SILLIMAN JOURNAL

First Quarter, 1963

A QUARTERLY DEVOTED TO DISCUSSION AND INVESTIGATION
PUBLISHED BY SILLIMAN UNIVERSITY, DUMAGUETE CITY, PHILIPPINES

A QUARTERLY DEVOTED TO DISCUSSION AND INVESTIGATION IN THE HUMANITIES AND THE SCIENCES

* * * * *

SILLIMAN JOURNAL is published quarterly in March, June, September, and December by Silliman University under the auspices of the James W. Chapman Research Foundation, Dumaguete City, Philippines. Subscription in the Philippines, ₱8.00 a year, ₱2.25 per copy; U.S. and foreign countries, US$5.00 a year, US$1.50 per copy. Entered as second class mail matter at the Dumaguete City Post Office on September 1, 1954.

SILLIMAN JOURNAL

CONTENTS

VOLUME X, NUMBER 1 • FIRST QUARTER (JANUARY-MARCH) 1963

SILLIMAN JOURNAL

Leadership in Asia

Antonio S. Gabila

THERE IS A TENDENCY to refer leadership in Asia today in a caustic tone, rarely in praise of it. This would seem to indicate that while it is easy enough to chastise leadership, or find fault with it, it is more difficult to understand it. There is no simple explanation or definition of leadership.

It is a mistake, of course, to conceive of leadership as static or standardized, like an automobile, so that you can bump into the same style and make in Buenos Aires or in Djakarta or Manila. It is a more serious error to believe that the type of leadership that is adequate and efficient in one country will produce the same results in another country, just across its border—Indonesia and the Philippines, for example. To appraise the leadership of a country is to appraise it in the context of its history, culture and economics, and against the background of its colonial experience, if any, its subsequent struggles for full sovereignty, and in relation to its over-all aspirations.

This struggle for national identity may have dictated the type of leadership that has emerged in the last two decades in the countries of Asia—the strongmen that were needed not only to rally the plural society to a common cause but to exercise firm control over the fluid and potentially explosive situation.

The plurality of Asian societies, the diversity of their interests, and the multiplicity of their problems and conditions, including a low literacy rate, have been advanced in justification of various types of "democracy" in Burma, Indonesia, Korea, and Vie'nam, and for the persistence of strongmen in positions of leadership. On the other hand, the rapidly deteriorating socio-economic situation of countries where power continues to be exercised by strongmen seems to indicate that other qualities of leadership are required besides strength of character and singular purposiveness. Many strongmen seem to have only one asset, not always of estimable value—a personal and subjective view of government. They also seem to have a common weakness for the rich privileges and unlimited opportunities of power.

Asian societies, too long dependent on Western nations and faced with a plague of problems and situations, generally economic

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 42)

FIRST QUARTER, 1963
VOLUME X, NUMBER 1

THE LOST DIMENSION IN THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM

Douglas J. Elwood

I SHOULD LIKE to take as my point of departure a statement which George Buttrick makes in his article, "Toward a Philosophy of the Church-Related University": "Is it not strange that secular universities, in a vague sense of something missing, are now instituting departments of religion, at the very moment when some church-related universities are tempted to disown their faith?"[1]

Moral Breakdown in Western Civilization

This "sense of something missing" is due in part to the moral breakdown in Western civilization since the First World War. Whereas it was once assumed without question that education was intrinsically good, this generation has been shocked into the realization that education is not necessarily a good thing. A dramatic illustration of this is seen in the fact that the nation of Europe which had reached the highest point in intellectual development surrendered its freedom, in the 1930's, to an irrational ideology, namely Naziism. Paradoxically, the most highly educated nations of the world today are at the same time the greatest single threats to the peace of the world, and indeed to the very preservation of intellectual culture as we know it. The hypothetical visitor from Mars might well conclude, on first observation, that education is a bad thing and that the most advanced areas of the globe are the remaining pockets of primitive culture!

Back in the 1940's H. G. Wells was crying, "Humanity is engaged in a great race between education and catastrophe!" He was right, but since then it has become even more apparent that it all depends on what you mean by "education." The late Albert Camus,

[1] *Christian Scholar*, Summer, 1962.

in his last essay, paraphrased Wells in a significant statement in which he, an unbeliever, addressed himself to Christians: "What the world expects of Christians is that they should speak out, loud and clear. . . for between the forces of terror and the forces of dialogue a great unequal battle has begun."

There was a time when this matter of the religious dimension in higher education could be debated as a purely academic question. That time is past for it has become a life-and-death issue. In our time we have witnessed violence and cruelty on a scale unparalleled in modern history. The situation was foreseen by an earlier writer, Henry Adams,[2] when he proclaimed 1900 as the end of the era of the "virgin" and the beginning of the era of the "dynamo." To Adams, the concept of the "virgin" symbolized all that has been distinctively human in life—the warm and simple virtues of an age now vanished; the concept of the "dynamo" represented the annihilation of all human values by the eventual triumph of impersonal forces over personal life. One may look back still further to Herbert Spencer who observed, at the turn of the nineteenth century, that "to educate reason without changing desire is to place high-powered guns in the hands of savages." Knowledge without wisdom is dangerous; ability without responsibility is power without control. But we have been slow to learn the lessons of history.

These are indeed challenging times to be alive; they are also frightening times to be engaged in teaching, for what guarantee have we that our students will use creatively and constructively the information we pass on to them? How can we be sure they will not use their knowledge against us, and even against themselves? This points us to the urgency of rediscovering the "lost dimension." It was Henry Adams who said, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

The Secularization of Higher Education

In his influential book, *The Crisis of the University* (which perhaps has done more than any other single thing to renew the dialogue between religion and other intellectual disciplines), Sir Walter Moberly said: "Mores, ways of life, the recognition of binding obligations, are bound up with some accepted view of the nature of

[2] Although written in 1905, *The Education of Henry Adams*, his autobiography, was not published until 1918.

man and of the world, though this may take the form less of a doctrine embraced by the mind than of a picture dominating the imagination. But it is just this common picture or framework that has now so largely disappeared."[3] More than a moral collapse, it is a spiritual and cultural crisis.

There are several reasons for this "crisis" in higher education. It is partly the result of a strong reaction on the part of liberal universities to Protestant denominationalism. In the early part of the nineteenth century some defensive Protestant groups turned education into indoctrination. Understandably, liberal universities quite rightly insisted that there was no place in liberal education for indoctrination.

Another factor responsible for the crisis in higher education is the increase in specialization, so well known in the Philippines that it is not necessary to labor the point here. It is reported that at the height of the emphasis on specialization in Germany one doctoral dissertation was written on the subject: "The Use of the Comma in Medieval Icelandic Literature." With equal humor, however, one can point to the extreme in general education, as in the case of the final examination question for a survey course: "Describe the universe, and give three examples."

The strongest force is the third factor contributing to the crisis, namely, secularism. This is in part a product of the naturalistic philosophy which some have mistakenly thought to be required by modern science. It is even more a product of the easy optimism about the inevitability of human progress, through education, which dominated Western minds before the world wars. Ordinarily this secularism has expressed itself in indifference to religion rather than in open opposition to it. It can be seen in the view, still current, that freedom of religion means freedom from religion. It has insisted that universities must maintain strict neutrality on ultimate questions. Until recently, this secularism has been the dominant force in liberal education in this century.

A New Recognition of Religious Values

During the last two decades the pendulum has swung back toward a new recognition of the place of religious values in univer-

[3] Walter Moberly, *The Crisis of the University*, p. 16. London: SCM Press, Ltd. 1959.

sity instruction, along with a recognition of the need for integration of the student's knowledge. This change in the intellectual climate of many modern universities can be traced to a number of causes.

One of the reasons is the already mentioned moral breakdown in Western civilization.

Another is the decline of sectarianism (defined as a divisive spirit) and the growth of the ecumenical movement.

A third reason is that courses in religion are now taught by teachers whose scholarship is equal to that of their colleagues in other departments. Progress in Biblical and theological studies has removed the suspicion that the teaching of religion is doctrinaire.

A fourth cause of the change is seen in the fact that secularism has begun to lose its former appeal. A generation which has witnessed two world wars and is now haunted by the threat of a third world war—this time "a war to end all wars," for sure—has not been able to maintain the optimism of an earlier day about education leading to inevitable progress and about man's capacity to fulfill his aspirations within the limits of this earthly life. Earlier views have been shattered into illusions before our eyes. Along with this there has been a growing awareness, on the part of scientists, of the limitations of science.

Finally, this recent turning of the tide is due in part to a strong reaction against the earlier assumption that open-mindedness necessarily demands neutrality on ultimate issues. Studies and surveys—like the well known Jacobs report—have shown that the attitude of neutrality has produced graduates without any clear purpose or sense of direction, with no higher goal in life than pleasure or material success.

Even Christian universities had succumbed to the earlier assumption that neutrality was necessary to liberal education. It is reported that a German graduate student in the social sciences came to a Christian university in America in order to find answers to his problems. Interested in the political and economic life of his country, he had come seeking a consistent answer to give to his German friends who were finding the Communist answer to Europe's problems convincing. In disappointment he said, "I went to the social sciences and found our moral issues reduced to social conventions. This did not help me. Economics discussed human values, but levelled them down to economic needs and described them in relation to established types of business organization. I went to psychology, to

have my questions by-passed because of basic mechanistic assumptions. Such points of view are really more compatible with Communism than with Christianity. I have not found the Christian answers. In this sense the University is not a Christian university."

A few years ago an Asian University Teachers' Consultation was held at Bandung, Indonesia, at which the Philippines was represented. The primary stimulus for the consultation was Moberly's book, *The Crisis in the University.* Reporting on the Consultation, Dr. Paul Braisted, president of the Hazen Foundation and a recent visitor to the Silliman campus, pointed out that the Asian teachers were not at all ready to accept the assumptions of the Moberly volume as to what the "crisis" of the university was. The difference was traced to the different stages of development of Asian and Western societies in relation to liberal and rational values. "The West is at the end of the Renaissance and the Reformation," it was observed, "while Asia is at the beginning and rationalism and secularism stand in many countries of Asia for the liberation of the human from the irrational impersonality of an ancient static collectivism; while, therefore, Asians are thankful for the caution against the pagan spirit of liberal and scientific rationalism, they see in them positive values to be affirmed in the name of the truly personal and human in this present stage of Asian social history."[4]

Braisted comments that this should serve as a word of caution to Western Christian educators who in their zeal to reclaim a fair place for religion in higher education may be tempted to undervalue rationality. On the other hand, Asian universities may be warned against the danger of simply repeating the experience, along with the mistakes, of many universities and colleges in the West. The Western development in higher education might prove illuminating to educators in other lands since the change is in the main a movement away from the secular outlook of a decade or so ago toward a recognition of the necessity, for all who are engaged in the intellectual enterprise, to study and teach religion fairly and objectively. Perhaps the Joint Statement of the 1961 Conference of Asian University Presidents, related to the United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia, represents the more mature conclusion of Asian teachers: "A Christian university must never be less Christian for being a university, but even more it must never be less a university

[4] *Christian Scholar,* p. 120 June, 1954.

for being Christian."

The Nature of the Religious Dimension

We are accustomed to thinking in levels from the lowest to the highest, from the inorganic realm to the supernatural world. Actually this is a vestige of an outmoded world-view. It has proved to be an unsatisfactory way of speaking about our world and God, because in reality there are no levels; there are only dimensions. According to the Theory of Relativity, we live in a multi-dimensional space world. These dimensions interpenetrate one another at every point, yet they do not conflict with each other at any point. This is the great advantage in using the metaphor of "dimension." Supposed conflicts between science and religion are caused not by the progress of modern knowledge, as commonly supposed, but by a confusion of dimensions. At least one physicist has defined God as "the dimension of dimensions," meaning that God is not merely one dimension among many but the "suprapolar space" which includes and transcends all other dimensions.

It may be helpful to think of religion as life's dimension of depth. This would correspond to the third dimension of our physical experience, like the "depth of field" in photography. It would correspond to the phenomenon of the "deep unconscious" in Depth Psychology. In philosophy it would correspond to the answer we find to the most ultimate question a man can ask, namely, "What is the meaning of my existence?" Because many twentieth-century men have lost the courage to ask the ultimate question seriously, they have not found an answer and thus do not live in the dimension of depth. Paul Tillich has defined religion as "living in the dimension of depth."

The religious dimension in life is lost to many people because we live in a period of history in which nature is subjected scientifically and technically to the control of man. The God-dimension, or dimension of depth, is being replaced by the horizontal dimensions of length and breadth, symbolized by such expressions as "bigger and bigger," "better and better," "more and more." Modern man needs desperately to recover the experience of the height-depth dimension of life and to ask again with ultimate seriousness the question implied in human existence, "What is the meaning of life?" Viewed in this broad sense, religion is not just a separate experience but an

"overtone" that is present in every experience we have. It is not merely a way of looking at certain things; it is a certain way of looking at all things.

I recall a passage in Sir Arthur Eddington's great book, *The Nature of the Physical Universe,* in which he compares a rainbow as viewed by a physicist with the same rainbow as viewed by an artist. While the scientist describes it in terms something like .00000086 wave lengths, the artist describes it in terms of delicate shades and transitions of color from one band of the spectrum to the next. One could add a third perspective from the viewpoint of a theologian whose description might run something like that of the Psalmist: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows his handiwork. How majestic is thy name in all the earth!"

The three perspectives involve three different patterns of meaning, and the three patterns of meaning correspond to different dimensions of reality. Which view of the rainbow is correct? Obviously, all three. The scientist, the artist, and the theologian view all of life from three different perspectives, and no one of them dares tell the other two that they have not seen the rainbow. It is not impossible, of course, that the same person might be able to participate to some degree in all three, or in two, dimensions of reality, even though he be a specialist in only one. The important thing is that each be willing to admit that, from his angle of vision, he has seen only one facet of the many-faceted rainbow. It is a matter of mature intelligence to acknowledge that life is made up of different orders of being, distinguishable dimensions of reality, and therefore also of distinct patterns of meaning. Alfred North Whitehead has made the same point in a telling way, substituting the sunset for the rainbow: "When you understand all about the sun and all about the atmosphere and all about the rotation of the earth, you may still miss the radiance of the sunset."

Alternative Religious Perspectives

There is a strong argument for a religious perspective that can restore wholeness to the educational process, that can include all the dimensions of meaning represented by the specialized disciplines as well as religion's own concern with ultimate questions. In the recent turning of the tide in higher education there is a felt need for some such unifying perspective. It is now rather widely held that any

philosophy of education which fails to include religious claims would be ignoring an important dimension of the human spirit. Free inquiry must be exercised with a sense of responsibility to all dimensions of human experience. To teach with a religious perspective is to teach with an awareness of the dimension of depth in human experience.

There are three attitudes a Christian may take toward his teaching and his intellectual discipline. One attitude is "Christian anti-intellectualism," common among varieties of separatist Christians. While this attitude is right in its concern for a definite Christian commitment, it is wrong in the way it disparages the significance of free and critical inquiry. It is also characteristic of authoritarian-type institutions where everyone must conform to a "party line" theology.

It is not at all suprising to find another attitude rising in opposition to "Christian anti-intellectualism." This is "anti-Christian intellectualism." The first is the perspective of the fanatical sectarian, the second of the fanatical secularist. The latter uses the slogan "free inquiry" as synonymous with an outlook which is often as dogmatic and obscurantist as the "Christian anti-intellectualism" which it replaces. There is a possible fundamentalist mentality to the extreme left as well as to the extreme right. Nathan Pusey, Harvard's president, coined the phrase "secular fundamentalist" to apply to those who manifest a "cultic self-sufficiency" which imagines it has a monopoly on truth and is exempt from criticism and correction. By denying a fair hearing to Christianity, such an attitude refuses both the responsibility and the risk of open dialogue. It is an illiberal perspective in the guise of liberalism. Incredible though it may seem, many convinced Christians adopt this kind of an attitude toward education.

The "cult of objectivity" has been called into serious question in the past two decades by those who recognize the psychological fact that everyone comes to problems and issues with certain premises or "faith-judgments"—even when they are not expressed—which condition his conclusions. As Moberly puts it, every teacher approaches his teaching with some accepted view of the nature of man and of the world, which may not be so much a doctrine consciously embraced as a picture dominating the imagination. This attack on the "cult of objectivity" must never become for the Christian, however, an excuse to propagandize in the classroom. This would

be a return to "Christian anti-intellectualism." In either case, the geniune search for truth has been abandoned. It is tragic that many have felt that they had to choose between a Christian anti-intellectualism and an anti-Christian intellectualism.

There is a third alternative which may be called "Christian intellectualism." This is a perspective that includes a genuine encounter with other views, a happy combination of conviction and openness. Christian commitment must never become a substitute for professional competence, nor should a teacher simply look upon his teaching as a means of evangelizing students. On the other side of the coin, however, there is no need for the intellectual to look upon another teacher's concern with ultimate questions as a sign of intellectual surrender. Education cannot afford to become a propagandizing process nor can it afford to assume indifference to values.

"Christian intellectualism" avoids the intellectual arrogance which assumes that one's own version of the truth is the whole truth. Any honest educational process will let students see the alternatives to Christian truth, as well as alternative versions of Christian truth, and make their own decisions about them. It is when we are insecure in our own faith that we tend to hide alternative possibilities from our students, resorting to catechetical instruction instead of critical inquiry. When Robert Hutchins was chancellor of the University of Chicago, a wealthy contributor complained to him of the fact that they were teaching Marxist Communism in the Political Science Department. "True," replied Hutchins, "and we also teach cancer in the Medical School!" The secure and mature intellectual does not seek to hide alternative views. By the same token, however, neither does he try to hide his own faith-judgments but freely acknowledges them, asking only that those of other persuasion will do the same. This is the path of intellectual honesty, and the attitude of the Christian intellectual.

Christianity and Culture

The university has been called a "microcosm of culture." It is also a "mirror of culture." More important, perhaps, it consciously or unconsciously plays a leadership role in the shaping of culture.

A highly significant analysis of the tensions which have characterized the Christian church in its various segments throughout history is offered by Richard Niebuhr in his book *Christ and Culture*.

He distinguishes three major positions or attitudes which have been taken by Christians toward culture: (1) "Christ against culture," (2) "Christ of culture," and (3) "Christ above culture," the third view being subdivided into three classes: a) the synthesists, b) the dualists, and c) the conversionists.

The "Christ against culture," or anti-culturist, attitude is represented early in Tertullian's famous question, "What does Jerusalem have to do with Athens?" This attitude is characteristic of separatist Christianity, most dramatically seen in our time in the Jehovah's Witnesses movement.

The second view, "Christ of culture," or pro-culturist, position is a path of compromise in order to make Christianity acceptable to its "cultural depisers." It recognizes a fundamental agreement rather than a necessary opposition between Christianity and intellectual culture. This view is represented in every attempt that is made to identify Christianity with any culturally-conditioned system of thought, whether economic and social or political and philosophical.

Under the "Christ above culture" position the "synthesist" looks upon Christianity as fulfilling and restoring human values; the "dualist" contends that man is subject to two moralities—the order of grace and the order of nature—and must live in a state of constant tension between these two areas of responsibility; the "conversionist" believes that, in Christ, God has entered into human culture in order to transform man and through man the culture. This last view is probably closest to the religious heritage of most of us at Silliman. It looks to the creative and redemptive power of God at work in the world and to the history of dramatic interaction between God and man. It is a doctrine of reconciliation and transformation, and is represented, for example, in the thought of Calvin and Wesley. The "Christ against culture" position is characteristic of the fundamentalist; the "Christ of culture" position is characteristic of the theological rationalist; the "synthesist" doctrine is the consistent position of the Roman Catholic Church; the "dualist" view is usually associated with Lutherans; the "conversionist," or Christ-transforming-culture, position is represented by the various branches of the Reformed or Calvinistic tradition.

An important implication of the Christ-transforming-culture view is that the tension between religion and culture, between the sacred and the secular, is not due to any separation between areas of culture, but instead between the creative and the destructive use to

which the artifacts of culture are put. Even if it sometimes means being anti-church, the Christian must stand always on the side of the creative as opposed to the destructive forces in human culture. George Williams of Harvard, in his book *The Theological Idea of a University,* has answerd Tertullian's question by saying that "unless we are conscious of a dual spiritual citizenship, belonging both to Athens and to Jerusalem, then Athens herself may eventually sink into barbarism, forget her universal mission, and...cease to be the domicile of objective reason."[5] Does Jerusalem have anything to do with Athens? Much, every way! Happily, one of the powerful new emphases in current theology, both Protestant and Catholic, is upon the dialogue between faith and culture. One recalls a pointed statement of William Temple: "It is a great mistake to suppose that God is only, or even chiefly, concerned with religion!"

The Christ-transforming-culture attitude enables us to see that God is concerned with human culture. It provides us with an affirmative and hopeful attitude toward human achievement. Man working in a created world lives under the rule of God, and yet it is recognized that sin has influenced all of man's achievements. History is seen not merely as a series of events under the control of an alien power from which man must be saved, but as a dramatic interaction between God and man. Christ is at work in the world even beyond the bounds of the church, converting and transforming culture by his judgment and mercy. For these reasons the Christ-transforming-culture position is highly relevant to the educational enterprise in our time.

Can Education Be Both Liberal And Christian?

A Genuinely Liberal University

A liberal university has been defined as "a community of students and teachers engaged in the rational pursuit of truth." When we begin to talk about the need for dealing with religious issues and implications in every subject of the curriculum wherever they are relevant, some might think that we are trying to change the image of the modern liberal university into a medieval university which would impose religious uniformity upon its faculty and students. In this connection Moberly suggests that the monolithic type

[5] George Williams, *The Theological Idea of a University,* p. 93f. New York: National Council of Churches, 1958.

of Christian university, characteristic of the Middle Ages, might even prove to be dangerous to the Christian cause itself. While Christians may believe, he says, that "the whole truth is in Christ," we have to recognize that there are no Christians who possess the whole truth, either individually or collectively.

> Domination by theologians is no less objectionable than domination by any other group. Any implied claim to infallibility is unchristian, since it clashes with Christian insight into human creatureliness and human corruption. . . . But it is still more essential to recognize that God may speak, and often does speak, through what we should have thought very improbable voices, through men who do not consciously know Him and who are disastrously wrong in their main contentions. As of old the heathen peoples might be instruments of God's judgments on Israel, so Marx or Nietzsche or Freud may have a word for our generation, to refuse to hear which would be to be deaf to the voice of God.[6]

The committee of experts representing the major disciplines of the university curriculum, which conducted the Hazen Foundation survey, in 1952, on "Religious Perspectives in College Teaching," reached the important conclusion that "Christian professors should do what their secular colleagues who believe in scientific humanism have been doing all along, i.e., teach freely and openly from their perspective." Is this what Albert Camus was asking Christians to do—to "speak out, loud and clear"? In this way, says the Hazen Survey, Christian professors would make clear to their students the presuppositions with which they approach their subjects.

> If Christians were as open in expressing their convictions as their humanistic colleagues now are, there would be a more lively ferment of ideas. Students would be confronted with various alternative positions on ultimate issues and would be challenged to decide among them. They would no longer be misled into thinking that the position one takes on ultimate issues is unimportant; indeed, they would see that it is the most important thing in life. Under these conditions, if they decided against Christian theism and in favor of scientific humanism, it would be only after they had faced the issue between the two positions. At present, the decision often goes by default against Christian theism because the issue is simply ignored.[7]

This is not an argument for a "Christian university" of the monolithic type, in which alternative views do not receive a fair hearing. It is rather an argument in favor of a genuinely liberal

---

[6] *Ibid*, Moberly, p. 104f.

[7] H. N. Fairchild, ed., *Religious Perspectives in College Teaching*, pp. 18-20. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1952.

university which does not evade ultimate issues in the name of a spurious neutrality but faces them in frank and open dialogue. Professors need to become more concerned about the presuppositions from which they think and teach, refusing to accept uncritically the perspective of the textbook which may be at variance with the teacher's own views. At the same time, however, ways should be found by which alternative views may be presented more adequately, as for example through the outside stimulation of an endowed lectureship.

Genuinely liberal education may be defined as education which liberates the whole man. In the words of Nathan Pusey in his inaugural address at Harvard, "Liberal arts education should address itself to the whole person—not any less to minds, but also to hearts and wills. When the heart and mind are brought together in a supporting relationship, then the whole person is set free not just from a lack of knowledge, but also from a lack of meaning, a lack of direction, and from the failure of concern for others." I believe this is what Woodrow Wilson meant by "a surplus of mind" which he felt a responsible university should produce in the lives of its students. A person is educated only when the truth sets him free, and this freedom involves responsible thought and action. The university graduate should be more unified and more compassionate as well as better informed.

The Wholeness of Truth

The Christian educator must recognize that truth is two-dimensional. One is discursive truth, by which is meant the truth that is known or knowable about the world around and within us by means of our comprehension of the patterns and structures and values in the world and in our experience. This is what Plato and Aristotle meant by "truth," what the Renaissance and the Enlightenment meant by truth, and what most modern intellectuals mean by *veritas*—a word which often appears, as it does at Silliman, in the university's seal.

The other, and often forgotten, dimension of truth is seen in the New Testament word *aletheia.* Though it occurs 100 times in the New Testament, it never means "discursive truth," but always "ultimate truth." It may be translated literally "unveiled mystery," with special reference to the mystery of the ultimate meaning of human life as disclosed in and through the Event of Jesus Christ.

Thus, truth has two distinct dimensions and they are necessary to each other. The one cannot be converted into the other, nor can either be simply added to the other. The Christian intellectual, who has a dual citizenship in Jerusalem and Athens, has also a dual responsibility to truth. The two dimensions of truth require two distinct patterns of meaning and reflect two different orders of being. It may be said that "discursive truth" is primarily the truth about creation, while "ultimate truth" is primarily the truth about the Creator. The two must never be posed as alternatives or rivals to each other. They must be co-related in the life of a university which has a Christian orientation. Anselm's famous definition of truth, as "faith in search of understanding," brings the two dimensions together into one perspective. The best education has an acknowledged religious perspective at its center. A valid faith actually prompts men to an inquiry which is both free and disciplined. In his great book *Science and the Modern World,* Alfred North Whitehead has argued convincingly that it was really the Christian belief in Divine Providence—the Creator purposively at work in His creation—that gave the initial impetus to what we know as modern experimental science. Perhaps it is just here, primarily, that the church-related university can recover a clear and valid image of itself which distinguishes it from other academic communities and at the same time commits it to equal standards of academic excellence.

Three Common Objections To A Religious Perspective

The Hazen Survey uncovered three primary objections to religious perspectives in college teaching: the fear of dogmatism, the illusion of neutrality, and the lack of specialized knowledge of theology.

The Fear of Dogmatism

While this objection is understandable, in view of authoritarian claims on the part of some institutions, it rests on a logical fallacy. Because some religious people hold their beliefs in a dogmatic way, this does not mean that all, or even most, religious people hold their beliefs in this way. If it be argued that religion is a divisive element and therefore should have no central place in a university curriculum, then surely the same argument would dispose of political

and economic theories. It should be observed, however, that every university—be it secular or religious in orientation—has somewhere a nest of "dogmatism," some belief or tradition that is too sacrosanct to be questioned in classroom or faculty meeting. Reference has already been made in this paper to the "cult of objectivity" and to the psychological fact that everyone comes to problems and issues with some kind of pre-conditioned assumptions.

The Illusion of Neutrality

The Hazen Survey report concludes that even if neutrality were desirable, it would be impossible.

> If a professor does not base his interpretation of his field upon presuppositions derived from Christian theism, he will base it upon presuppositions derived from some other perspective. . . . Thus, the real issue is not whether a professor shall teach from a religious perspective or from no perspective at all, but whether he shall teach from a religious perspective or from a humanistic perspective. Why is it impossible to teach without presuppositions? It is because facts are meaningless unless they are interpreted, and any interpretation is based upon presuppositions. The human reason cannot think about phenomena of any kind without organizing and synthesizing them by means of principles of interpretation. . . . In effect, those who urge us to 'dispense with presuppositions and simply teach the facts' are inviting us to stop thinking altogether.[8]

It must be added here that each professor in a university is obligated to learn to recognize not only his own bias but also that of the textbook. More important, perhaps, he must openly acknowledge his and the textbook's assumptions and subject them to criticism. Uncriticized presuppositions can do as much harm as the lack of recognized presuppositions. Marxist theory taught at the University of Chicago would be dangerous only if its assumptions were disguised as democracy or allowed to go uncriticized. Here again Moberly is helpful when he says, "What is essential to honest thinking is not that all presuppositions be discarded, but that they should be uncovered, clearly expressed and thoroughly scrutinized. . . . The most dangerous preconceptions are those which are unrecognized and uncriticized. The most pernicious kind of bias consists in falsely supposing yourself to have none. . . . Once our presuppositions are brought into the open, they are relatively harmless."[9]

---

[8] *Ibid.*, Fairchild, p. 22.

[9] *Ibid.*, Moberly, pp. 64, 67.

Lack of Specialized Knowledge in Theology

We need to be reminded that religion does not contribute new facts to a subject so much as a new dimension to the interpretation of the facts. It is therefore not necessary that every professor become an "expert" in religious history or ideas. He is not expected to become a theologian in the professional sense. Yet, if a Christian is to be a responsible professor in a responsible university, whatever his speciality may be, he must take some time to make his religious convictions clear to himself. Otherwise he will not be able to make them clear to his students nor will he be able to see their relevance to the subject he is teaching. He will fail his students at the very point where the ultimate meaning of their existence is at stake.

It almost goes without saying that, while some kind of commitment is inevitable (as Martin Luther taught, a man's "God" is whatever he clings to as most important in life), Christianity is not the only option. In many places, as at Silliman, it is the only *live* option to non-religious philosophies. More often than not, cultural considerations decide a university's particular religious commitment. In a predominantly Christian nation and in a university with a Christian orientation, Christianity would obviously be the only live option.

But no particular version of Christianity should be identified with the whole of Christian truth. It is an historical fact that Christianity has been distorted when the whole Christian truth has been claimed by any institution or individual. This violates what Paul Tillich has called "the Protestant Principle," according to which nothing finite can properly make infinite claims for itself. This is where the idea of a monolithic-type Christian university with a party-line theology would actually harm the cause of Christianity. It is also true that the vitality of Christianity depends upon a genuine encounter with other interpretations of Christianity, as well as with outlooks upon life which are not specifically Christian. The Christian intellectual should reflect a many-sided approach to knowledge, which alone is adequate to the diversity of truth. He welcomes truth from whatever source it may come.

Teaching From A Religious Perspective

Teaching from a conscious and acknowledged religious perspective involves giving due weight to "religious facts" whenever such

facts are a natural part of the subject-matter in a non-religious discipline of learning. An example of this would be the relevance of the development of Christianity to the history of Europe.

A conscious and acknowledged religious perspective should also lead the teacher to recognize the limitations of the method peculiar to his own field, and the error of imposing his own method upon the subject-matter of other disciplines. As leading philosophers now acknowledge, the recognition of different patterns of meaning necessitates a "language" appropriate to each discipline, the criteria of verification for which must be drawn from that discipline and not from some other.

As already stressed, the presence of a conscious religious perspective provides not so much new facts as a dimension of depth in the interpretation of the facts. This is because religion by its nature embraces all of life, and is therefore not so much a way of looking at certain things as it is a certain way of looking at all things.

The personal attitudes of the teacher are also influenced by a religious perspective. A genuine search for truth will be reflected in a sympathetic receptivity in the classroom to all insights, and by a reflective and critical attitude toward one's own religious commitment. The Hazen report concludes that a religious perspective may be expressed more effectively through the personal qualities and attitudes of the teacher than through anything he says in the classroom. "Unless the teacher shows by his daily conduct that he has access to a source of strength and serenity, students are not likely to treat his religious pronouncements with much respect. But if, in addition to professional competence, he displays good humor and kindliness, respect for the undergraduate as an individual and concern for his development. . . he can now and then say something that will arouse in this or that young woman or young man a religious interest that has been dormant."[10]

Relevance of Christian Ideas to the Educational Process

A brief look at the broad doctrines of creation and redemption may serve here to illustrate the relevance of the Christian understanding of man and the world for interpreting the facts in any of the various intellectual disciplines.

The Christian doctrine of creation means that the universe is

[10] *Ibid.*, Fairchild, p. 36f.

intelligible. Its reality and order are reflections of God's creative power and intelligence. Nature is neither self-generated nor self-explanatory. It is the function of the Christian intellectual to explore this world, in its every part and dimension, as the arena where God is working out His purpose. The parenthesis of our finite existence is surrounded by the infinite mystery of the reality of God, in whom all men live and move and exist. We are constantly reminded that we belong in this world but that it is a world we never made. Existence is God's creation and we have been commissioned to participate in its fulfillment. All our efforts to explore, describe, and appraise the world around us gain significance from the central conviction that God is the Creator, man the creature. Without preaching in the physics lecture or giving an altar call in the chemistry laboratory, we may nonetheless bear witness to the truth that "the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament shows forth his handiwork" as we exercise our powers of perception in exploring the world He made. A vivid sense of the intelligibility of the universe brings to the whole range of our learning a meaningful frame of reference. It tends to make of all our inquiry and interpretation a basically religious enterprise.

Christian understanding also recognizes in man the need of redemption in order that our lives may reach their fullest maturation and their highest good. Some of the "worlds" the Christian scholar explores disclose disorders which are not part of God's purpose in creation. Man himself is estranged from the true Source of his life and from his fellows, and needs to participate in the restored humanity as personified in Jesus Christ, God's saving deed. The Christian has therefore a sense of sin and a sense of tragedy, and analyzes and evaluates life and society according to this awareness of distortion in existence.

These twin-affirmations of faith are but suggestive of ways in which the adjective "Christian" can significantly modify the noun "university." To make such truths as these relevant to our respective disciplines in classroom teaching and scholarly writing is an important part of our vocation—our divine calling—as Christian professors. To this end we were born! We can, with Hamlet, curse the day we were born: "The time is out of joint! O cursed spite that ever I was born to set it right!" Or, with Jesus, we can accept the challenge: "To this end I was born, and for this purpose I came into the world: to bear witness to the truth!"

THE IDEA OF A CHURCH CATHOLIC, REFORMED AND EVANGELICAL

Peter G. Gowing

Introduction

ON SUNDAY the 4th of December, 1960, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Stated Clerk of the United Presbyterian Church, was invited to preach in San Francisco's Grace (Episcopal) Cathedral. His sermon was entitled "A Proposal Toward the Reunion of Christ's Church"; and it challenged the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ in America, and the United Presbyterian Church to join in conversations looking to a union of those denominations, forming one church which would be both *catholic and reformed* in its essential character. Dr. Blake's sermon was enthusiastically endorsed by California's Episcopal Bishop James A. Pike and, indeed, the church union plan became nationally known as the "Blake-Pike Proposal" and almost immediately captured the imagination and support of leading churchmen all over the United States. On April 9-10, 1962, a formal consultation was held in Washington D.C. to consider the Blake-Pike Proposal, and each of the four denominations mentioned in Dr. Blake's sermon sent delegates. They set about organizing a permanent "Consultation on Church Union" and invited the Evangelical United Brethren, the Polish National Catholic Church and the Disciples of Christ denominations to become members.

Dr. Blake, in his sermon, had urged the churches to look to a united church that would be catholic and reformed; the Washington consultation affirmed that participating denominations were discussing the "possibility of the formation of a church truly catholic, truly reformed, truly evangelical." The addition of the adjective "evangelical" was intended, no doubt, to describe generically the witness of those Christians (e.g., the Methodists, and the Congregationalists in the United Church of Christ) who feel that the adjective "reformed" does not quite represent the fact that they see themselves

historically as a little less bound by Scripture, tradition and doctrinal confessions and a little more bound to the "continued guidance of the Holy Spirit" than those churches usually designated "Reformed".

It is my purpose in this paper to briefly set forth the image of the Church of Jesus Christ as it is seen in the so-called Catholic, Reformed and Evangelical traditions; and then to examine them altogether to see if the varied images can be reconciled into one composite image that might be properly described as catholic *and* reformed *and* evangelical. This is a large order for a paper of so small a compass, but the attempt might be valuable as a starting point for fruitful discussion. And such a discussion is just as important for us here in the Philippines as it is in the United States of America. Many of us in the separated churches in the Philippines sense keenly that we are under the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ who wills His Church to be one. We, too, sense the scandal and the waste and the ineffectiveness of our divided witness. We, too, are aware that in the face of mounting materialism and secularism and other Godless "isms" we can no longer afford the luxury of our historic divisions.

And, like those churchmen in the United States discussing the Blake-Pike Proposal, many of us in the Philippines are inspired to imagine that the one visible Church of Jesus Christ, whatever its form and whenever it comes into being, must indeed be truly catholic, truly reformed and truly evangelical—for we too behold the vigorous ministries of Christian denominations from each of those traditions and we agree that the vital witness of each belongs in the unified whole.

Let us turn, then, to a description of the image of Christ's Church as it is conceived in the Catholic, Reformed and Evangelical traditions. We will limit our discussion to the image of the Church in its visible and earthly manifestations, for that is the primary focus of the Blake-Pike Proposal and, also, of the modern ecumenical movement as a whole.

The Catholic Image of the Church

We must first off understand what we mean when we use the word "Catholic" in this paper. We use the word as a generic term to describe those churches, notably the Roman Catholic Church, the Eastern Orthodox Churches and the Anglican Communion (particularly the Anglo-Catholic wing) which place greatest stress on the

Apostolic and doctrinal continuity, the sacramental offices, and the liturgical heritage of the Church. We do not use the word "Catholic" to refer to the Roman Church alone—for indeed the Roman Church is only one of the Catholic churches (though it is the largest) and is regarded by nearly all the others as in some respects deviant from true Catholicism. Nor do we use the word "Catholic" in this paper to refer to the universal Church of Jesus Christ; for in that sense every one of us is a Catholic. In this paper we are narrowing the use of the term to refer only to those whose practices and whose understanding of faith and order are traditionally *Catholic* in contrast to *Protestant* practices and understanding.

Bishop Angus Dun in his book, *Prospecting for a United Church,* affirmed that to Catholics "the Church is the great society, with its essential institutions, established on earth by God to bring men into right relations with Himself and with one another under Him."[1] This society was, according to the New Testament, organized by the Apostles and functioned under their leadership. Across the centuries it has continued to perpetuate the teachings and sacraments of Jesus Christ as transmitted to the Apostles; and it has preserved the Apostolic traditions in doctrine, worship and prayer. The Holy Bible of the Old and New Testaments and the Sacred Tradition, especially the pronouncements of the first seven Ecumenical Councils of the ancient undivided Church, and including the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, constitute the vehicles in which the teachings of Christ and the Apostolic traditions have been carried forward.

Through the Church, which is regarded by Catholics as the "mystical body of Christ" and the very continuation of Christ's incarnation, God's saving grace is imparted to the believer pre-eminently (but not exclusively) in the holy sacraments. As Bishop Dun has stated:

> Catholicism is sacramental through and through. Its worship is most characteristically a holy action of the Church. . . . The Church does not talk to people chiefly; it acts upon them and for them. It takes them up into its life.[2]

The Catholic is incorporated into the mystical body of Christ by Holy Baptism and this incorporation is reaffirmed in the Sacrament of Confirmation. The Church blesses the vocation of the Catholic,

[1] New York: Harper's, 1948, p. 46.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

whether it involves Matrimony or Holy Orders. Through the Sacrament of Penance the Church restores the Catholic as often as he falls into sin. And in the last hour of his earthly life, the Catholic receives from the Church the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. The good Catholic believes that his growth in grace is dependent in large measure on his being the recipient of the sacraments of the Church; and chief among all the sacraments through which God imparts his saving grace is the Sacrament of Holy Communion (Eucharist). In the Holy Communion, the Catholic believes that he is offered Christ's Body and Blood, the very Bread of Life.

In the Catholic view, the validity of the sacraments is guaranteed by, if not actually dependent upon, the orders of ministry. Again, Bishop Dun has written:

> This priesthood is a gift of God to his Church. Its authority comes from above. Its origins are seen in Christ's empowering and commissioning of his apostles as his plenipotentiaries. The Church's bishops are the bearers of the authority and sacramental power in apostolic succession. To be without them is to lack the ministry which God in Christ has given to his Church.[3]

In the light of this interpretation, the role of the layman in the Church appears to be little more than that of receiving the sacramental ministry of the priesthood. Actually, Catholicism does stress the fact that the efficacy of the sacraments as respects an individual is dependent on his own subjective intention and faith. Thus, the role of the layman is not purely passive. Even so, the emphasis is on what is done to and for the believer. Walter Marshall Horton, in his *Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach,* puts it bluntly as follows:

> . . . the dominant emphasis of the whole Catholic system is still upon what is *objectively* done to and for the believer through the clergy in the sacraments, dogmas, laws given to him by the Church, rather than what he subjectively feels, thinks and does. . . . All Catholics stress the apostolic authority of the hierarchy and its commissioning from above. . . all stress the literal identity of the consecrated Bread and Wine with Christ's Body and Blood. . . all stress 'the faith' of the Church rather than the 'faith' of the believer. In all its forms, Catholicism is a complete social system, objectively given, to be obediently and humbly received.[4]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[4] New York: Harper's 1958, p. 233.

This is the place to point out that in the Catholic view the Apostolic ministry is not only the keeper of the sacraments, but the guardian of the deposit of faith as well. The proclamation of the true faith of the Church (basically that which is summarized in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds) is regarded as a means of grace along with the sacraments, and, indeed, both are held to be essential for salvation. But it is not too much to say that Catholicism in practice exalts the celebration of the sacraments above the preaching of the faith, for it regards the sacraments as presupposing the faith. Not only that, but in the Catholic view, the very celebration of the sacraments is yet another way of proclaiming the faith.

Catholics frequently list the marks of the Church as follows:

1) It is *one*. That is, the Church is a unique, spiritually organic and indivisible unity—divinely established, with Jesus Christ as the head of the body. It proclaims one faith and acknowledges one Baptism.

2) It is *holy*. That is, the Church is the guardian and keeper of the means of grace, namely, the true faith and the sacraments, which are the divinely ordained means of both salvation and holiness. Also, the Church is holy in its essential being because the Holy Spirit dwells within her. The Holy Spirit is the soul of the Church, its power, inspiring both the Scripture and the Tradition and leading men on towards attaining the Christian ideal.

3) It is *catholic*. That is, the Church is for the whole world. It is destined to include all men of all times, races and nations. It is catholic both *de jure* (by right) and *de facto* ("in fact" for it is established all over the world and it has expanded from twelve Apostles in Palestine to millions on every continent).

4) It is *apostolic*. That is, the doctrines, practices and institutions of the Church are those of the Apostles.

The Anglican Communion at its Lambeth Conference in 1888 put forth what is called the "Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral"—a four-point statement of principles from which Anglicans would be willing to begin to discuss union with non-episcopal (non-Catholic) churches. The four principles are regarded as the *terminus a quo* from which there can be no dispensation; and in substance, as far as Anglicans are concerned, they constitute the minimum requirements for a church that would be "truly catholic". The four points of the Quadrilateral read as follows:

A) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard

of faith.

B) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

C) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

D) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and people called of God into the unity of His Church.[5]

The Reformed Image of the Church

Those denominations which stand in the tradition of what some call "classical Protestantism" look back to Martin Luther, Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin as the great interpreters of the Christian heritage they prize. These denominations, notably the different Lutheran churches, the Swiss, Dutch and French Reformed churches and the various Presbyterian churches, among others, are the spiritual descendants of the 16th Century Reformation in Germany and Switzerland. There is no significant difference theologically between the sons of Luther and the sons of Calvin—and indeed, important unions between Lutheran and Reformed churches have already taken place, especially in Germany. So, when we try to define the so-called "Reformed" image of the Church what we say would enlist the near unanimous agreement of Luther's descendants and Calvin's. In this paper we are broadening the term "Reformed" by making it refer to those who are of the classic Reformation tradition. We must recognize, of course, that some Lutherans might be unhappy, largely for historical reasons, to see themselves blanketed-in with Swiss Reformed Christians, Presbyterians and others under the label "Reformed". But as a matter of fact, this attempt to bring the Lutherans into our thinking in this paper is done on purpose—for there is no good reason theologically why Lutherans should not join with the other denominations in at least discussing the Blake-Pike Proposal. Basically, a church which aims to be "truly reformed" *ipso facto* aims to incorporate most, if not all, that Lutherans hold dear.

Reformed Christianity regards the Church as the servant of God's Word, and like any servant it is under the judgment of its master. The Word of God judges the Church and the Church must

[5] Quoted from Ruth Rouse and Stephen Neill (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*. London: S.P.C.K., 1954, p. 265.

continually reform itself in the light of that judgment. The Church consists of all throughout the world who profess the true religion—it is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God. This Church is found in many separate denominations. To the Church, Christ has given the ministry, commandments and sacraments of God for the gathering and perfecting of the saints. The continuity of the Church is in doctrine, for the Church embraces the deposit of faith transmitted to and by the Apostles. This deposit of faith is found in the Holy Bible—indeed, the Bible *contains* God's Word in the sense that it testifies uniquely to Christ, who is God's living Word. Thus, the Bible affords the chief norm for the Church's teaching, worship and life. The Church is the agency God has established for the promulgation of his Word; and the authority of the Church is to be respected in its interpretation of the Word, which interpretation is, of course, guided by the Holy Spirit.

In the Reformed tradition, the preaching of the Word is regarded as the primary means of God's saving grace. Both Luther and Calvin agreed that the true Church is a congregation of believers "where the Word is rightly preached and the sacraments rightly administered." Doubtless, they deliberately put preaching of the Word first and administering the sacraments second—and as a matter of fact, they both tended to interpret the sacraments in much the same fashion as St. Augustine interpreted them, i.e. as *verbum visibile* ("Word made visible"). It should be noted here that Reformed Christianity recognizes only the two sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as comming from Christ himself; and it testifies to the real (though not corporeal) presence of Christ in the latter.

Whereas Catholicism places its emphasis on the grace of God as something which is objectively given to the believer through the Church, Reformed Christianity lays its emphasis on the grace of God as something subjectively received by the Christian individual by faith. "The just shall live by faith."[6] Both Catholicism and Reformed Christianity agree that God's saving grace is objectively given and subjectively received—but Catholics have tended to stress the objective *giving* (through the sacerdotal and sacramental systems of the Church) whereas Protestants have tended to stress the subjective *receiving*. This in part accounts for the fact that in practice Catholicism exalts the celebration of the sacraments above the preaching of

[6] Romans 1:17 (King James Version).

the faith, whereas Protestantism tends to the reverse: it exalts the preaching of the faith (the Word) above the celebration of the sacraments.

Since Reformed Christianity focuses so much attention on the subjective faith of the believer, it is not to be wondered at that the doctrines of repentance, sanctification, justification by faith, etc., have received greater development in Protestantism than in Catholicism. It is not surprising, either, that Reformed Christianity should put as much emphasis on church discipline as does Catholicism. Indeed, John Calvin listed the upright administration of church discipline as one of the marks of the true Church, along with right preaching of the Word and right administration of the sacraments. In this connection, Reformed Christianity has been characterized by what might be called "creedalism". The confessions of faith it has accepted, including those from the ancient Church and those from the Reformation period (with their modern revisions), have been employed as tests of faith and used as instruments of church discipline in matters of doctrine.

In summary, then, we can say that if a united church is to be "truly reformed" it must be, at the very least, a congregation of believers wherein there is to be found the true preaching of the Word of God, the right administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the upright administration of ecclesiastical discipline.

The Evangelical Image of the Church

Once more we must be careful about the use of words. The word "Evangelical" in the Philippines is employed to refer to those denominations which are non-Catholic in their organizational, liturgical and, to some extent, doctrinal heritage. In fact, "Evangelical" is preferred to the word "Protestant" and is frequently used as a substitute for it. Thus, in the Philippines, Christians in the Lutheran and Reformed traditions are included under the label "Evangelical". In its deepest sense the word is a good one—it means "one who is loyal to the *Evangel* (the Gospel)"—and every Christian, Protestant or Catholic, should be eager to be called "Evangelical". In this paper, however, we will employ the term in a specialized sense: we will use it as it is used in discussions centering around the Blake-Pike Proposal—to refer to that heritage of the Christian faith which fits

completely neither the Catholic nor the classical Protestant heritages. It is a view of the Church which is embraced by the so-called "free churches," notably the Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, and the Disciples of Christ among others—a view which constitutes their deepest bond of kinship. It is a view which affirms that the Church is essentially a divinely called-out fellowship of believers, rather than a divinely established institution. In this view the Church is a Spirit-led fellowship of men and women who have been called out in the midst of the world and drawn together by their common loyalty and obedience to Jesus Christ. The Church is regarded as a covenant community of those who love God as He reveals himself in Jesus Christ. God-in-Christ calls, the repentant and committed believer responds, and bands together with all other like-minded believers to grow in holiness and to witness and to serve in God's name in the world. Thus, God's ministry is regarded as belonging to the whole fellowship *and each member is a minister,* though for practical reasons some are separated and ordained for the special ministry of Word and Sacrament.

The continuity of the Church is primarily the Holy Spirit himself—the same Holy Spirit that led the early Church continues his guidance in the new day with its new problems and challenges.

In Evangelical Christianity, the Word of God is regarded as essential, but there is little or no attempt to bind it to creeds and catechisms. Though creeds (statements of faith) and catechisms are sometimes used as expressions of the present mind of the fellowship, they are never used as tests of faith. The Word of God is found in the Holy Bible, read and interpreted under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Thus, there tends to be a wide latitude of belief and practice among Evangelical Christians, which is not to say, of course, that they are all equally tolerant of one another or regard each other as true Christians.

With the notable exception of the Quakers and the Salvation Army, nearly all the Evangelical denominations celebrate the two sacraments (ordinances) of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism is regarded chiefly as an act of faithful obedience on the part of the believer (or on the part of believing parents for the child) which testifies publicly to the faith he already possesses or to the new life he has already received. The Lord's Supper is regarded as chiefly an act of fellowship in which the congregation of believers witnesses, in the spirit of repentance, humility and reverence, to its own in-

ternal oneness and to its oneness with all Christian believers in Christ. In the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Jesus Christ is regarded as really present, but in the hearts of the believers rather than in the elements of bread and wine. Here it should be noted that worship in Evangelical denominations, generally speaking, stresses the spontaneity of the Holy Spirit and so tends to be "free," or non-liturgical.

To Evangelical Christians, the Holy Spirit is not only regarded as the Church's continuity, he is regarded as the primary means of grace as well. The really Spirit-led fellowship is already full of grace. So, while preaching of the Word of God is essential and the celebration of the sacraments is useful and helpful, and an ordered ministry might be nice, the main emphasis of Evangelical Christianity is never on these things. It is on the free fellowship of believers who live and labor under Christ and the Spirit.

A church which aims to be "truly evangelical," then, will be one in which the free fellowship of believers will be stressed and in which nothing will be done to block the leading of the Holy Spirit in the lives of believers, individually or collectively. A church "truly evangelical" will minimize conformity and uniformity and will include in its life a wide diversity of theologies and a wide variety of worship, both liturgical and non-liturgical. A church "truly evangelical" will give more than lip service to the concept that the whole fellowship, clergy and laity alike, is charged with God's ministry in the world.

A Church Catholic, Reformed and Evangelical

Our problem now is to see whether these varied images of the Church can be reconciled into one image that is truly catholic, truly reformed and truly evangelical. It is possible to have an understanding of the Church that affirms at one and the same time that the Church is the mystical Body of Christ which through the sacramental ministry of the Apostolic priesthood incorporates believers into its life and transmits God's saving grace; *and* that the Church is the agency established by God for the right preaching of his Word and the right celebration of his sacraments and the upright administration of discipline, that all who hear and receive and obey by faith might be saved; *and,* finally, that the Church is a free fellowship of believers who are called out to be God's Church in the world and

who through the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit are led into ever-increasing understanding of truth, ever-widening avenues of service and ever-broadening opportunities for witness?

In asking this question, we must keep in mind that historically Evangelical Christianity rejects the sacramental system of Catholicism and looks on its "Apostolic" hierarchy and priesthood as having no solid foundation either in Scripture or the early history of the Church. At the same time, Evangelical Christians regard classical Protestantism as too creedalistic, too much bound to the traditions of the past and still a bit too clerical and sacramental. Likewise, Reformed Christianity rejects both the sacerdotalism and sacramentalism of Catholic Christianity without rejecting the concept of a divinely appointed (in and through the Church) ministry and sacraments. It looks on Evangelical Christianity as entirely too permissive and chaotic, providing no adequate ecclesiastical structure for the preservation of the essentials of Christian faith and practice. And, of course, Catholics say to Reformed and Evangelical Christians: "A plague on both your houses!" To have little or no regard for the historic episcopate, to treat the sacraments as though they were only of secondary importance or even of no importance at all, and to affirm the doctrine of *sola Scriptura* while denying that the Word of God has been transmitted also through the Sacred Tradition is to play fast and loose with institutions which belong to the *esse* of the Church and which God-in-Christ ordained as his instruments for the salvation of souls and the up-building of his body. Thus, our problem in reconciling the three varied images of the Church is not simply theological, it is very much bound up in historical and pragmatic considerations as well.

We must, then, guard against seeming to arrive at too easy an answer to our problem, because the actual life of the churches has shown that the answer is not easy. Still, one is led to inquire whether the three heritages are entirely disparate. Manifestly not, for each has important elements in common. For one thing, all three images recognize the indwelling presence, inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church. All three acknowledge the importance of the faith of the individual believer as at least a prerequisite for the efficacy of saving grace (though some Christians believe that faith is itself the evidence of saving grace specially bestowed). All three regard the Bible as the record of God's Word and as authoritative in governing the faith and morals of Christians.

Catholic, Reformed and the majority of Evangelical Christians affirm the importance of a ministry of Word and Sacrament and at the same time recognize that such a ministry amounts to naught in the lives of individual persons who interpose the obstacle of unbelief. All three heritages acknowledge that the Church, whether a fellowship or an institution, is not man-made, but is divinely established. And all three confess Jesus Christ as Lord of the Church; and, in one way or another, all three regard the Church as continuing the earthly ministry of Christ. So right from the start we have a high degree of agreement in the three views. They are not completely disparate.

However, certain differences remain which seem to defy reconciliation. Clarence Tucker Craig, in his book *The One Church*, reduced these differences to three main issues: 1) the question of the limits of the Church; 2) the question of the form of the Church; 3) the question of the continuity of the Church.[7]

Christians are not agreed on whether the one, true Church actually exists visibly or whether at present it is but a spiritual reality which constitutes the bond of unity between Christians separated into many denominational bodies. Most Catholics and many strongly sectarian Protestants affirm that they, in their particular denominations, constitute the one, true Church. Most Protestants, however, acknowledge only the invisible, spiritual oneness of the Church which has yet to be visibly manifested.

Christians are not agreed on whether there is one obligatory form of Church order—episcopal, presbyterian or congregational. Catholics affirm that episcopacy belongs to the *esse* of the Church and was instituted by Christ and the Apostles, as the New Testament amply evidences. Most Protestants, however, hold that the New Testament reveals variety in church organization; that no particular form belongs to the *esse* of the Church; and that every form is subject to change under new circumstances.

Christians are not agreed on the nature of the Church's continuity. Catholics are utterly committed to the position that saving grace and authority to teach and govern were imparted by Christ to the Apostles and by them to their successors, the bishops. Catholics affirm that any break in that continuity renders ministerial ordination and the celebration of the sacraments invalid. Reformed Chris-

[7] New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951, p. 27.

tians, as we have seen, stress the continuity which is to be found in the Word of God and the Apostolic faith rather than in the ministry. And Evangelical Christians place greatest stress on the indwelling Holy Spirit who stands in back of and beyond all orders of ministry, all affirmations of faith and even the Bible itself.

The Second World Conference on Faith and Order held at Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1937, was led to a conclusion that the passage of time since then has not been able to erase—"The conclusion that behind all particular statements of the problem of corporate union lie deeply divergent conceptions of the Church".[8] It is apparent that if ever there is to be a reconciliation of the three deep differences we have just outlined, there will have to be a radical change in the perspective in which those concerned do their thinking. Within the Ecumenical Movement, and more particularly in Faith and Order discussions, the urge for a new perspective is strongly felt. For example, the Faith and Order Section Report at the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches at Evanston, Illinois, in 1954, went so far to suggest the elements of a new perspective in which the churches might see their differences. Among the elements suggested were: the oneness God has actually given in the World Council of Churches itself, and the theological implications of that ecumenical fact; attention, in the midst of disunity, to the one Lord speaking through the Holy Scriptures; facing honestly the non-theological factors (social and cultural influences) which contribute to division; exploring the implications of the one Baptism for sharing in the one Eucharist; discovering the meaning of the ministry of the laity for Christian unity; and, above all, praying together for unity. "To pray together is to be drawn together."[9]

In summary we are forced to conclude that the three images of the Church springing from the Catholic, Reformed and Evangelical heritages can be, at this time, only partly reconciled and that nothing short of bold and honest thinking in a radically new perspective, along with much earnest prayer, will bring about the reconciliation of deep remaining differences. And surely prayer ought to focus on petition *for the grace to realize the Church God intends us to have* and the courage and obedience to abandon our own image of that Church if it in fact counters God's purpose.

[8] Quoted from the Edinburgh Report in Horton, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

[9] *The Evanston Report.* W. A. Visser t'Hooft (ed.). New York: Harper's 1955, pp. 89-91.

But we must not bring this paper to a close without recognizing that, as a matter of fact, denominations representing two, and even all three, of the images we have discussed have united. The United Church of Christ in the Philippines, and similar united churches in Canada, the United States, Japan and elsewhere have seen denominations from the Reformed and Evangelical heritages coming together in one body. And the Church of South India represents the first successful union of denominations from the Reformed, Evangelical and Catholic heritages; and other such unions are contemplated. The marvelous thing is that these denominations have merged without completely reconciling their varied images of the true Church. Nearly all the united churches experience tension within their membership springing from conflicting ideas about the nature and mission of the Church. Yet, despite these tensions they remain together in one body. Actually such tensions are not a phenomenon of united churches alone. The Anglican Communion has long experienced the contest between those who would emphasize the Protestant and those who would emphasize the Catholic heritage of their church. Some of the Evangelical denominations, such as the Methodists, Baptists and Congregationalists, have come more and more to take on the attitudinal and institutional characteristics of the Reformed Protestant denominations as they have grown larger and more world-wide—and, thus, they have come to experience tension between those who would stress the old purity and power of the local fellowship of believers, and those who would stress the importance and mission of the new institutions. Yet, for the most part, these Christians in tension respecting their idea of the Church, remain together.

What we are implying here is simply that it is possible to have within one church body varied concepts of the nature of the Church which are not completely reconciled. The recent history of uniting denominations shows that Christians need not wait for a total reconciliation of their doctrines of the Church before coming together in one household of faith. Indeed, some of the united churches are discovering that as a result of their corporate life there emerges an entirely new image of the Church that suspersedes the separate images originally carried into the union. Life is a great reconciler of irreconcilables! This might be a good thing for the American churchmen discussing the Blake-Pike Proposal to keep in mind, and a good thing for churchmen in the Philippines to ponder as well.

In an article published recently in *The Christian Century* reporting the meeting of the Consultation on Church Union held at Oberlin, Ohio, March 19-21, 1963, Kyle Haselden made the following comment, speaking truly and (we hope) prophetically:

> But a proposed union which waits for theoretical resolution of all differences never occurs. Many of the theological and ecclesiastical issues which divide the churches can be removed only in and by the uniting process. In the actual encounter, in the genuine search for union, agreements theoretically impossible emerge.[10]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blake, Eugene Carson. "A Proposal Toward the Reunion of Christ's Church," *The Christian Century,* LXXVII, No. 51 (December 21, 1960), 1508-1511.

Craig, C. T. *The One Church.* New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951.

Dun, Angus. *Prospecting for a United Church.* New York: Harper's, 1948.

The Evanston Report. W. A. Visser t'Hooft (ed.). New York: Harper's, 1955.

Flew, R. Newton (ed.). *The Nature of the Church.* London: S.C.M. Press, 1952.

Haselden, Kyle. "Fusion at Oberlin," *The Christian Century,* LXXX, No. 14 (April 3, 1963), 422-423.

Horton, Walter M. *Christian Theology:* An Ecumenical Approach. New York: Harper's, 1958.

Molland, Einar. *Christendom.* London: A. R. Mowbray, 1959.

Rouse, Ruth and Stephen Neill (eds.). *A History of the Ecumenical Movement.* London: S.P.C.K., 1954.

"Washington Conference Reports Progress on Unity," *United Church Herald,* V, No. 9 (May 3, 1962), 6.

---

[10] Kyle Haselden, "Fusion at Oberlin," *The Christian Century,* LXXX, No. 14 (April 3, 1963), 422.

NATION-BUILDING: THE CONTINUING CHALLENGE

Cornelio T. Villareal

I CAME TO Silliman University, to see but not "to conquer."* I say this because a politician, especially one belonging to the party of the majority, is always suspect, whatever he does or wherever he goes. That is the price we pay for existing in the focus of public attention.

However, I assure you that in this particular instance of my visit to my Alma Mater, I have no motives other than the purely personal wish to revisit the scenes of my younger days and to renew acquaintances with old friends and with your vigorous, invigorating and far-seeing president.

There have been great changes on the Silliman campus since I was here in 1922-1924; and that is the way things should be. Even our own country has changed, from a basically agricultural country to one that is rapidly being industrialized, from a carabao-and-plow economy to a technological economy as we use more and more "know-how" and machines to develop our rich natural resources.

In just six decades, the nation has undergone changes, both internal and external, that we can be proud of. Our people are more literate, better clothed, healthier, more articulate, better educated than the Filipinos of the Spanish era. While we all wish we had progressed more extensively and more rapidly, and we wish we were more united in the effort to build up this nation, we know that we have done much and that we can do more.

We can do more if all our people are educated; we can do much more if our people are *better* educated—educated for dedicated leadership and to assume unhesitatingly the burdens of civic and personal responsibilities.

The educated man is a productive man: he is a creator and a

* Allusion to newspaper reports of his visits to the provinces purportedly to win over to the Liberal Party members of the opposition Nacionalista Party.

craftsman; he is above pettiness and beyond corruption. He believes in God and delights in the finer things in life. He shirks no neccessary duty and moreover welcomes challenges. Where do we find this kind of man, this educated Filipino? How soon can we produce a race of truly educated Filipinos?

I would like to say that we can find the educated man on the campus of our universities. But I cannot honestly say this, and you know why. Many of our institutions of higher learning have fallen on their job of producing the truly educated man, the exemplary man, the leader. Instead they have produced imitators and docile followers. They have not produced the thinking man, they have not produced the doers of good, the useful producers of society: the inventive man, the creative man. They have not produced the solvent society.

Much may be expected of our universities, and much should be expected of universities that set the pace for other universities. I am proud to say that my Alma Mater has been a pace-setter among our institutions of higher learning, and I am not being partisan when I say this, nor am I being polite. Here on this campus, in spite of many problems and difficulties, a decisive effort is being made to raise the standards and improve the general quality of Philippine higher education. You have assiduously reviewed your programs and offerings to keep up with the most modern trends in education in more advanced countries, and you have revised them to meet the growing needs of a changing society.

You have amplified your curriculums to develop leaders for this nation in many fields. I believe that this is of the greatest importance to a developing nation like ours, for on the quality of leadership as well as on the quality of citizenship we produce will depend the future of this country. Silliman must produce leaders in economics, in business, in law and nursing, in technology, in creative writing and journalism, in music, in public administration, in the churches, and even leaders on the athletic fields. Silliman must be the source and breeding center for young and vigorous and dedicated leaders of all kinds; it must be open at all times to the elite of the intellect, no matter of what race or creed or politics, or economic stature. For only when a university is dedicated to education without bias or hypocrisy is it truly and validly an institution of learning.

You have also, here in Silliman, opened wide your gates to poor but talented young people, young men and young women, who be-

cause of the accident of birth or the incidence of poverty, run the serious risk of being delegated to eternal anonymity and general uselessness. Thanks to your efforts to raise scholarship funds last summer, I understand you were able to give scholarship to 220 students worth ₱21,030.96, grants-in-aid to 222 students worth ₱15,491.20. In addition, this University has given work opportunities to 340 students valued at ₱51,422.59 from its own funds.

This effort on behalf of the poor but deserving is a distinctive mark of Silliman, an institution founded on the generosity of the original benefactor of this institution, Dr. Horace B. Silliman, and built up by the faith of its past presidents and hundreds of loyal and devoted Americans and Filipinos on the faculty and staff. It speaks well of the Silliman tradition and its commitment to the basic concept of democracy, the belief that "there are extraordinary possibilities in the ordinary man."

It is on this concept of the great possibilities and the ultimate wisdom of the common man, earned through long generations of struggle for survival and every conceivable difficulty, that great democracies are built, requiring the utmost dedication and discretion in national leadership. And it is in this area as well as in the development of an intelligent, sentient common denominator of the democratic formula that Silliman University can make a great contribution. We need a citizenry that is alive to public issues and problems, capable of expressing, and of making felt, their will on these issues and problems. We need a people possessed of the highest concern for the welfare of this nation, whether on the local or barrio level or on the national or policy-making level. And above all we need a people alive to the needs of nation-building and capable of contributing to fill these needs.

But our people cannot make any appreciable contributions to the major task of building our nation unless our educational institutions help change their attitude towards work, towards their civic and personal responsibilities, towards their community and towards the country. We are one people living in one country, but at times we think and behave as though we are a hundred separate, distinct, even antagonistic, tribes or factions with nothing in common except the color of our skins.

I am happy to note that in this vital area, this University is making great progress. It has, through its Extension Service Program, made contributions to the improvement of barrio life, and through its work scholarships it has impressed its students with the

value of work as a means to acquiring experience as well as a living. Significant changes in our society are not brought about by preaching or lecturing or writing about them, although all these are valuable as eye-openers, but by slow, painstaking demonstration and practice of what we preach or teach or write about. I would like to see every major school in the country do what this University is doing—has been, in fact, doing for many years.

The Government, despite what you read in some newspapers and what you hear from some speakers, is deeply and sincerely interested and committed to a program of national advancement, of developing and utilizing to the fullest the vast resources of our country and people. I have the greatest faith in our potentialities and capabilities as a people and in President Macapagal's program of nation-building. But no program, however good, however desirable, however necessary, will achieve its goals unless—and this is an important consideration—the people, the Filipino people, have faith in it, want to see it succeed because it is for the common good, and have the will to make it achieve its purpose.

The tradition of partisanship that has made us one people in times of emergency and war, must be made manifest, not in the interest of political ambitions, but in the interest of the common, national goal—the building of a strong, progressive Filipino nation. Is there a higher or a better goal than this—for our Government, for our people, or for our schools?

We shall depend on our schools and universities to help us build this nation, to give us this kind of Filipino citizenry and leadership. You have done well; you must do more. You must, in your own favorite words here at Silliman, "educate for excellence." You must so educate and inspire the Filipino student with a love and respect and admiration for everything done well, whatever it is, however small or seemingly trivial it is, as long as it is done well. This deep respect for quality, whether in goods or services, is I think one of the most valuable virtues you can inculcate in our people. Unless we have this desire and unless we insist and demand quality, we cannot produce quality goods, we cannot expect quality service, we cannot build a quality nation.

For my part, I pledge to do all I can to help you achieve your goals—personally as an alumnus of this University, as a public official dedicated to our national welfare, and lastly and proudly, as a Filipino.

Leadership in Asia

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4)

require qualities and capabilities never demanded of leadership in simpler or less critical times. Since the main burden of leadership is the formulation of decisions that would redound to the national well-being, it is important that leadership should be well tutored or advised in those fields wherein the decisions lie. In no case may it escape responsibility or blame for a wrong decision, since major decisions involve the welfare of millions within a country and possibly more millions outside it.

Asian leadership today, however, is more committed to internal duties than to its international obligations, since in developing countries there is greater urgency, for instance, in a program to increase the food supply than in cultural exchange with other countries. The chief burden of Asia has always been its teeming, hungry millions and how to make them work towards a higher and bountiful destiny.

In this decade at least, Asian leadership will be assessed in terms of the common man in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, the Philippines, and the other countries—how well it has brought him contentment and security, improved his livelihood as well as his attitude towards society, how well it has realized his dream of a fuller and more useful life.

To the vast mass of humanity in Asia, the shape of leadership is less material or important than the extent to which it serves the people's primary needs for food, clothing, shelter, and employment. Long years of Western tutelage have not changed Asia much, nor its needs. Leadership must satisfy the physical hungers and thirsts before the real work of building towards a happier life can begin.

Yet, for many of Asia's leaders, the basic problems seem insoluble as long as the economy remains marginal and the people unenlightened; and few have been able to improve the economy or the status of the people with large foreign aid and vast natural resources.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that Asia has entered a phase of development that requires a new type of leadership—knowledgeable in the requisites of nation-building and no less consecrated to the people's welfare.

THE MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL GROWTH

Earl Carroll

DURING THE PAST half century, this country was under American tutelage in the principles and practices of the democratic way of life. This institution is an example. From among the first American troops that were stationed in the islands came the first teachers of democracy. Then followed government officials, politicians and professional teachers, such as our late friends, Dr. and Mrs. Hibbard.* They spread out all over the country and aggressively with a spirit of dedication, especially among the teachers, to impart the basic concept of a democratic way of life. The Filipinos were quick to respond and they learned rapidly. In fact, they learned so rapidly that, after three decades and a half of American rule, preparations began for a complete transfer of the reins of government to their hands.

Unfortunately, however, the Americans failed in at least one very important respect. It is true that they taught the Filipinos the mechanics of running a democratic government; but there was one phase, and a very important one, of the democratic way of life which, unfortunately, was not given too much importance nor emphasis by the American tutors, namely, training in the management of national resources. It was really not until after the war that this was given the attention it deserves. There was, however, no delaying the granting of political independence to the Filipinos. A promise had been made. It had to be fulfilled. It was fulfilled.

Immediately after the granting of Independence on July 4, 1946, economic programs were drawn up. The country had been badly ravaged by the last war. Industry, agriculture, transportation, the currency and the health of the entire nation were seriously impaired. The planning and execution of economic programs for the country's

* The Reverend David Sutherland Hibbard, first president of Silliman Institute. He started the school on August 28, 1901 on instructions from the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, New York. The Hibbards now live in retirement in Duarte, California.

reconstruction and rehabilitation were of paramount importance, but, unfortunately, mistakes were made; excesses and delays plagued the planning and execution of these programs.

The lack of planning and managerial tradition and experience was, and still is, a big problem. Great progress has been made in spite of this handicap but a lot of improvement is still needed. A lot of work still lies ahead, and the rapid development of the proper managerial skills is indispensable if the Philippine economy is to prosper significantly.

The country is once again standing on the threshold of a major opportunity for social and economic progress. The enthusiasm for growth which flowered and blossomed during the nineteen-fifties but visibly declined at the beginning of this decade is again gathering force—a little slowly perhaps—but it is definitely increasing in strength and enthusiasm.

This revival of the national spirit was not accomplished on a hit-and-miss basis. It was achieved by a carefully designed program. To my mind, this is the strongest evidence that the highest authorities of this nation fully appreciate the utmost importance of sophisticated management in the handling of socio-economic affairs. Not only are they aware of this need but are actually exerting strenuous efforts to revise, amend and transform outmoded, age-old methods, procedures and practices so that they may better facilitate the attainment of programmed objectives.

All these moves are of course to be welcomed. It is only by competent and efficient management that we can hope to obtain the maximum national product from national resources. The time we could confidently say "bahala na" is past.

Already we are confronted by a population problem: at 3.5% increase in population annually, in about 30 years from now there will be 50 million Filipinos. Adequate provision must be made for their basic needs—for a fuller life than they have known before. The problem is not only to provide the present standard of living for 28 million but to provide for 50 million—to say nothing of improving the standard of living. Fortunately, the present population has been nurtured in the belief that only under a democracy can the infinite possibilities of the human endowments be fully realized.

The challenge the nation faces today is to prove that this belief is true and can be realized. The Philippines is fortunate in having been blessed with a climate that is relatively moderate, resources

that are bountiful, a level of education that equips the people with a quick adaptability to modern techniques, and a political system that encourages private initiative. If we should fail, with these blessings, these resources, to produce an adequate amount of goods and services to satisfy the expanding needs of the people, the fault can only be laid at the door of poor management and inadequate leadership and nowhere else.

The Government is harnessing fully whatever managerial talent is now available. Thus, a number of young faces now occupy positions in the Government which are vital to the planning of the national economy. Even in the Cabinet of the President, we have some very young men who have not been in the limelight before, but who now have a great deal to do with the implementation of the President's socio-economic program. There is the Honorable Rufino Hechanova, Secretary of Commerce and Industry; the Honorable Rodrigo Perez, Secretary of Finance; the Honorable Alejandro Roces, Secretary of Education; the Honorable Bernardo Abes, Secretary of Labor; the Honorable Sixto K. Roxas, of the ACCFA and the PIA. They are young, capable and dedicated.

There are many more, to be sure, presently serving our Government, though in relatively less prominent capacities, who are capable of, and, no doubt, are contributing effectively toward the over-all effort of national economic improvement.

In the private sector, there are also a number of young and capable men who, in effectively handling their respective assignments, are contributing toward a better economy for our country.

Despite these illustrations, however, the talents available appear pitifully small, when compared to the tasks at hand and the more gigantic tasks that lie ahead. Indeed, the American tutors failed to initiate and lay the foundations for discovering and training management personnel.

I am not speaking of a quantitative problem. As is true in other nations, where the economy is in the initial or take-off stages of development, manpower is plentiful here. The Philippines has a reasonably large labor force. The quantity is available. It is the quality that is lacking.

Economic development could perhaps go on with the utilization of only unskilled manpower. However, progress will be at a very slow pace, assuming it progresses at all. Mistakes will occur. There will be a substantial waste of resources. I am not at all sure that

the nation can wait—that mistakes and waste can be tolerated. We must not forget Indonesia and China. Unskilled manpower must be led by well-trained men if progress is to proceed at a reasonable pace.

Now, how does a nation get a sufficient number of trained men who can meet the challenges presented by a struggling economy? It cannot be done overnight. But a start has to be made—and made now. The costs of delay can be disastrous.

The inculcation of the attitudes, the discipline and the habits that characterize a good manager and creates the social climate most favorable to the development of good managerial talents must begin in youth. They need to be deliberately implanted, encouraged and developed. Neatness, orderliness, truthfulness, sincerity, self-reliance, industry, prudence, thrift, fairness, studiousness, respect for other men's rights, genuine concern for social welfare, and many more similar traits must be taught and learned in the early years.

Good management is not an obligation of the highest government authorities alone. It is an obligation that must be shared by all authorities—all along the line—down to the level of the barrio lieutenant.

And in the private sector it is an obligation that must extend to and be shared by not only the heads of businesses and civic organizations but by the heads of families, schools, and religious institutions. I believe that the biggest and foremost job of all is to instill a general awakening on the part of all the people of the responsibility each one has for conserving resources and economizing in their use; for doing one's part as an individual, at all times, in this gigantic social effort of maximum utilization of the nation's resources.

Let me cite some very humble examples: The throwing of refuse on the roads or of waste paper and other materials on public parks increase the burden on the community for cleaning expenses and expenditures for the maintenance of health. The careless handling of books and reading materials in public and school libraries increases the burden for replacement on the part of institutions concerned. The construction of obstructions to public rivers and canals and the wanton denuding of forests result in a tremendous public loss when floods occur. The careless use of clothing, utensils, and household furniture and fixtures reduces the amount of increment to capital that the family builds.

In other words, the discipline and obligations necessary for good

management, in the final analysis, must be shared by every individual in the community. Each one has the paramount duty to the community of being able to manage himself, to pull his own weight, not only in his self-interest, but also in the interest of the whole community and nation itself.

The appreciation of the importance of self-discipline in the maintenance of community welfare unfortunately is not inborn in human beings. It is a habit that is taught; it must be learned. The process begins in the home and is continued and reaches its refinements in church and school. The indoctrination of human beings in the ways, beliefs, practices and mores of the society he lives in and the world he forms part of, as well as the development and sharpening of those traits and qualities that make him a potential leader among his fellowmen, is the sacred obligation of our colleges and universities; and I pause here to congratulate Silliman University for its wonderful part in leadership training.

More than ever before in this country colleges and universities are challenged to turn out men and women who are not only technically skilled, but who are imbued with a deep feeling for the welfare of their people, who are alert to the possibilities of their own country, and who are deeply conscious of their obligation to assist in the effective management of the social resources that constitute their patrimony.

It is the obligation of colleges and universities to produce men and women who are painfully aware of the shortcomings of their political economy, and of the superior blessings of more advanced and older societies, but who would use this awareness to fortify a determination to improve their economy rather than to question and abandon it. It is only by meeting this challenge and buckling down to it that the colleges and universities can justify their existence.

There is a great responsibility, indeed, in the hands of our educational institutions. They are responsible to a great extent for turning out the sorely needed leaders who can manage the resources of the nation.

The educational institutions, the faculty members, and the students must, therefore, hand in hand, attend conscientiously to their respective responsibilities and obligations to the nation. Silliman has proven, by its accomplishments, since its inception, a high devotion to the performance of its obligations. I am sure that Silliman will continue to undertake and push through this noble program with

renewed zeal, because the objectives you are serving are very challenging ones. The cause of freedom is involved.

If prosperity cannot be attained because of lack of management, democracy will wither on the vine in this country and its place will gleefully be assumed by an ideology foreign to our beliefs—and we shall come under a fascist or a communist dictatorship. We cannot allow this to happen. The consequences would be fatal to the democratic way of life for which your fathers and ancestors and my fathers and ancestors have fought and died.

PEACE, THE PEACE CORPS AND THE PHILIPPINES

Lawrence C. Howard

IN THE LIGHT of advanced publicity perhaps I should say a word about the title of these remarks: "Peace, the Peace Corps, and the Philippines." Unfortunately, the title preceded the assembly of the text. To a large extent, fortunately, the title retains some relevance. I have addressed myself to four topics. First I want to call your attention to the dangerous threat of war. Then I will turn briefly to the nature of peace. My third section attempts to relate the Peace Corps to the movement for peace. Finally, I will allude to the experience volunteers are having in the Philippines.

The Peace Corps is only beginning to learn about peace. We would not qualify for an honor's prize today. We are still apprentices, still learning. It's because we're still groping that I'm grateful for this opportunity to talk with you about peace. It forces me to focus on the idea of peace and to reflect with you about it. As we have gone only a little way towards peace, it hurts very much to be jostled with the comment: "Oh, you've come to bring us peace? What about Cuba? What about Mississippi!" Peace is crucial for Cuba and Mississippi. Perhaps our experience here may make it more possible there.

Rather, instead of bringing peace, we are pursuing it. Our efforts can be better understood if highlighted against the backdrop of four great struggles that have dominated human imagination and purpose throughout history:

The struggle for mastery over nature—for subsistence.
The struggle for freedom and growth.
The struggle for human distinction—for excellence.
The struggle against war.

None of these struggles has been won. The last one, against war, is the only one, however, where man has dangerously lost ground. "Man today is not safe in the presence of man." We still need the basic primer for the end of hostility to prevent man's extermination. If we can structure peace then these other struggles can be pushed:

mastery over nature, the pursuit of freedom and excellence—all leading to a meaningful life.

Its terrifyingly urgent that "we study war no more." While Geneva conferees fiddle over three on-site inspections or seven, the arsenal of warheads, missles, germs, and gases mounts. Time runs out. Each moment brings closer further loss of control with the attainment of a nuclear capacity by other sovereign states. In any war between nuclear powers the main casualty will be humanity.

Two recent books underline the dangers of a thermonuclear war: *In Place of Folly* by Norman Cousins, and *The Arms Race* by Nobel Peace Prize winner, Philip Noel-Baker. These remarks borrow liberally from both. The theme of each is man's having in reach the power to deciminate—to destroy the larger part of—the human species.

Within an hour a big part of the world's population can be annihilated, the species' genes can be mutuated through radiation, the Darwinian assent can be reversed and man's vital environment (the air, the water and the land) can be polluted.

Consider how ominous the dangers. A combination of 12,500 megatons of thermonuclear explosions would bring on the disaster. That much explosive power at this very moment may be aloft in American B-52s or Russian Migs. It's certainly beneath the sea in atom powered submarines or loaded on missile launchers for ICBMs. All are zeroed-in on key population centers. If released today, by nightfall they would devastate North America. Two weeks of fallout would wipe out most of the people north of the equator. Those who would survive would rebuild amid ruins in a polluted atmosphere. They would have to begin by reconstructing nature herself.

Beyond the thermonuclear are chemical, biological and radiological warfare. Earlier generations have had the power merely to affect history; ours has the power to erase it.

The core of our crisis is uncontrolled power. In our own lifespan man has brought about more fundamental changes than in all recorded history: There is conquest of the earth's gravity (the satellites), liberation of atomic energy, abolition of distance, instantaneous communication, automation. Unprecedented are the scale and intensity of scientific development. Forces and processes now coming under human control begin to match, in size and intensity, nature herself. Our total environment is within man's power to influence.

At the same time the world has been shrunk to a single neigh-

borhood. With nuclear power under control, man could turn his attention to the unfinished business: the struggles to adjust and distinguish himself in this environment. With nuclear power out of control man seems doomed. This could be the last generation of men on earth. Survival requires leaders who will love humanity the way Gandhi loved India. It also requires followers who are furnished at least a primer on peace.

The Nature of Peace

The word "peace" like the word "university" is a multi-faceted, demanding word—only more so. Peace is the end of pain, the beginning of promise, the concern of states but no less of individuals. The Latin *pax* focuses upon peace as the end to national hostilities. It is an agreement between warring states. Peace in our time must begin to abolish war through arms controls.

Peace at the individual level means quietude, a tranquility. This is a New Testament theme. Tranquility is the gift of God, a blessing which gives man an inner wholeness. It is a freedom from personal anxiety. Man craves this peace.

Peace also has more active meanings. Like prayer, peace changes things. The Hebrew word for peace, *shalom,* conveys this positive quality. *Shalom* means the absence of strife; but it also implies good health, prosperity, well-being. It is the fruit of a right relationship with God.

Still more basic than *shalom,* more desirable than even the masterful control of passion, is that peace defined as the right direction of man's energies, tensions and passions both individually and in the aggregate. The tone here is Asian. It makes a blessedness out of tension as well as Faith. Real peace is a function of being—when you be what you are to be. In essence it is an affirmation of man as he is to be.

The chapters of the primer for peace would thus encompass all man's struggles: Toward ending national hostility; the elimination of destructive disturbances; achieving mastery over nature; building man's freedom and excellence; and finally meaning in the good life.

The pages of such primer must contain human experiences born of the search for peace. This brings us to the Peace Corps and peace.

The Peace Corps and Peace

The intention of the Peace Corps is peace. It is the desire to

expose an entire generation to peace. The authorizing Act declares United States policy to be to promote world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps. Peace is a high American purpose. Eight hundred Americans volunteer every day to work for peace. Nearly 5,000 are already overseas. The largest number is in the Philippines.

Yet the word "peace" comes hard for Americans. We have fostered no peace movement such as those in England or Japan. Pacifists are to be found in the United States but they are written off as radicals. Personal tranquility is not a common American commodity. In fact, most Americans would prefer to qualify the word peace with "peace in freedom," or "peace with justice."

It is in the cause of peace with freedom that we stockpile armaments and resume nuclear testing. Americans have accepted the burden of 55 billion dollars for military defense. Aid to education, uplifting depressed areas, improving the care for the aged (that is, an affirmation of natural man), by contrast, find tough sledding in Congress. It is in the same context of freedom that we now re-evaluate aid to the Philippines and consider its reduction.

I'm frankly worried about the President Kennedy's strategy of peace. He says:

> Our task is to rebuild our strength, and the strength of the Free World—to prove to the Soviets that time and the course of history are not on their side, that the balance of power is not shifting their way. First, we must make invulnerable a nuclear retaliatory power second to none. It must be based on hidden, moving, or invulnerable weapons in such force as to deter any aggressor from threatening an attack he knows could not destroy enough of our force to prevent his own destruction.

This kind of policy is seriously disturbing. I believe there can be no adequate defense for humanity in a policy of deterrence through ever expanding armaments. Will not such a policy only prompt an enemy to improve his own capability? Will he not seek to muster the power to deliver the decisive nuclear blow before retaliation is possible?

Meanwhile, precious moments slip away, we develop a bomb-shelter hysteria at home (men arm against their neighbor), and the possibility of accidentally triggering off nuclear warfare increases.

But after achieving adequate strength, the President does go on to a positive program. He would greatly increase the flow of capital abroad, perhaps more as loans than as grants. He would make an

honest effort to close the economic gap between the "have" and the "have-not" nations. He proposes a new approach to the world's tension areas. He would recognize national aspirations and would display a respect for cultural differences. He understands that one of the world's greatest needs is to have an America that understands the world.

The Peace Corps is thus part of the President's initiative—toward peace. This approach is new. We are not an adjunct of the cold war struggle; neither are we associated with the Disarmament Agency or the program of Atoms for Peace or Food for Peace. The Corps is separated from these traditional efforts to beat swords into ploughshares. This is basically a person-to-person program aimed to promote mutual understanding. It is designed to be at least as rewarding to ourselves as to participating nations. But whatever the national gain for ourselves or for the Philippines, we hope that our greatest contribution will be toward world peace.

This is a new means of representing America abroad. It hopes to establish a new image. We hope that by living with others who are different, by sharing their struggles, by trying to understand their culture, ideals, and ambitions, we will create a new impression of America abroad. As Senator Humphrey* put it:

> This is what the world wants more than America's money or even more than it wants her technology. It wants from America the reassurance that we believe in people.

We are also striving to make a contribution to development. We want to do what host countries determine and to do it under their supervision and control. The skills that volunteers have to offer are limited by their age and experience. They are middle level skills, neither technical nor manual. They involve working *with* people, not over them; providing living testimony of a reverence for man and his labor and the human responsibility to work with those who are in need. In the Philippines, we're mostly educational aides in barrio elementary schools.

The principle of volunteering is central. This is a private commitment to which each volunteer must re-commit himself every day. One volunteer has explained his motivation: "I've been sitting on the sidelines all my life and watching the world go to pot. No one ever asked me to help until the Peace Corps came along."

---

* Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota.

This is not a program of Americans crusading for democracy, but of democrats crusading for the advancement of human welfare, for the realization of the aspirations of all peoples. This is our job. Other by-products are possible: maybe the basis for a broadly redefined foreign policy outlook for America; maybe a transformed America with new and strengthened ideals. But to think of the Peace Corps simply as part of the United States government is to weaken and defeat its purpose. It is much better to think of the Peace Corps and the Philippines. For in the struggle for peace, nationalities are relevant only for the uniting of diverse experiences to highlight our common humanity.

....*And the Philippines*

There is much about peace to be learned in the Philippines. Whenever I tell someone in Manila that I'm from the provinces, from Dumaguete, they invariably say, "That's a peaceful place!" Life in the barrios, where most volunteers are assigned, is peaceful. The largest Peace Corps contingents are in peaceful places: in Nigeria, Ethiopia, and the Philippines. All three have long non-aggressive histories, all are strategically located in the north-south, east-west axis of separated peoples. All three are polyglots. Nigeria and Ethiopia's roots are Mediterrean and Middle Eastern as well as African. The Philippines is an amalgamation of Asia, Europe and America. All three accommodate Christian, Moslem and pagan. All have much to teach the world about peace.

This is a compelling time to be in the Philippines! There is hope in the air and development is on the move. Here, there are pioneering experiments in rural reconstruction, in community development, in education for economic growth! There is also a move towards moral regeneration.

Here, too, are vivid negatives: the destructiveness of feeling inferior, peacelessness in asserted absolute sovereignty, the self-defeat of economic isolation.

Far more dramatic, however, are the positives here: patience, reciprocity, hospitality, a concern for the human factor in personal relations. Surely, if the world is to survive, it must become rather more like the Filipino who is unalterably Eastern but yet very much Western. Looking at the Filipino's love of family perhaps the world will see more closely the family of man.

The experience of the first groups of volunteers, now completing

their overseas tours, confirms for me that the Philippines has provided the Peace Corps volunteer with a clearer view of peace.

Away from America, one can see the need to build a structured peace through a strengthened United Nations. Enforceable disarmament through a world authority to undercut even our own absolute national sovereignty takes on high priority.

In the Philippines, the struggle for mastery over nature is graphically depicted. We have learned that a world approach to the problem of development is clearly preferable to the tyrannies and indignities of bilateral aid. Living here, one can see the importance of ending the wastage of natural resources and the spoilage of the soil. No longer will references to population pressures mean just alarming statistics. Passing through Manila is vivid illustration (even nearly two decades later) of what the devastation of war can be and how we could be involved. Here one also learns that although man's habit of violence is bad, so too is disconnectedness from other men.

Here the ancient struggles of man to master his environment for us have thus taken on reality. The cause of freedom, we now know, is only an experiment limited to a narrow privileged class. Most of the world is still stranger to the written word. Formal education is available only to a minority. Excellence in education is not yet defined or even desired.

But mainly the Philippines has been for us a setting for self-discovery. Perhaps we have learned most about peace by seeing ourselves for the first time reflected in the lives of people in our barrios or at our schools. Volunteers in this region just finished an End of Tour Questionnaire. Nearly everyone said that personal development was the most dramatic result of his stay thus far; some underlined a deep spiritual awakening. As to contributions to peace, most mentioned a better understanding of others, a respect for cultural differences.

One volunteer said:

> Being here has made me realize that it doesn't take too much effort to love people. I think universal and eternal love are the ingredients of peace.

Another:

> We've made some progress towards peace if people I've associated with have the same frustrations I have.

Yesterday morning's mail brought this from another volunteer:

> To communicate with one another, if we are to know each other well, is imperative, but extremely difficult. I may use words that have to you a different significance from mine. Understanding comes when we, you and I, meet on the same level at the same time. That happens only when there is real affection between people, between intimate friends. There is an art too to listening. It requires putting to one side all prejudices, preformulations and daily activities. In a receptive state of mind, things can be understood. Unfortunately most of us listen through a screen.
>
> One is aware without too much discussion, that there is unnecessary individual as well as collective chaos, confusion and misery throughout the world. Is it not also obvious that what I am in my relationship to another creates society and that without radically transforming myself there can be no transformation of the world. Until I, in my relationship to you, understand myself, I am the cause of the chaos, the fear, the misery and destruction.

In the Philippines, Peace Corps volunteers, I would say, are coming to know about peace.

BOOK REPORT

UNDERSTANDING DECISIONS

Patterns in Decision-Making. Case Studies in Philippine Public Administration. Edited by Raul P. de Guzman. Manila: University of the Philippines, Graduate School of Public Administration. 1963. 594 pp.

THIS VOLUME of case studies represents an outgrowth of the cooperative efforts of many participants in the Case Study Program of the Graduate School of Public Administration, University of the Philippines. In his foreword to this work, Dean Carlos P. Ramos of the U.P. Graduate School of Public Administration stated that these studies will not only acquaint students of public administration with the decision-making process in the Philippine government but they will also encourage and further the search for common and comparable approaches to problems that confront government administrators throughout the world.

There are fifteen comprehensive case studies in this volume and the subject matter ranges from legislative policy-making in government to a local controversy concerning a traffic experiment. An introductory part preceding each case explains in detail the circumstances that surround the main action and the general environment of the problem such as the function and character of a particular agency, pertinent legal provisions and general policies that bear upon the situation. Following the main events are concluding remarks by the case writer to point out some problems or questions that appear to emanate from the study. This arrangement enables the reader to analyze the data that have contributed to the existence of the problem, to interpret and weigh the evidence that bears on the situation, and then to leave the task to him to adopt for himself the most appropriate method of solution to the particular case.

Some of the case studies as they appear in the volume are classified as follows:

Title of Case	*Subject*
The Passage of the Anti-Graft Law	Policy-formulation; legislative-executive relationships

The Sale of the Maria Christina Fertilizer Plant	Policy-formulation; decision-making in the disposal of a government enterprise
Appointing a PTA Chairman-General Manager	Personnel administration; presidential appointment
The Citizens League and the 1959 Local Election	Citizens' participation in the electoral process; public relations
The District Supervisor's Dilemma	National-local relations; human and public relations.

Each case presents an interesting interplay of the attitudes, motives and actions of the participants, a complex interweaving of personal and impersonal components and the appreciation of various factors that might have wielded an influence on the people involved in the decision-making process. In almost every decision rendered, there appears an attempt to "reconcile the formally prescribed norms with the apparently conflicting demands of particularistic interests and traditional values in the society." For example, this book includes a case study entitled "The Passage of the Anti-Graft Law" which illustrates a situation where the legislative and the executive departments resolve their conflicting views on a common objective: elimination of graft and corruption in the public service. Another study deals with the appointment of the Chairman-General Manager of the Philippine Tobacco Administration by the Chief Executive. In this particular case, the reader gets an insight into the political maneuvers and countermaneuvers to place protégés in a government position and the conflicting human drives and attitudes that prompt the appointing power to make up its mind.

The reader discovers that sometimes the possible avenues of thought and courses of action within which he may move are explicity supplied in one case, and not in others, but in all instances, the scope of the thinking and action is defined by the evidence available in the given situation. The reader does not face a static situation where he may only criticize the actions of others but he is frequently led to decide for himself what action is appropriate to his own appraisal of the problem. This probably makes this volume of case studies an excellent text on Philippine public administration where a realistic description of a typical governmental process or action would serve as the primary springboard for general discussion.

SOLOMON L. EBARLE

AUTHORS IN THIS *JOURNAL*

DOUGLAS JAMES ELWOOD is Head of the Department of Religious Studies, Silliman University. Dr. Elwood received his undergraduate degree from Wheaton College and did graduate work at Princeton Theological Seminary, the University of Edinburgh, the University of Zurich and Yale University.

PETER G. GOWING, Associate Professor of Church History and Christian Doctrine, Silliman University, is the editor of the *Silliman Christian Leader,* a quarterly publication of the College of Theology.

CORNELIO T. VILLAREAL is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Congress of the Philippines. On a visit on December 10, 1962 to Silliman University, his alma mater, he read the paper on "Nation-Building: The Continuing Challenge."

EARL CARROLL, President of Philippine-American Insurance Companies, read his paper on "The Management of National Growth" at the Honors Day Convocation, Silliman University, February 16.

LAWRENCE C. HOWARD is Associate Peace Corps Representative for Western Visayas, Philippines.

SOLOMON L. EBARLE is Acting Director of the School of Economics and Business Administration, Silliman University. He received the Master of Public Administration degree from the Graduate School of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.

GORGONIO D. SIEGA, Silliman University Librarian, and ELISEO P. BAÑAS, Head, Processing Section, have been compiling the Selected Philippine Periodical Index for the *Journal* since 1958.

ANTONIO S. GABILA, Editor of the *Silliman Journal,* is Director of Information and Publications, Silliman University.

SELECTED

Philippine Periodical Index

January–March, 1963

By Gorgonio D. Siega and Eliseo P. Bañas

PUBLICATIONS INDEXED

BW	*Boys World*	PCC	*Philippines Caltex Circle*
CCJ	*Coffee & Cacao Journal*	PEB	*Philippine Economy Bulletin*
CM	*Chronicle Magazine*	PEF	*Philippine Educational Forum*
CT	*Catholic Teacher*	PGJ	*Philippine Geographical Journal*
ERJ	*Economic Research Journal*	PJE	*Philippine Journal of Education*
EC	*Education Currents*	PJN	*Philippine Journal of Nursing*
EQ	*Education Quarterly*	PJP	*Phil. Journal of Public Health*
ES	*Esso Silangan*	PL	*Philippine Labor*
FA	*Filipino Athlete*	PS	*Philippine Studies*
FF	*Filipino Farmer*	PFP	*Philippines Free Press*
FCL	*Filipino Child Life*	PHM	*Philippines Herald Magazine*
FT	*Filipino Teacher*	Sc Rev	*Science Review*
FAN	*Flying "A" News*	SJ	*Silliman Journal*
FW	*Free World*	SR	*Statistical Reporter*
JES	*Journal of East Asiatic Studies*	SN	*Sugar News*
MM	*Marcelo Magazine*	STM	*Sunday Times Magazine*
MST	*MST English Quarterly*	WG	*Weekly Graphic*
NN	*Nutrition News*	WW	*Weekly Women's Magazine*
PA	*Philippine Agriculturist*	WH	*Woman and the Home*

EXPLANATION

ANIMAL industry
The status of PI animal industry. WG,
Mar 6 '63. V. 29, No. 37. p. 28-29+.

The above entry shows that the article "The status of PI animal industry," is to be found in the WEEKLY GRAPHIC issue of March 6, 1963, Volume 29, Number 37, pages 28-29 and continued elsewhere.

A

B

C

D

E

F

H

I

J

K

L

M

M

N

O

P

Q

R

S

T

U

V

Z