths, we shall be compelled to be ruthless honest in the language we use to define and communicate religious truths. To say that the concept of “God” surpasses human intellect and cannot be adequately defined in intellectual forms is at least a defensible position. But we must be prepared for a dilemma in our communication with those whose language is precise if we try to force God into intellectual forms which should have a very definite intellectual meaning. Norbert Wiener points out that layers of prejudice encumber our approaches to the problem of the common ground or overlap where science and religion come together. The treatment of the theory of evolution is an obvious example, but other far more searching questions will be raised by propositions of bio-physics, of genetics, and of cybernetics. At present there is little theological thinking remotely on a level with the thinking of these disciplines. No one can confidently predict that there will be in the next thirty-five years. But one may confidently predict that if such thinking is conducted, new and richer dimensions of religious truth will be unfolded, and if it is not, religion will progressively retreat into an intellectual ghetto. No doubt there will always be the giants of conservative obscurantism who will earn approval for faithfulness and courage, but who will contribute little to progress in the unfolding of the Truth. Wiener says truly: “It is part of the duty of the honest scientist, or man of letters, or clergyman, to entertain heretical and forbidden opinions experimentally, even if he is finally to reject them.”

The turn of the century will mark a great advance in concepts of universalism. The dimensions of global war have already made trivial and naive old concepts of national or individual guilt. War is even now seen as a universal disease of humanity in which there are no “enemies,” but only fellow victims. A new religious dimension is likely to emerge around the moral truth of our responsibility for areas of human need from which in the past we have been protected by our national or group concern. The proximity of human need will grow with the explosion of population, and we will know a dimension of internationalism, the implications of which will change the present balances of power as radically as modern society differs from the feudal system.

In guiding humanity to such a concept of internationalism, the Christian Church could experience its greatest hour of leadership. Liberated from its sterile past associations with nationality, social status or the prejudices of history, and proclaiming man's “wholeness” in obedience to God, the Christian Church could give to our fragmented society, as no other faith could do, that for which man longs most—unity, peace and concord, above all the divisions which fragment us, national, racial, industrial, social, and intellectual. Under pressure of that need, it is likely that by the year 2,000, the Ecumenical Movement will define the world mission of the Christian Church, and not a pseudo-political adjustment of theological viewpoints.

Twenty years ago, Bonhoeffer wrote from prison: “The Church has fought for self-preservation as though it were an end in itself, and has thereby lost its chance to speak a word of reconciliation to mankind. So our traditional language must perform become powerless and remain silent. By the time you have grown up,” he wrote to a newly baptised, “the Church will have changed beyond recognition. The day will come when men will be called again to utter the word of God with such power as will change and renew the world. It will be a new language, which will horrify men, and yet overwhelm them by its power. It will be the language of a new righteousness which proclaims the peace of God with men, and the advent of his Kingdom.”

That vision has not yet been realized. The Church has continued to fight for its self-preservation as though it were an end to itself. But now new pressures which Bonhoeffer did not clearly foresee are being applied to the Church from outside it—scientific, bio-chemical and intellectual. My belief is that the Church as we know it will endure—and should now willingly prepare itself to endure—a Crucifixion—of its structure, of its security, of its dogmatic assurance, of its traditions—in order that it may “going through the vale of misery” discover a well from which will grow a resurrected, purified Church, braced by a faith which will stand the test of any pressure of, inquiry, because it is dedicated to the Truth into which Jesus said the Holy Spirit would lead us, and in the pilgrimage towards which we have nothing to fear.

There is something audacious, even presumptuous, about labeling an entire series of lectures "Toward the Year 2000." Predictions about the future have long been notorious for being no more than projections into the future of the beliefs and prejudices of the prophet. Doubly is this true at a time such as ours. Changes that used to take decades or even centuries happen in a year or two. If one were to chart the graph of change in relation to the sequence of the years, it would surely describe a radical upswing during the first two thirds of this century, when the invention of the airplane in 1903, the formulation of the general theory of relativity in 1913, the work of Picasso and Joyce and Stravinsky, and the Second Vatican Council have all changed forever the world of thought and value that was current when this century began. Who would be so bold as to maintain that this acceleration of intellectual change will not itself be accelerated beyond recognition or prediction in the final third of the twentieth century?

Moreover, if anyone has the right to speak about the twenty-first century with confidence, it is probably not the historian of the development of Christian doctrine. With some outstanding exceptions, historians of any kind have a well-earned reputation as unreliable guides to the future. Even though they are chroniclers of the changes that have shaped the world of the present, they are, for some reason, not equipped by their scholarship to cope with the prospect that the future will bring not only further change, but perhaps the revision or even the rejection of some of the convictions and beliefs that have underlain all the changes of the past. It is one thing to describe the changes that have gone on within a given system of presuppositions; it is quite another thing to contemplate the possibility that these presuppositions will themselves be questioned and discarded as no longer fit to account for reality as man experiences it. The historian of Christian doctrine suffers from a special embarrassment; for the body of Christian belief and doctrine, whose changes in the church's past he seeks to analyze and record, is the very system of presuppositions that is now regarded as obsolete and superseded in its effort to describe the ways of God with his creation. If the task is to look "toward the year 2000," what right does a historian of doctrine or any other Christian theologian have to speak?

That challenge has been addressed to Christian theology with mounting stridency since the seventeenth century, when the new man of the Enlightenment first became aware of his powers and began to question the need for grace to supplement nature or for revelation to supply what human reason could not discover for itself. Confident of the powers of reason to draw the plans for "the heavenly city of the eighteenth-century philosophers" and of the capacity of the human spirit to build that city, rationalists such as Thomas Jefferson and Edward Gibbon found the supernatural content of the Christian faith increasingly irrelevant to their conception of the future and to their hope for achieving it. During most of the period that has styled itself "modern," the Christian message has been attacked as excessively gloomy and pessimistic, with all its talk about sin, hell, and the wrath of God. Nothing seemed to make less sense than the apocalyptic language of the Old and New Testaments, for the future was shiny enough by itself, without having to be illumined by the brightness of the great day of the Lord.

That mood has been fundamentally transposed during the first two thirds of the twentieth century. Now the Christian message is being attacked as excessively optimistic and comforting, with all its talk about grace, heaven, and the life everlasting. It is not the Christian message that has changed; it is the temper of the times. Grace and the forgiveness of sins used to seem unnecessary; not they seem impossible, and the Gospel is too good to be true. Thus the apocalyptic language of the Bible has begun to make a grim kind of sense—not as the harbinger of hope, which it was for earlier Christian believers, but as the voice of doom. The reverse Utopias of Huxley and Orwell bespeak a loss of appetite for the future, a failure of the capacity to hope, a paralysis of expectation. The paralyzing apocalypticism of our time has elevated to a dominant position some of the very accents in Christian thought that seemed permanently obsolete at the turn of the century, even as it has turned away both from the Christian expectation of the life of the age to come and from its secular counterpart, the doctrine of progress.

The secular doctrine of progress may be seen as the attempt to affirm the Christian hope of the future without the Christian faith in the past. It saw the processes of history as self-redeeming and as moving inevitably toward the achievement of their inherent goal, but it did not believe that the incarnation, life, death, resurrection of Jesus Christ were necessary either for the achievement or even for the discovery of that goal. As it was with the goal of history, so it was with the destiny of the individual. His hope for a future life beyond the grave was not contingent on the cross of Christ and the empty tomb, but was the natural possession of his immortal soul. Thus, in Lessing's famous formula, "contingent truths of history can never become proofs for necessary truths of reason." And so it came that the hope of the future was disengaged from the faith in the events of the past. Destiny was independent of history. At most, the biblical story of the covenant of God with Israel and with the church could be seen as a
helpful preparation for an age of spiritual maturity, in which man could himself become, in Emerson’s phrase, “a newborn bard of the Holy Ghost,” who did not need historical revelation, and a bearer of his own fulfillment, who did not need historical redemption. The sacraments of the church were, at best, symbols among other symbols of the way things are, rather than channels through which the grace won in the death and resurrection of Christ is communicated.

All of this makes for a radiant hope and a serene expectation of the life to come—or, at least, it does for a while. But the Christian hope of the future is tied inseparably to the Christian faith in the past. The Christian declaration, “And I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the age to come,” appears as the end and the climax of a creed whose central content is the eternal being of the Blessed and Undivided Trinity and the historical incarnation of Jesus Christ. As in Bach’s Mass in B-Minor the words, “Ex expecto resurrectionem mortuorum,” repeat the majestic leitmotiv of the earlier, “Et resurrexit”; so in Christian confession the faith in the heavenly origin of Christ is the ground for hope in the heavenly destiny of man, and the historical death and resurrection of our Lord enable the believer to pass through his death to resurrection. The sign of this connection in the New Testament is the second advent of Christ, which stands in continuity with his first advent and yet differs from it as glory does from lowness. “This Jesus,” says the angel in Acts 1:11, “will come in the same way as you saw him go.” Likewise, the sacraments are a bond between the church and the history of Christ. Baptism is a baptism “into his death” (Rom. 6:3), and of the eucharist the apostle says in 1 Cor. 11:26: “As often as you eat this bread and drink the cup (in the present), you proclaim the Lord’s death (in the past) until he comes (in the future).”

From these affirmations it seems to follow that, in the Christian sense of the words, one cannot keep the hope without the history, and that the road to a future with God lies through a past with Jesus Christ. And as this axiom applies to the ultimate hope of life beyond the grave, so it applies also to the lesser hopes and proximate goals toward which the human spirit looks. For the Christian and the church, the way also to these proximate goals this side of the great hope leads “through Christ our Lord,” as the collects say. These lesser hopes are what a collect calls “those good things which we are not worthy to ask, but through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ,” who gives us the right to pray and the grounds to hope. We pray for these hopes and work toward these goals as we give “a cup of cold water” (Matt. 10:42) or whatever else may be needed to aid and support the life of a humanity for which Christ died. “As you did it to one of the least of these my brethren you did it to me” (Matt. 25:40): these words, spoken in the context of an apocalyptic message about the coming of the Son of man in glory and all the angels with him, consecrate the time between his first advent and his second to the service of the neighbor and to those hopes which, while less than ultimate, are no less a part of the future toward which the church looks and moves in the name of Christ.

What happens to that future when that name falls silent, and where is the hope without the history? For a while, perhaps, very little happens, as an individual or an entire culture continues to affirm the ancient hope without the ancient faith. But eventually the loss of history takes its revenge in the form of a loss of the sense of purpose and direction in history. When this happens to those who are old and tired, it produces cynicism; but in the young it produces nihilism, for it robs the young of that openness toward the future and eagerness for what is yet to be which are the prerogative of youth and its gift to the cynical world of its elders. Many of the martyrs of history have been the young, who had not yet learned the sly arts of compromise with evil and who were willing to sacrifice their own private futures for the sake of the great future. Zeal for martyrdom, like chas­ti­ty, is a virtue only in those whom it costs something. But young people who are so completely the captives of the present moment that they can neither recognize the accents of the past nor open themselves to the possibilities of the future have also lost the capacity for martyrdom, replacing it with a senseless and nihilistic anarchy. “There is a time,” said one of their spokesmen in an attack on his university, “when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can’t take part; you can’t even tacitly take part, and you’ve got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you’ve got to make it stop.”

The tragedy of that young man and of the sullen nihilists to whom and for whom he was speaking is that the violence of his moral indignation has issued in a negative and destructive whine of protest, instead of leading to the kind of creative revolution which both society and the university need so desperately. Many of the student revolts of the 1960’s are just not revolutionary enough, because they are animated by a resentment of the past more than by an affirmation of the future. Such a hope-less revolt simply cannot match the devotion and zeal of the Marxists, who know what their hope is for the future and who are committed to its historical actualization. It only serves to confirm the moguls of the establishment in their smug belief that the younger generation cannot be safely trusted with the future. Thus the university is deprived of its creative and revolutionary function. For just as there are places on the earth where tomorrow’s weather is being formed today, so there must be places in the culture where tomorrow’s life and thought are being formed today. Two such places are—or ought to be—the university and the church, both of which are charged in a unique measure with responsibility to the future. Something is radically amiss when either the university or the church or both
have lost the capacity to point the young toward that future in a way that speaks to their condition.

But the university and the Church are also charged in a unique measure with responsibility to the past. They live for the future, but they live by the past. Cultivation of the past for its own sake is the antiquarianism of those who commemorate the American Revolution by opposing all revolutions or the obscurantism of those who celebrate the coming of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost by quenching any manifestation of that Spirit that takes place today without their authorization. We shall not be preparing anyone for the year 2000 if we permit the dead hand of the past to control either the witness of the church or the curriculum of the university. Archaeologists are continually finding the relics of institutions that were not ready to open the door when the future broke down. History has a way of burying those who make an idol of history. Rigid, doctrinaire, insensitive, and unimaginative—they not only lose the future, but they take their precious past down with them as they sink out of sight forever.

The most effective antidote for this idolatry of history is a deeper and richer awareness of history. The cultivation and preservation of this awareness is the special vocation of a university that wants to stand in the Christian tradition, not because it is afraid of the future or enamored of the past, but because a lively participation in our Christian and cultural heritage is the best possible preparation for the future. It is fatal to live in the past; it is equally fatal not to live with the past. I am not speaking here on behalf of some simple-minded notion of the lessons of history, which are thought to be derived from a careful study of the data unearthed by the historical scholar and to be applicable to similar situations now. For I do not find such lessons to be at all obvious in the results of my own scholarship, and I am increasingly impressed by the variables in each historical situation, which make a one-to-one parallel difficult to discover and any lessons of history difficult to apply. But I am equally persuaded that there is a wisdom about the affairs of men that can come from continued exposure to the story of man's long career on this planet, and perhaps only from this. For the eyes of Christian faith, that wisdom is a function of an obedient and thankful acceptance of the gifts of God, conferred in Christ and conveyed by his Spirit through his church and through the means of grace which she distributes. For since Christ is the wisdom of God and the power of God, Christian faith sees him both as the power at work in the history of man and as the wisdom that enables us to share in that history meaningfully and responsibly.

No amount of historical research will give us new data about the year 2000 or enable us to chart some cycle that is scheduled to come full turn at the end of the second millennium after Christ. When the first millennium after Christ was about to end, some parts of Europe were aroused by the fervent expectation that the second advent of Christ, so often promised and so long delayed, was now finally to break upon the world. As so often, that expectation was disappointed: instead of the kingdom of God, they got the Holy Roman Empire! Although I do not anticipate a similar wave of hope in the parousia of the Son of man, I do believe that without some hope we shall move toward the year 2000 and beyond it as the playthings of a destiny that is uncomprehending and unresponsive. Neither the university nor the Church can stand by and watch this happen. But we shall not rescue this generation from pessimism or (in the haunting words of Theodore H. White about President Kennedy and the young) "remove from them the slander of cynicism" by scurrying about for educational gimmicks or theological novelties. What the university owes its students and what its students owe their entire generation is a new and deeper sense of the revolutionary tradition of Christian humanism, which includes theology but is not exhausted by theology. It is the paradox and mystery of tradition that we shall do our descendants the greatest service if we introduce them to their (and our) ancestors. Each found a fresh vigor of expression by cultivating the chorale; a new understanding of American history underlay the "new birth of freedom" a century ago; and out of the historical study of philosophy, literature, and architecture have come some of the most exciting creations of the twentieth century.

So shall we be of service to those whose lives and careers are pointing them toward the year 2000, and even the historian has something to contribute. The tradition of Christian humanism does not carry guarantees, not even the guarantee of its own survival. It is only against the church that the gates of hell shall not prevail, and even that is a promise rooted in eschatology. But the tradition of Christian humanism does carry the opportunity to face the revolutionary future as a part of the family of man and in the company of fathers and brethren. It makes us suspicious of easy solutions, but open to new suggestions; devoted to continuity, but unafraid of change; eager for the future, but not contemptuous of the past. At a time when loss of the past has cost so many their sense of the future and the destruction of continuity has deprived them of hope, we may, in all due reverence, restate the words of the apostle in 1 Cor. 13:13: "So faith, hope, love abide, these three; but the greatest of these is hope." For where there is no hope, love is a thing of the moment and faith is an idle fancy. But with hope, faith may dare to love, even amid the changes and chances of this present life, and to look forward to the fulfillment of perfect love in the presence of God.