

THE NINETEENTH CONFERENCE

DEACONESS ASSOCIATION

and

THE TENTH CONFERENCE

FELLOWSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL WOMEN

UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA

August 25 - 30th, 1963.

COVENANT COLLEGE

77 CHARLES ST. W., TORONTO

THE WORLD AROUND US (I)

by

Rev. Dr. K.G. McMillan
General Secretary
Canadian Bible Society

I have entitled these lectures "The World Around Us" and I hope that what I have to say will be of some help as you deal with the whole theme of this Conference -- How to Make the Gospel Relevant in this very exciting world. I shall attempt to speak about the world in which we live; the world to which God calls us to take the Gospel; the world which is sweeping us along at such a terrific pace in this decade. Now I know that no one is qualified to speak on this subject -- The World Around Us -- but this does not seem to impede many from writing and speaking about it. I can assure you that all I presume to do is to give you my impressions, but this is all, after all, that anyone can do. Sometimes we seem to forget that.

It seems to me that each one sees the world much like boys and girls, in considerable numbers used to watch ball games. That is through knotholes in board fences around the ball park. Now, a knothole is not the best place to see a ball game for one's vision is considerably restricted. There were a few lucky people as I remember who were privileged to go up into the bleachers or the grandstands where they could sit and their eyes could see the whole field.

I have to confess that my view of the world is a knothole view. My knowledge and understanding is determined by what I can see from where I stand. I can see a little and am interested in seeing all that I can, but I realize that there are others from their privileged positions in the grandstand who can see and know and understand more, much more, than I can. I am always anxious to listen to them. I also know that there are many people who, when they see the game, will understand more of what has been taking place. So you see I could have entitled what I am going to say to you in this ninety minutes you've given me "A Knothole View of the World."

I would be interested to know what you see through your little knothole. You must have a different view of the field than I have. You will have different impressions as to how the game is going. But whatever you think I would suggest that most people see the world through their own little knothole. This, I think, is tremendously important. I think of this as I sometimes meet very eminent people in the church. There is a Presbyterian knothole through which many of my friends look at the world. There is the parish knothole which gives a very parochial outlook. There is the Newfoundland knothole, and the British Columbia knothole. There is the church secretary's knothole. There is the Communist knothole; the capitalist knothole; the nationalist knothole; the sociologist's knothole. There are dozens of knothole views of the world and all I'm going to do today is to give you mine and I would ask you to remember that I'm not pretending to have a view of the world as it actually is, but just what I see. I should remind you that I have moved around the fence a little bit, as it were, and looked through knotholes to the right and to the left, of the knothole we have here in Canada and right over to the

other side and looked back at the field from the other side. You get a little different view when you see the world from these other knotholes.

I must confess it would be much easier for me to speak to you on the world around us if I were looking only through the Canadian knothole. Japan, and India, and South America, etc., look quite different from here than they do from Tokyo, or Calcutta, or Rio de Janeiro. There is so much truth in that statement that you can only write a book in a country after you've been there three days or twenty years. It's impossible to know what to write in the time between the fourth day and the twentieth year. One could always keep silent, of course. Sometimes it's more difficult to keep silent than it is to speak; especially when one feels a little bit exasperated as so many church people appear to have little interest in anything other than their own greater prosperity and advancement in the church. For their own good and their own congregations they seek to promote certain things, but they are little interested in other matters which are not directly related to the prosperity of the local situation in which they find themselves.

We all have experiences which we never forget and I had an experience last winter which I shall never forget. I was speaking at a ministers' breakfast in Western Canada on "The New Age in Which We Live", and I must confess that I've never spoken to a group of people who were so completely unresponsive and who were so completely disinterested in what I was trying to say. I could not help but think of that phrase "to be ignorant of one's ignorance is the malady of the ignorant." People are not much interested in the world in which we live. We must somehow see that this affects us personally.

Now the world around us can be described in so many ways and from so many different angles that it is difficult to know where to begin. I've just come back from Rochester where, as you perhaps know, the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches is meeting. During the various meetings I was, naturally, thinking about this Conference and about my subject and seeing if I could pick up any new information. Well, I heard many of the things that I'm going to say here, but I'm going to say nothing new.

I attended the Anglican Congress in several sessions and I listened to see what new notes were being struck and I must confess that again there was nothing new that was said, as far as I could see; about the world in which we live. We heard about rapid social change, and all these things. Now, I must confess that I'm going to repeat these same things again. I feel kind of badly about it, but I have to speak about the world around us and what else can I do?

One could describe the world around us in so many ways. At the Vatican Council last year a French Dominican described the world in these words: "If the world was described as a place where one man in every four is Chinese, two men out of every three are starving, one man out of every three lives under Communism, and one Christian out of every two is not Catholic".

Well, that's one way of speaking about the world. A rather startling way of saying what is true and obvious. I think the interesting thing is that such a simple, obvious statement had to be said at the Vatican Council, and moreover that this was one of the arresting and revolutionary

statements which I would think that practically any intelligent person today would just accept as something that everyone knew. Many of the Fathers gathered there at the Vatican evidently with rather narrow views of what the world was or what it demanded of the Council were content to have the purely intra-mural discussions drone on and on and to ignore the world. Well, they found out that they could not do that.

Now another way of picturing the world around us is to see that six simultaneous revolutions are taking place. The revolution of nationalism; of technology; of weapons; of the attitude towards the world community; social and economic revolutions; population explosion. But such a statement as that is so overwhelming that I think we find it makes little impression upon us. For that reason I think it is best for us to settle down to a few often repeated facts, to begin with, about population and poverty. I do not think, even though we have heard these over and over again, that we can really carry on our work today as Christian people unless we are extremely conscious of these facts.

You know that in the year 1800 the population of the world was about one billion. By 1900, or in 100 years it became two billion. The next sixty years it became three billion. Now they tell us that by the year 2000 it is going to be six or seven billion. By the year 2000 three out of every five persons on this planet will be an Asian. There may be more Chinese, actually, than all the non-Asians put together on this planet by the year 2000. The population of the world is said to be increasing at the rate of sixty million people per year; five million a month, or over one million every week. In every 18 weeks, in other words, the world population increases a number equal to the population of Canada. The daily increase in population of India, just India alone, is equal to the population of one of our small cities such as Woodstock, Ontario. Of course, those of you who have been around are struck by the fact that you see people everywhere who are young people.

This increase in population has many effects, but perhaps the most obvious one is that more food is needed. If a hundred and fifty thousand additional people sit down for breakfast every morning a lot of additional something is required. Not only do they have to be fed, but they have to be clothed and housed. Five-eighths of the world suffer from malnutrition. These people are, in some areas, worse off today than a few years ago because the rate of increase in population has been greater than the rate of increase in agricultural production. In fact most of these countries today are feeling very serious problems as far as food is concerned.

When my wife and I were in India we had dinner one evening with the minister of food and he was telling us quite frankly about the very serious situation which India is entering now once again as far as the shortage of food is concerned.

It is somewhat correct to say that the rich nations are getting richer and the poor nations are getting poorer. Malnutrition, of course, cause suffering and pre-mature death. It has other effects which are of great significance to many countries. Malnutrition causes loss of weight and reduction in physical activities, but also characteristic behaviour symptoms, such as lack of mental alertness, coherent and creative thinking, apathy, depressions, irritability, and in extreme cases, loss of moral

standards and social ties. All of these things follow malnutrition. It permits diseases such as tuberculosis, blindness, rickets and anemia, etc., to flourish. There is still another factor about malnutrition which is often overlooked. From the point of view of investment a human being is fed for fifteen years before he begins to produce. Fifteen years of food is invested in a person. In Canada that person will produce for forty-five years thereafter. In the coloured world he can be expected to produce for only fifteen years. Thus thirty years of potential production are lost. When it comes to developing, to creating wealth we must always remember that man's work is the primary resource. The underprivileged can only exploit a small fraction of this basic resource which is man's work. They are therefore handicapped in the start in their production plans, as would be any industry whose machinery wore out in one year instead of three years. Food is essential, but clothes are needed also. Five-eighths of mankind which is badly fed are also badly clothed. The average North American consumes forty pounds of fibre, cotton, flax, linen, and wool, a year. The average Chinese has three and a half pounds -- less than one-tenth. The average North American goes through seventeen hundred pounds of wood each year. That is for building and fuel and other products. At the end of the scale is India who burns cow-dung because of not even having twigs to build a fire. To break the wooden plow is a major catastrophe for the home. In making comparisons I think that there is one other point that I would like to make.

I have heard people say that some of these countries are not as badly off as it appears because while incomes are low, so also are prices. I do not think that this is a valid statement. In North America an agricultural labourer makes, for instance, about six dollars a day. His Indian counterpart makes, perhaps, twenty-five cents a day. The wholesale price on one pound of wheat in the U.S.A. is about three cents. In India it is four and one-half cents. So you see the Indian farm labourer pays one and a half times more for wheat than does the American farm labourer. Although the American farm labourer has earnings twenty-four times higher. Even when you come to rice you find that it is six cents a pound in India, approximately, and its only nine cents a pound in the United States -- not that much higher really.

Let me take an example or two to get a picture. The Indian peasant, for instance, who owns some land is one of the fortunate ones. He is better off than the average. But even he only has an annual income of a hundred dollars. The typical Indian peasant who owns land has four acres, a wife, three children, a cow, and, if he is lucky, a couple of bullocks. He pays fifteen dollars in taxes and twenty-five dollars to the money-lender. Thus he has sixty dollars left to feed himself, his family, and his cattle and to keep his one-room combination home-and-stable in repair. He has, in other words, sixteen cents a day with which he can buy a quarter pound of oil and a one-pound tin of rice. This Indian will die, exhausted, at the age of thirty-two -- an old man.

We'd already said that two-thirds of the world are suffering from malnutrition, disease, and live a life of sheer misery. But let us look at a couple of other examples.

The man you might meet in the market-place in Eastern Pakistan would be a day labourer earning a dollar and fifty-six cents a week. His

life is a constant struggle for food. If he spends all his money for rice there will be twelve ounces a day for a family of six. Twelve ounces at a hundred calories an ounce gives them twelve hundred calories a day. As we talk to this man we remember that in Canada we are taught that a grown man, lying all day and all night in bed, uses twelve hundred calories: but this man can't stay in bed because he has to work to make that one dollar and fifty-six cents a week. If he asks for more money, there will be plenty of people standing there ready to take his job. This man has a job -- therefore he can borrow money. This he often has to do and he pays interest at the rate of sixty percent per annum.

Or, let us walk up to a man in the Middle East. A conversation with him shows that while he has a good job an unemployed man in the U.K. is six times as well off as he is. If I wander into Saudi Arabia I may meet one of the five hundred thousand people who are slaves there who have no rights or privileges and where the suffering is simply enormous -- in this day and generation. The individual instances of suffering that lie behind the selling of wives, the smuggling of children and the exploitation of humans can hardly be imagined. Recently we read in the paper that this thing is supposed to have stopped; but I think that people who know the situation have very grave doubts if they freed anything but a fraction of the half-million people who are virtual slaves in Saudi Arabia.

In Asia alone, where half the population of the world is, one half of the one hundred and thirty million people of school age get no schooling at all. These children are illiterate -- chained to a narrow life of inherited, unproductive soil, they nearly always go to bed hungry. They have little protection from disease and can expect to live only half as long as we do. They are caught in a vicious circle. They can't get an education because they are too poor and they are poor because they are denied an education. Their government cannot afford a free educational system because the people are too poor to pay enough taxes to finance one.

You all know something of the situation in Hong Kong. The assistant director of education there showed my wife and me around and one of the little points that he made out was the fact that if they introduced compulsory education in Hong Kong -- compulsory free education -- it would cost more than what is the present total budget of the colony of Hong Kong. They simply cannot afford to have free education for everybody. So everybody has to pay fees to go to school and therefore only a small fraction of the people get to school.

The average income of the Asian, African, South American, is less than one tenth of ours, and some of course are much lower. Half the world in which we live lives under the shadow of malaria and about two hundred and fifty million suffer from it each year. They estimate something like a million and a half dying from it each year. The loss in productivity due to malaria in India alone they estimate at half a billion dollars. Now I could go on and on and I realize that this may be humdrum information to you, but these facts and many similar ones, such as that there is probably no African child who has not suffered at some time in his life from illness created by an acute shortage of food, are all an integral part of the world around us. If we want to live in our world as we are forced to do I

should not think that we can put these things out of our minds even though we may think that they have nothing whatever to do with us.

At this point I would ask you to turn your eyes from that world about which we have been talking and to look at ourselves. I think that we need to look at ourselves because I don't think that we really understand what has happened to us in the last few years.

We are living, as we know, in an affluent society. We are living in luxury. We are a part of the world where ten percent of the population is getting richer. The U.S.A. industrial firms, we are told, are grinding up more than half the natural resources that are being processed each year on this planet for the benefit of six percent of the world's population. Our memories are very short and we forget that a rich society such as we have is a comparatively new thing. In fact we forget, sometimes, that when we were born things were not like they are now. This is the first time in history when the masses of men in any country were rich like we are. In fact this is the first time in history when the masses of men in all countries were not desperately poor. Also for the first time in history we have nations which are rich. Nearly all people in all nations throughout history have been very poor. The result is that we are living in a new situation and we cannot learn from history how the rich masses, or the rich nations, should act. The wisdom of the ages, the ideas by which we interpret life and the meaning of life -- these were all the product of a world in which poverty had always been man's normal lot. In fact, any other type of existence was not imagined. The wealth of national communities began in countries like England and Holland in the Eighteenth Century and this was one of the momentous events in the history of the human race.

J.M. Keens in a book "Essays in Persuasion" writes "from the earliest times of which we have records, back say to two thousand years before Christ down to the Eighteenth Century that there was no very great change in the standard of living of the average man living in the civilized centres of the world. Ups and downs, certainly: visitations of plagues, famines and wars, golden intervals; but no progress, no violent change."

Adam Smith, who is now, of course, ancient history, foresaw great increase in the aggregate wealth of nations but he did not see that the working masses would benefit, and that their income would ever rise above the minimum level for survival. Other economists believed that mass poverty was the inevitable, perpetual lot of mankind. There have always been a few people who are rich but the bulk of the human race historically has been concerned with the problems of hunger, sickness and cold. It was a world of grim scarcity. Poverty was the all-pervasive fact of the world. This has been the way it's been all along until the present. I think, in passing, it is well for us to note that this was the world in which the church began; in which the church's theology was hammered out; in which our Christian faith was historically expressed. It may be that one of the things we have to do today is rethink the Christian faith in terms of an affluent society because it is certainly different from living in a day of want. The bulk of the world lives the way our ancestors lived and the way

all men in the world lived until just a few years ago. So you see that we are living here in a strange new way of abundance. We are living in a world which is foreign to the historic conditions of the human race and which is foreign to the experience of most people today. We are not pre-occupied with the same things as all men used to be pre-occupied with, and with which practically everybody in the world is pre-occupied today. That is getting something to eat, to ward, and a place to shelter yourself.

Now, it is true that we still have our wants, but our wants are vastly different from the historic wants of mankind. One of the really ridiculous aspects of our life is that we spend millions of dollars on advertising; on trying to persuade ourselves that there are things that we really need; to make us want things. Now very few people throughout the history of the world have needed an ad-man to tell them what they wanted. They wanted food, and shelter, and clothing. Very few people today need to be persuaded what they want. We know all too well what we want. It is all too evident what they need.

In thinking of the world around us we need to see that living in our little secure world of gadgets, of things, and of artificially-induced wants has created a situation where we are cut off from the past and from the world around us. Just the same as the world of poverty made its impact upon the thoughts and the religions of men and still does for those who live in poverty so a world of wealth has profoundly affected us.

It seems to me that we should note something that makes us different from most people in the world. Most people in the world want a revolution. We are against revolution. This is one of the big differences between us and the great people of the world. Now you see, we fail to realize how simple it is to get followers in this world. All you have to do to go anywhere in the world and get followers is simply to stand up on a soap box and say the world must be changed. That's all you have to do. And if you lived there you would listen to that man who said the world had to be changed. The poor person, you see, is interested in change. He's interested in revolution. He has nothing to protect and he is not concerned about safeguarding his position. A revolution -- even a violent one -- may be a desirable one for it offers the possibility of change. Now we don't want revolutions. We want to protect what we have and this results in the well-known pre-occupation that we have with security.

Above all we are against revolutions because revolutions threaten the status quo. Now, most of the world does not feel this way. I think it is most important that we should see that we are automatically out of step with practically the whole of mankind because we do not want a revolution. We want things to stay as they are -- they are so good! They want things to change because they are so bad!

I think whenever we talk about the population explosion and about the poverty of two-thirds of the world's population it should always be accompanied by this look at ourselves that I am trying to give you this afternoon. For this helps us to understand how little we really understand the world around us. As once was pointed out you and I are like people living in a small wealthy suburb and all about us are the vast slums where people live lives of sheer misery and where life is so utterly different that we are not actually living in the same world.

Now I've said a little about three things, if you've been awake and listening to me. The first is the increase in population, about the poverty of the two billion people, and the affluent society in which we live. I realize that I have merely reminded you of what you already know. And I do not apologize for doing that for I was asked to speak on the world around us and it seems to me these facts and figures about life expectation, malnutrition, population growth, famine, disease, ignorance, oppression, and sheer misery can hardly be ignored. I believe that we must constantly remind ourselves that most humans on the earth are hungry most of the time, are helplessly and hopelessly sinking into the quagmire of destitution, suffering and premature death. While in North America billions of dollars are squandered with the nonchalance of pennies in an arcade. We have the luxury of motor cars, television, radio, and our three-- or more -- meals a day. While the majority of people on earth subsist on, at most, three or four meals a week while some satisfy themselves and keep themselves alive by a crumb or two a day.

I repeat that hunger, poverty, disease, and oppression are the daily lot of the majority of the people in this world. We live in a world where only one out of ten thousand people can ever be in a hospital; where only one out of eight thousand can ever be in a clinic. We live in a world where our per capita income is thirty-two times that of what it is in India.

And now, if I may, I would like to be rather personal in reporting some of the things that I see. As I have mentioned before I have seen some of these countries and understood something of the problems that there are there. The Bible Society is at work in over a hundred countries and one does make very good friends in places such as Brazil, and Peru, and India, and Indonesia, and Hong Kong, and Burma, and so forth. From reading and from personal contacts and from visits, I venture to say some things which I firmly believe to be true; things which I think are open to question and some things with which you may tell me you do not agree. -- which suits me fine as long as you can tell me why you are right and why I'm wrong.

On this recent trip my wife and I were in fifteen different countries and I think that just a sentence or two about these countries will, perhaps, help you see something of the impression that you get which you don't get from reading our newspapers.

One thing is this terrible state of turmoil that there is in the world -- the instability of society which is so very evident. When we were in Italy the election campaign was on and it was quite a thing to see these great banners across the street urging people to vote Communist. I intended to take a few pictures and bring them back to show to my American friends, but I didn't. But you could see something of the spirit -- "Vote Communist" -- this was a real issue there and believe me they polled a lot of votes, as you know.

You move on to Greece and there you could feel the tension created by ancient grinding poverty. You could sense the resentfulness of the wealth of the few. You knew how real poverty is, and underneath is simply seething unrest throughout the whole of life -- discontent, discontent.

In Egypt the tourist going through has no consciousness whatsoever of the real situation under which these people are living in that land. A land where only fifteen percent are literate; where many people live, literally, like animals. But it's a world where you really realize that people are living in tension and they do not know what the future has. I'm not suggesting that there's going to be a change or anything like that.

When we flew into Jordan there were only thirteen on the plane built to carry eighty passengers because of revolution.

When we arrived in Jerusalem there were five thousand troops patrolling the streets of Jerusalem. Riots had been on. Ten thousand students had marched through the city the previous Saturday and some three students had been shot as they tried to pull down the Jordanian flag. Curfew on every afternoon at two o'clock. All the people had to be off the streets and the stores closed. You get something of the sense of what it was like to live in a land where you never knew what was going to happen. And, of course, I haven't time to go into the background of why all this is, and what is taking place although it is very easy to figure it all out when you are there.

India. Some of you, of course, I know are missionaries from India. I don't need to tell you that India is at war. This is a thing that amazed us, I must confess, to find that literally a quarter of the paper is given over every day to war talk. They are at war! Something that they cannot afford. One wonders if this is China's way of stopping the progress that India is obviously making. India, of course, is in a tremendous state of turmoil and I haven't time to deal with that here.

We'll go on to Burma. In Burma we found a revolutionary government. No visitors' visas permitted. All you could get were transit visas. There you have a government which has no semblance of democracy. A government which the people, I think, honestly welcome because it has done something about this awful corruption which there was in the land.

And you could sit and talk about Thailand with their great consciousness about the fact that China is to the North of them and they do not know what will happen in the future because so many people in that part of the world, and I talked with some pretty knowledgeable people, say that within our lifetime they fear that the whole country will come under the influence of the mainland of China.

Go to the Philippines where you have again so many problems. Corruption again in government, slums. It's quite a thing tonight to see boys and girls going ahead of the garbage trucks along the edge of the streets to go through the garbage before the trucks get there. This is a nightly and daily routine, for many, many people. The Chinese are there in numbers. The Chinese are not hated, but they are certainly feared to a certain extent. There is a deep hatred of the Japanese. There is a resentment of the West.

And then, of course, you could go to Hong Kong. You could mention Taiwan. You could mention Japan. But what I'm trying to say is that this is the world, you see. Whatever one felt about these countries one thing seemed certain. They are all determined to change and every one of these is in a state of nation-building.

Nation building. This is an amazing thing. Even Hong Kong. Its rather surprising but Hong Kong doesn't ask for our help. Hong Kong is only asking for one thing -- that we buy their products. That's all they ask. Buy their products. They are willing to look after themselves. They are willing to live and they are proud of the fact that they can.

I was amazed at the changes that I saw in my superficial way after four years. There is a new smell abroad in the world today. It is a smell of fresh cement. Wherever one goes there is building, building. Its the smell of this decade -- fresh cement. The Bible Society has launched a campaign which we call "God's Word for a New Age" which I'll tell you about any time you'd like me to, but I won't tell you right now. We were looking for a symbol and the symbol we chose was a Sputnik. It was rather interesting that the Asian people said "We don't want that symbol. The symbol of the new age is not Sputniks or rockets. The symbol of the new age for us is dams, and bull dozers, and tractors, and factories, and radio, and television, and roads, and jets, and trucks." This is the new age. This is the spirit that you find in the world. Unrest, turmoil, revolution, and also a flexing of the muscles and the determination to move ahead. I would say that no one knows how these people are going to change things and they don't know themselves, but they know that they are going to change them.

Most countries have barely got started, but there is a determination to advance. Japan, of course, has arrived. Japan is now, practically, an affluent society -- believe it or not! They've got as many television aerials as we have. They've got more cars than we have. I hate to quote statistics on their cars, but I've heard that there are ten thousand additional cars on the streets of Tokyo every month and its quite possibly true, but one has only to go and see the people holidaying and water-skiing and boating, and all the rest to realize that Japan is now practically an affluent society. I mentioned water-skiing. It was rather interesting in Israel to see the water-skiing on the Sea of Galilee -- quite different from the Bible pictures that we have, but perhaps these are the pictures that we should be having with our children today -- people water-skiing on the sea of Galilee -- because this is the new world.

The Philippines are moving ahead with their nation-building. When the U.S.A. left that country it wasn't a colony (because the Americans didn't have any colonies), but when they left only twenty-five per cent were literate. Now they are rapidly changing that and literacy is spreading throughout the land.

I mentioned nation-building and I would like to say something about this because I think it is notable that nation-building is perhaps the number one characteristic of Asia and Africa and, to a similar degree, Latin America. This is something about which I think we have not heard as much as we should have. We are going to have it in our mission study next year, or the year after -- the New Nations.

Well, I think it is not easy for us to understand in Canada, because, you see, we in Canada are not in a state of nation-building. This is one of the things that we are not. In fact, we are very much filled with

uncertainty about the future of our nation. This is a very real fact. Some of our best minds -- many people like Hugh MacLennan, the novelist, express our doubts when he said he is more disturbed about Canada today than ever before with our regionalism, our separatism, our lack of a sense of destiny, the fact that we don't know what our national anthem is, and we're not sure about our flag; and the fact that a man like the Premier of B.C. could get up the other day and say that we'd rather buy from England than Ontario.

How can you build a nation with this type of attitude and spirit -- it's a free country, a man can say anything he wants to say -- but I am just saying you cannot build a nation on this type of spirit.

Now, you see, this is completely different from what you find throughout the world. It's in sharp contrast to what you find everywhere else, because these people are very much aware of themselves -- they are self-conscious and self-confident.

Think of little British Honduras which is going to get its independence shortly. Only a handful of people, you might say, but the British Hondurans I was interested to note think the eyes of the whole world are upon them -- they are so conscious of their nationhood.

Political independence, re-surgence of ancient religions, increasing literacy, population explosion, all of these are there, but now these are all seen within the context of nation-building. This is something which I think is new and this is something which I picked up in Manila and in Asia as I travelled this time. These things I've mentioned, such as the resurgence of ancient religions and literacy and the population explosion, have acquired a greater, not a lesser significance, but not for what they represent in themselves, but for what they can do for the nation. Nationalism is now, for instance, not merely the expression of patriotic feeling or pride in ancient heritage. It is the urge towards nation-building. One meets with gigantic programmes everywhere. People point to them with pride because they promise to alter the face of country after country in a short time. It's part of nation-building and nationalism. Or Freedom -- freedom is more than a word now. In this day of nation-building content is being poured into that word "freedom". The vision of a new life is to be realized by means of building the nation. Aristotle's definition has at last come to life in these areas and the state is now charged with the responsibility, as Aristotle said, to provide the conditions under which men could live the good life. This development and the underlying hopefulness of the masses and a desire to bring big changes marks a break with the past and with the traditional and static natures particularly of Asian society. I shall have more to say about this later. But in viewing the world around us it is obvious that in vast areas of the world the big thing now is one thing and that is nation-building. This is what the new age means.

And you see, when you come back to Canada you can't help but wonder what is wrong with us Canadians. And the people of the world, of course, think that we are just stupid sitting here on half a Continent and we haven't enough brains to know how to run our own nation. This is the attitude of the educated people of the world today. They just can't understand the people of Canada. They are building a nation and here we

are sitting on our wealth and we are running an annual deficit in our budget for a billion dollars. To me it just doesn't make sense and this is why we have lost all our prestige that we gained after the war, because in a day of nation-building we are talking about splitting up and dividing and fighting among ourselves. One little demagogue someplace is saying something and another little demagogue some place else is saying something and that's as far as it goes. But let me go on with this nation-building.

Side by side with the period of nation-building is another factor that is mentioned cautiously but persistently today and this is one thing that you don't hear much about. It is corruption in public life. You can't talk about the world around you today without facing this fact. Now there has always been a certain amount of corruption, but the people of Asia and Africa and Latin America will tell you it is now a very serious problem. Most new nations have planned economies -- five year plans, and so forth. What must be seriously noted is that there is a definite connection between planning and corruption, which has come to the surface. One Christian leader in India speaking, in Manila, of India recently said: "Planning appears to be the most potent single factor in fostering corruption. Where you have a planned economy with its inevitable concentration of power in the hands of the ruling party and officials you have the ideal set-up for corruption. A corrupt official plus extraordinary power is a horror and a social curse."

Recently, when the results of the first five-year plan and the second five-year plans in terms of increase in national income were made before the Indian parliament the Prime Minister very pertinently asked: "Where did this extra income go?" And Nehru voiced the suspicion of millions of others in the country that perhaps the additional income went to fatten the purses of individuals, rather than bring relief to the poverty-stricken masses.

Now, there is no way that we can avoid the fact that corruption is rampant. I heard too many stories about what is happening in hospitals, in schools, in churches, with relief in Latin America and elsewhere. The superstructure of these nations merely affords additional opportunities for exploitation and self-aggrandisement. And you see what happens! In Pakistan, why did they put in a dictatorial government? Why were they glad to get rid of the democratic government in Burma? Because of the sheer corruption. The new government in the Philippines had promised to get rid of corruption. Why is it that Communist China makes people sit up? Because one of the greatest things they have done, and this seems to be a fairly accurate report, is the moral reformation that has come to China under the Communists.

This crippling corruption is a very real part of the world around us. It threatens every democratic government. It creates a situation which cries out for an authoritarian government. Now, needless to say, considerable disillusionment has arisen because of the failure of nations to govern themselves as they hoped.

There is no suggestion that any nation would return to foreign control or that the revolution of rising expectations has spent itself. It is simply, rather, that the nations are learning how long and hard a

way they have to go if they are to take their places in the world. I think that we should note the principle upon which nation-building is taking place.

In all the current planning and in pursuit of the ideal of the welfare state there is the conspicuous absence of reference to religion -- Christianity or any other. It is not clear whether any religious foundation is at all considered necessary by the planners: although in India, for instance, one occasionally hears of the ancient spiritual heritage upon which the present structures are supposed to be founded. But the goals defined at present are not found in the ideals of the past and they have been inspired by ideas which were never a part of the country's ancient religious lore. Essentially the various national plans operating at present are adaptations of the experiments started in other lands, such as Europe, U.S.A., Japan -- the Beveridge plan, the new deal, the Russian and Japanese experiments, have all contributed in some way. These plans have been adopted, taking into account the differences in social structures, traditions, peculiar needs, and other features. But the philosophic and religious foundations and pre-suppositions which had underlain the adopted plans have not been considered. It's taken for granted, in these new nations, that man is the master of his destiny and that the proper use of economic resources will itself guarantee posterity and peace. These plans for nation-building even in Islamic states such as Egypt and Pakistan, or in a Bhuddist state such as Ceylon are peculiarly secular. The Hindu state is a secular state. Even Israel which one might think might be a religious state is a secular state. The goal consists of increasing the nation's wealth. No one will quarrel with the goal of raising the standard of living and increasing industrialization and employment. But when a nation considers that acquisition of wealth is the highest good that its problems are only material, then that nation is building on a very facile foundation according to our standards.

The fact that man, even with food, shelter, and clothing, will not only have problems, but will be a problem is both unrealized and ignored. The secularist philosophy is basic to the actual plans of new nations, even though lip-service is given to historic faiths. It may be that secularism always accompanies a technological, industrial civilization. However, there are some points, for instance in the case of India, which I think should be noticed.

The General Secretary of the Bible Society there, on the point of how they are building an Indian nation without religion, says: "the rapidity with which the religious outlook is disappearing in India is alarming. Even though one might not have approved of all the popular and traditional expressions of this outlook one would have granted that at least a sense of the supernatural was deeply ingrained in the people, and that it tended to influence to an enormous extent their everyday activities. Moreover, there was recently the special impetus provided by the life and work of Mahatma Gandhi. However, the present-day tendency is to follow Nehru rather than Gandhi; to adopt a humanistic rather than a religious outlook. In social behaviour, education, and national past-times it is this humanistic approach that is becoming apparent." He also goes on to mention about how today one of the most popular people they read is Ingersoll, the man

who was popular in this country a long time ago. But it is just another way of pointing this out, because I think it is tremendously important to have this nationhood and that they are building it in a purely secularistic way.

We have heard of the revival of ancient religions so often. It may seem strange to you that I say that while no one would deny that there has been a tremendous upsurge in many parts of the world of these religions and in some cases a successful attempt for these religions to accommodate themselves to modern life. Still among all educated people today there is a loss of faith in all religions and in all the old gods. This may not seem apparent, you see, as you move about. For instance, we visited Benares and when you see the literally hundreds of pilgrims come with tremendous devotion to bathe in the holy Ganges hoping perhaps that when they die their ashes will be thrown there; when you visit the Benares Hindu University of 15,000 students with the very heart of that university a great Hindu temple it may look as though this is a truly religious situation: but people who know the situation tell me that the people who are in that university are secularists and the education is a secular education. This whole business of the temple being there is utterly meaningless to those people.

You move into Thailand and you would think that it is a tremendously religious nation. There are more Bhuddist temples in Thailand than there are Protestant Christians -- 34,000 Bhuddist temples. You would think it was a religious land; but nevertheless, this is not the case. A profound philosophical change has taken place in the world which can best be described as a loss of faith or the inability of man to believe. A practical atheism seems to follow whenever these people have been delivered from ignorance and superstition. What is not generally appreciated is that Communism is the logical philosophy for men to follow, if atheism is accepted the individual is not regarded as a child of God. To the true Marxist belief in the existence of the supernatural is an objective lie; it's a bad thing; the lie that God exists hinders man from perfecting himself and society by his own acts. What you have embodied in Communism is a mechanistic, deterministic view of life. It makes the individual a tool in the machine of society.

Well this, whether it's called Communism or expressed in Communism is the basic view which seems to be permeating your University life and the thinking of people. In spite of the fact that you have this facade of religion all about you it seems to me to be rather meaningless.

To think of this loss of faith being caused by Communism is quite incorrect. Rather the reverse is true. Communism follows the breakup of the old beliefs. When we speak of a loss of faith I do not want you to think that I am speaking of a Christian faith; I am speaking of something different. This is where I, of course, feel that the Christian church has never really penetrated to this situation in which we are living in the world. It doesn't seem to realize what has happened in the world in which we live. Here we are thinking that we are living in a world where God is up there. This is what, of course, "Honest to God" is trying to bring out. He's trying to point out that we have reached this

loss of faith and perhaps he's trying to get us back to a position where we can believe, even though we have lost many of the things that we believed in.

You see, there has been this great change. So long as there was believed to be a God in the sky men could regard Him as the source of their ideals. The universe created and governed by a fatherly God was a friendly habitation for man. We could be sure that however great the evil in the world good in the end would triumph and the forces of evil would be routed.

Thus the world which surrounds us is nothing but a vast spiritual emptiness. The universe in which we live is not on our side of values but is completely indifferent to them. This loss of faith is creating a world-wide crises. Purposelessness is the one indisputable fact about the universe. Man's ideals are his own creation. The universe outside him in no way supports him. Man is alone and friendless in the world.

One of the great characteristics about the age in which we live is what I would call the inability of men to believe. In many cases they would like to believe but in the light of the evidence that there is they simply cannot believe the old ways of life, and the old gods and the old faiths have been swept away. This, of course, has not come about suddenly. As soon as philosophy and history taught men to seek not what is safe, but what is true all the traditional systems of belief were thrown into disarray. Attempts have been made from time to time to provide new bases for faith. The age of reason was one of these, but after 1914 the breakdown of confidence in the idols in the age of reason and the brave new world which democracy and science and moral idealism and liberal religion had promised to create the breakdown of all this was all too apparent. What has happened has been described as the breakdown of civilization. Albert Schweitzer called it "disintegration of modern thought". So many people quote Schweitzer without realizing what started him on his pilgrimage -- the fact that he saw that the whole business had collapsed and was collapsing. Men felt themselves back then, and they do now again, caught in the toils of collectivism and they fear the destruction of individual personality and responsibility. This is one of the things that has come in upon men. This, of course, is how you get your Nihilistic philosophy and Existentialist and so on. This is what they are trying to grapple with.

Out of this, of course, there are people who wonder what is going to happen. There are people like Adolph Huxley who has a tremendous influence all over the world. Huxley, generally speaking you might say, holds that the nightmare of total organization has now emerged from the safe, remote future and is awaiting us just around the corner. He argues that we are facing as mankind an impending shortage of goods because of over-population which will drive mankind towards dictatorship. In most parts of the world the population explosion is so far outstripping economic growth that it must force governments to assume more and more responsibility for the general welfare. And when you look around don't you see this? This will mean less and less individual freedom. This trend is predictable even if Communism, he says, were not an organized imperialist system which it is. And if there was nothing like Communism, we'd have to invent something. But Communism has been invented. Given this fact, he says, the

probability of over-population leading through unrest to dictatorship becomes a virtual certainty. Its a pretty safe bet that twenty years from now all the world's over-populated and under-developed countries will be under some form of totalitarian rule -- probably by the Communist party.

He goes on to say that it is true that there would be attempts to stop this. He does not see how they will succeed, and he says that after all we are all pretty well prepared for this with our political slogans and our singing commercials and the demand for conformity which you find on all sides.

Now, I do not think we need to listen to Huxley seriously ourselves or pay too much attention to him but he is a voice to be listened to and like so many other people who are serious people, really serious, looking at the world, their picture of the world is utterly dark.

What has the church to say to our world? I hope that you realize this, friends. The issue as you can see is not such questions that I hear discussed -- apostolic succession and the claim to the papacy and baptismal regeneration and the relation of the church and state -- but with the fundamental grounds of belief. This is what is before us today. How will man build a new world? He is going to build a new world. How can he do it? How will man affect the changes which are taking place, and which must take place -- this is the fundamental problem, the thing that the church should be grappling with. As I will be saying in my next lecture I can't find that the church is even aware that this problem exists let alone grappling with it in our day and generation.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE GOSPEL
IN A WORLD OF RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE

(I)

by

Miss O. Jessie Lace
 Senior Lecturer and Tutor
William Temple College

I am very glad indeed that Dr. Newberry referred to the Apostolic preaching of Acts and Professor Dodd's book on the subject. All I therefore need say now is that I am taking as read the understanding, which has developed and come to be very much taken for granted in the church over the last few decades, that the Gospel is the preaching of the Resurrection. And when you endeavour to discuss the relevance of this Gospel you are trying to discover what is the relevance of this fact -- I have read my Bultmann, as you have, so I hesitate on the word "fact" -- in relation to the world which was described to us all last night as a new, revolutionary, so-rapidly-changing-that-we-can't-keep-up-with-it world, this world in which we live.

What is the relevance, to that world that was described, of the assertion which has been the characteristic Christian Gospel throughout the centuries that God raised Jesus, now known as Christ, then known as of Nazareth, from death. This is the phrase more frequently used in the New English Bible -- "from death" rather than "from the dead". This seems to me to be one of the better new phrasings of the N.E.B.

This afternoon I want to talk about mankind. It is extremely difficult to define a human being. I was thinking slightly differently about this when I was listening to your conversation this morning about women and men. Subsequently I have some comments to make about that which, as I say, I was very much interested to hear.

When we are thinking in theological terms, and I suggest to you that it may be true to say this, that man is a being whose nature God may assume and He has. I found it interesting to put that into reverse and see what happened. This is what happened -- God is not a being whose nature man may assume (though man continually strives to do this).

I am suggesting to you that that way of describing man is part of the Gospel. It is good news about man to say that God has shared his nature. The Christian, of course, has the highest, most ambitious, doctrine of man. He must, because otherwise he cannot have a doctrine of incarnation. At least he cannot have the Christian doctrine of incarnation which says that God took upon himself manhood. I think this an extremely important point about the Gospel in the modern world for two reasons.

One is that so far as I have yet been able to discover in various countries -- this is not just true of my own -- it is commonly assured

outside Christian circles that the church has a very low estimate of man. There is a phrase going round in England now that the church is generally supposed to have a vested interest in sin. And unless the United Church of Canada is very different from all the others I have had any dealings with I think we have to realize that mistaken as this judgment may be it is not difficult to understand how people get this idea -- the idea that Christians are people who go around goading at people how bad they are, in order to bring them in and make them all right.

The second reason why I think this is important in the modern world is the very great danger that some people at any rate think we are in, and they may be right, of losing faith in mankind when we look at the world in the perspective and proportions that we have to accept; that the bigger everything gets the faster everything gets, the remoter and yet at the same time closer everything gets, less and less does the ordinary man feel that he has any -- not so much I think control over it because he knows that other men who were grander or more powerful than himself have got some control over it -- but he feels he hasn't got a grip on it. Again I don't know whether you think this is true and I hope you will discuss it, but it is certainly something that is being said a great deal. Both for this reason within the church -- that part of the public image of the church that she has a vested interest in sin and is largely concerned to tell people how bad they are -- and partly because of the alleged retreat of the ordinary man from trying to grapple with the world in which he lives it seems to me of primary importance that Christians should be presenting the Gospel of the greatness of mankind.

The first way, of course, to do it is to point out to yourselves and to other people that all of the great achievements which lie behind the accelerating of this process of change that we have been talking about are man's achievements. They really are man's achievements. This seems to be another thing which quite a lot of religious people think isn't quite decent to say, but it is true. These are not God's achievements, but ours. God's achievements are way, way, way back. I'm not going to suggest that they are all over or anything like that, but God was in this scientific racket creating it millions of years before whatever you think about time. We started finding out about it and our discovery of it is our great achievement -- one of our great achievements -- and we should be proud of it. We should rejoice in it and it seems to me that in the Christian churches today we are called upon to fall over backwards to say that this is what we think about it -- that it is a great demonstration of the greatness of man.

Now, that is one particular way of talking about the greatness of man which seems to me to be the most relevant one in the immediate context of what you have been hearing about, and talking about. One could choose lots of others. One had been hearing historical accounts of the developments of almost anything you might like to think of. The corresponding kind of point can be made and we could do this in a whole series of talks and lectures. But having established, at least to my own satisfaction, that one point, I now have to jump, of course, to the end of this argument -- at least the final point of this argument.

Man is a being whose nature God may assume and he has. This is what the Christians says about Jesus of Nazareth and before the stark statement of the Gospel of the Resurrection (stark statement that God has raised Jesus from death) makes any sense to anybody quite a lot of things have got to be said -- a) about God; b) about Jesus; c) about death - life of course really. But in order to make that statement mean anything at all those terrific words which occur in it have got to have some content fed into them. We, of course, have it; but we are talking about the relevance of the Gospel in terms of preaching it to other people. What content do we give to these words before we set out to do that? Of those three the one that I would venture to say something about in this session is the middle one -- talking about man. God has assumed man's nature and this is to talk about Jesus.

If He were with us now He would be rejoicing that a new world is being born. After all what He came to do was to give birth to something new or to call something new to birth. Perhaps you think that the new creation of which Paul speaks is something quite different from this new world which is being born on this planet. I don't think it is. This I would take to have been part of the measure, the stature, of his manhood. He would certainly not be amongst those who were found fearful of new ideas, new knowledge, new possibilities. Nor would he, I think, have found himself unable to grapple with whatever it was. Is there not plenty of evidence that his ability to grapple with whatever he was faced with in his lifetime one of the very, very striking characteristics about him as a person?

Now, after his death and when they began thinking about these implications of this belief that they had about his having been raised from death there was, of course, a large variety of ways in which they tried to talk about it. I want to turn our attention now to the particular one which is found in the letter to the Hebrews.

The stock quote from Bultmann, as far as I'm concerned, is the one to this effect -- "a man lived and died, all else is interpretation." This seems to me a simple statement of the truth and one of the interpretations is found in the Letter to the Hebrews. May I just remind you of the opening of this -- I'm reading from the R.S.V. -- "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by prophets. But in these last days he has spoken to us by His Son whom He appointed the heir of all things, through whom also He created the world. He reflects the glory of God and bears the very stamp of His nature, upholding the universe by His word of power. When He had made purification for sins He sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high, having become as much superior to angels as the name he has obtained is more excellent than theirs. For to what angel did God ever say 'Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee', or again... (and you will remember all this string of quotations from the Old Testament. And then remember the second chapter picks up with the practical reminder of all this.) Therefore we must pay closer attention to what we have heard lest we drift away from it. For if the message declared by angels was valid in every transgression or disobedience received for just retribution how can we escape...etc., etc."

Now such justification as there is for this misunderstanding of Christianity as having a vested interest in sin is of course to be found right in the beginning of that particular interpretation that I have read of the work of Jesus. "When he had made purification for sins He sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high."

Our quick reaction, I suppose, to being invited to regard man as great and to regard mankind as good is to say "oh, but that isn't how it is. It isn't like that at all", and our tragedy, perhaps, is that we don't manage frequently or quickly enough to swing back from the good to the bad and back again through this medium of what we believe to have been the reconciling, redeeming, purification of sins that is here the work of Jesus.

Is this, or is this not, a Gospel, in the sense of being a good and welcome news? To me, personally, it is. To many people with whom I talk, and to whom I talk, it seems that it is. What I want to say about it is that I am quite certain it ought to be. I would like, or perhaps this isn't a good illustration -- I haven't seen an awful lot of this here -- but in England there are quite a lot of societies who put up posters with texts on them and a certain number of them who slash them on walls with whitewash and so on. Just a short sentence, you see, "Jesus died for our sins". Now, if I had unlimited money I would like to endow an organization which would go round following all those up with "and was brought back from death for our justification". It would be scriptural; it would be true; it would be proper; and it would do this bringing back of the whole point of the incarnation surely onto the up-going, positive, good, proper, in my view, level that the Gospel has come. If the Gospel is something to do with a Gospel of forgiveness and recovery from sin what is all this for? Just that all these things may be forgotten and put out of the way in order that man may get on with the job of being human. So often I think that being human is being as we are and that Jesus was exceptional. Of course, it was he that was really human and we who fail to be quite human.

This point was underlined in my mind this morning when somebody got up -- I've no idea who it was, but I hope you don't mind -- and said that she was very human and then she went on to say how weak she was. Now, this is what we normally mean. But would not our Gospel be more relevant if we switched this one over too and suggested to people that we are not, you see, human like this. I am not suggesting that weakness isn't part of human nature, but I wanted to make the point that it isn't the characteristic thing.

The proper understanding of the nature of man is to be found by looking at the nature of Jesus in His full, living, death (of course because this is essential to our understanding of His work), His coming back from death and bringing to the world a new life -- positive, full, on-going, all the adjectives you can think of. Now, if it is true that mankind in general is rather afraid of the new world in which he finds himself now, it seems to me a quite simple position that it would be good news to tell him that he doesn't have to be afraid of it because this is what real man is

really like. Mankind by proper definition has the imagination, the courage, the initiative, the ability, to respond to all the new possibilities which are opened up by all these revolutions.

But what is the Gospel to all this. The Gospel, surely, to all this is that in this century too man is this great and incredibly complex stage in creation, but so great, so complex, so aware, so powerful, so endowed with understanding, that he is in fact this being whose nature God may-assume and has.

I myself believe that it is against such a background as this that the Gospel as more specifically understood in terms of the preaching of forgiveness on the basis of belief in the resurrection and so on, really may come to life again. I am quite sure that with you it is the same as with us that a lot of people get very depressed in Christian circles because they say what's the good of preaching the Gospel of forgiveness of sins when nobody wants their sins forgiven even if they think they've got any and they don't anyway. This is a word which is out. There is a sense in which the word has got to be brought in again, but surely not in the way in which some people are afraid to try to do it. We are trying to suggest to people that things which they've always thought were quite good, and honest, and successful, were in fact really bad and undesirable. This seems to me quite illegitimate and psychologically disgraceful.

The way to stimulate, I think, the sense of inadequacy which indeed is a necessary background for the preaching of the full Gospel is, I suggest, to try to discover for ourselves a new picture of adequate man -- a new picture of adequacy.

Are you familiar with the much-quoted dictum of Tillich when he finishes up by saying that the need for modern man is the need for meaning? Well, isn't this the meaning that we should be preaching in terms of our new world: putting it to people that this is an enormous human achievement: putting it to people that although most of us have not got the intellectual equipment to put us in the lead in any of this it is all part of us -- all part of the work of mankind. The top scientist, top engineer, the top whatever-you-think-of in these terms, the top town planner, is mankind and we are associated with him, or aren't we, or ought we not to be? And are we not called upon as Christians to throw all the weight of our thinking and the exercise of our responsibilities as citizens in this sense of appreciating that these great moves forward, these great achievements, are in a sense done on our behalf. Just as we call people to enter into the life of the Christian church in terms of what God has done which has been done on our behalf there, so it seems to me that this is a proper background for our understanding of the Gospel.

Finally I would just put it in this excessively risky form, but I hope you will take my point. I will just have to take this risk. You can't really talk about these things adequately anyway. Is it not true that, generally speaking, we have an idea of the order of creation as presented to us mythologically in Genesis? And you go up from the, using the old connections; from the inanimate to the animate and so on. You get up to man

at the top through the mammals to man and you say all this is the work of God. What I am really suggesting to you is that if you are really going to make any divisions here in your thinking you must take seriously my initial statement that Christians who say that God is made man in Jesus Christ have got to perhaps make a much bigger space in their thinking between man and the creation over which he has dominion. And perhaps see this in rather different proportion with the relation between man and God. From what we, I think, quite properly tend to do which is to put God so far away that we and the rest of the creation are so lumped together as creatures that our understanding of the nature of man becomes quite unworthy of the doctrine of incarnation. This has partly happened because we've tried to keep up with the astronomers and all these people who have made everything so vague. In all this "Honest to God" debate which is the title of the next book which is coming out, this is part of the basic problem -- for most people I think it is the most basic problem -- the problem of size. Although it looks like a problem of three-tiered universes and all these things which I suspect we are all getting pretty tired of because we've all known this for ages. We struggle to think of God as big enough and of course we can't. I don't think it is more difficult than its ever been -- it must have been fantastically difficult to adjust your idea of God when you first learned that there wasn't any up and down. This idea is some hundreds of years old. It hasn't just been discovered. But it is only a few hundred years old and it must have been fantastically difficult to displace God when you've discovered that there wasn't any more up and down.

I mustn't get sidetracked. I think we have honestly tried to stretch our ideas of God and it's a proper and right thing to do. But I have a nasty feeling that because of that, done with all good faith, we have failed to keep up with what we are called upon to do if the Gospel is to be relevant which is to increase also our concept of man; to take not only what the physicist tells us about the scale of the universe as being something that challenges our dimensions of God, but also to take the very existence of the physicist and his knowledge and what he is able to do -- what the technicians have been able to do in the way of making the new machines and telescopes and things of that sort -- that all this must surely call from us Christians of all people a claim to the great potential of mankind. On the contrary, this is something over which man is going to have dominion. The Genesis myth of creation and man having dominion, God giving man dominion, over the animals and his telling them to give them names and so on can be transposed right into all the things that we were hearing about yesterday. This I think is the first relevant thing about the Gospel in the modern world as I understand it. From this we go to what I will try to say something about after dinner, which is what has always traditionally been thought of, and I think still is, the heart of the Gospel -- which is what Christians have to say about why the picture doesn't look like, or what I have tried to suggest -- encouraging people to think what it ought to look like. I expect you all know this story -- about the lay preacher who was expounding the doctrine of creation, expounding Genesis and, as I understand lay preachers are inclined to do, he rather over-enumerated his examples and when he got to Adam giving the names to the animals he got a bit tired, you know, and he'd been trying to explain all these you see and when he got to the lion he said "Well you know he called him a lion because after all it looked like a lion."

But this is what I wish to present to you in terms of, remember, I said three words in the Gospel -- God raised Jesus from death; and Jesus, the one I have picked out of those three for the first time and have tried to talk to you about man and to say what I think Christians ought to be saying about man and his potential in the modern world.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE GOSPEL
IN A WORLD OF RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE

(II)

I want to begin by reading a fairly long piece from the Epistle to the Romans -- one of the passages which we normally study when we are thinking about the problem of the law and we are trying to get to the bottom of what Paul is saying about the law and all the problems associated with this for him in the early church. But if you listen to this passage with your ear tuned to the word death you will hear it quite frequently.

"Do you not know brethren, for I am speaking to those who know the Lord, that the law is binding on a person only during his life. Thus a married woman is bound by law to her husband so long as he lives. But if her husband dies she is discharged from the law concerning her husband. Accordingly she will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man while her husband is alive. If her husband dies she is free from that law and if she marries another man she is not an adulteress. Likewise, my brethren you have died to the law through the body of Christ so that you may belong to another; to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit to God. While we were living in the flesh our sinful passions aroused by the law were at work in our members to bear fruit for death, but now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive so that we serve, not under the old written code, but the new life of the spirit.

"What shall we say then that the law is sin, by no means. Yet if it had not been for the law I should not have known sin; I should not have known what it is to covet if the law had not said 'Thou shalt not covet'. But sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, wrought in me all kinds of covetousness. Apart from the law sin lies dead. I was once alive apart from the law. When the commandment came sin revived and I died. The very commandment which promised life proved to be death to me, for sin finding opportunity in the commandment deceived me and by it killed me so the law is holy and the commandment is holy and just and good. Did that which is good then bring death to me? By no means! It was sin working death in me through what is good in order that sin might be shown to be sin and through the commandment might become sinful beyond measure. But we know that the law is spiritual. I am carnal, sold unto sin. I do not understand my own actions for I do not do what I want but I do the very thing that I hate. Now, if I do what I want I agree that the law is good. So then it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me. For I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do, and if I do what I do not want it is no longer I that do it but sin which dwells in me."

And then the beginning of the following chapter eight -- the much-quoted and preached on -- "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death". And here, particularly let us just put the familiar idea of the "law discussion" into the secondary position and bring up to the first position in this verse and whole passage the contrast of death and life here.

The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death. We don't know how literally Paul read the Old Testament. We don't know whether he took the story of the Fall as history but it is quite clear that he takes seriously the underlying assumption of the story of the Fall which is that death entered into human experience because of man's disobedience to the expressed will of God. I assume that I'm speaking for everybody in this room when I say that we do not believe that there ever was one or more doesn't matter, human beings in the Eden story situation with a direct, specific, single commandment 'Do not eat the fruit of that tree', and they did and that was it. The questions earlier this evening about psychology raise extremely pertinent issues here as to what we mean by sin and disobedience: what we think about the beginnings of man's unsatisfactoriness, man's first disobedience: was there a man's first disobedience? Well, I don't personally think so and I don't really see how it is possible to go on using this part of the mythology. I think this part of the mythology is perhaps the most impossible because it is so contrary to our knowledge of the development of human personality and I think whereas the "heaven and hell mythology" can be used as mythology because we recognize it for what it is and it has a sort of poetic contribution to make. I think the sin and fall mythology is worse than useless to us because it is really contrary to what we know about the development of human personality. I hope that somebody will come back at me about this because I don't expect you will agree about it, but that is what I think.

So, we are in real difficulty I think about death because of the close association between death and sin in the minds of this particular New Testament writer -- noticeably this New Testament writer because of the way in which he uses it in relation to his main argument and his problem about the law. It seems to me, and again you may not agree about this, that whether or not his taking "The Fall" story as history he is taking the idea of the close relation between sin and death as a viable idea. So long as you are just talking about death meaning the end of any particular living span of any particular human being that to make any sort of cause and effect relation between sin and that is quite outside our thinking at all.

Death is an end to something. Christians rightly want immediately to go on and say "Yes, but it's the beginning of something else". But I want just to keep off other worlds and eternal life at the moment. Death is the end and we talk about the deaths, not only of human beings, but of civilizations, nations, epochs, and this is what we mean. We mean they have come to an end. They are over, finished. They may leave legacies. Civilizations rise and fall and the nations and races who have created them die and the civilization dies in that nobody goes on living like it. But their legacies are left behind. We enjoy the legacies of a number of major civilizations which we would now say are dead: so this is a coming to an end.

And it has been suggested, very powerfully, to us that the alternative to the sort of human prospect which I tried to indicate earlier on today as being what I thought Christians had ought to believe in. The alternative to that is the death of the whole human race. They go on telling us that we could blow ourselves up. This is one of the ways in which we all identify ourselves with these top people in all these departments. We say:

"We could blow ourselves up" -- by which we mean that somebody who knows which the button is could press it. I don't know whether this is true or not and I suppose we go on hoping that no one would try the experiment to discover it. But this is what they tell us -- that we could bring the human race to an end; we could bring death to mankind and that we have this power. This is suicide -- self-inflicted death, deliberately bringing to an end, an absolute end, an irrecoverable end, there is no going back, there is no changing your mind, there is no coming back to life after death if death is this real end of things.

I just wonder what these inarticulate people that we've been talking about earlier on think about it. I think this is a very interesting question. Our experience in England is that one of the things that people still come to church for, or are rather brought to church for, is to be buried. Now, it may not literally be to church any longer, but to the cemetery chapel where many of our ministers of all churches serve and take funeral services in relation to people (families) whom they may have never previously met, no previous consultation, so to speak, at all -- maybe not even since the death of the person whose funeral they are going to take. Many of them find this a very exacting thing and, of course, it is, but many of them say frequently that a high proportion of the people who come to those services expect something to be said to them about what's happened to this person and what is going to happen subsequently to them. In other words they do not accept the finality of death.

What of the pastoral responsibility on such an occasion? What are you supposed to talk to these people about -- complete strangers, suffered a bereavement, at the moment the solemn moment of burial or cremation or whatever it is. Do you talk about the deceased? Or do you try to comfort the relicts? And I find that a lot of people think you ought to try to comfort the people who are left behind without any reference to the deceased which is the one thing that they are, normally, thinking about. So, if you are trying to talk to them about something else, it is not likely that they will hear what you say. They are thinking about this person whose life is finished and we've all had this experience, both with regard to people we've been close to and others as well. We all know this experience, this mysterious experience, of the ending of a human life. It is just as mysterious whether it is a child or what have you, and look at the great, sort of, flare-up of world concern about the Kennedy baby -- not because it was born but because it died.

Well, this is death and I don't think that we've really got anything to say to people about our belief that this is not final in a full sense unless we are going to enter fully in the factual finality of physical death with people. But I really want to say something about death more generally than this.

We talk about people -- you know, "a living death" -- not living full lives and we've expressed our concern about this and people not finding meaning in them, and so on. Is one other way of describing this through saying that they are just slowly dying on their feet, not physically, in other senses? Because they are not fully living are they in fact slowly dying? Well, if they are, as we fear that some of them are, perhaps this is

true. There is, in fact, no alternative is there? Either you are growing and living and engaging in an on-going process of living which is something which cannot be brought to an end the Christian says, or we are not alive. And if we are not alive, we are already dying. This is a process which will go on to its completion and that will be the end. So I suggest that unless our civilization, our society, is going on in a positive and constructive line then it is doing the opposite and it will die and it will be succeeded by something else.

From here, of course, I can go off from one of two different directions and because, inevitably, I'll have to choose one don't think that I'm not aware of the other.

Now, when the first Christians told one another that Jesus was alive after death they really meant it. I'm perfectly sure myself that one of the significant things about the comparison of all four Gospels is the emphasis that they all have on the fact that he was buried, seen to be buried, witnesses for his burial, because unless he was really dead there is no resurrection. Unless he was really dead it's this thing -- not what Christians preach. Death is thus part, then, of all human experience and to this even he is no exception. It is part of his humanity. And I would therefore suggest that it is not possible to make the logical connection between death and sin which is in the Biblical mythology. The connection between death and sin when you are talking about Jesus is the illogical or super-logical connection that he underwent this experience voluntarily, on account of other people's sins.

Out of this comes not a restoration to life as it was before, but rather something which is new. This is perhaps the most difficult of our things to talk about in the present day. I don't know. Perhaps it's just that I find it so. What do we mean by eternal life? But I think it is absolutely essential to make it quite clear that when we are talking about the resurrection -- preaching the resurrection if you like -- that God raised Jesus from death, in the first place to emphasize very, very strongly that this really was death and to be prepared to engage in this experience of the puzzle of death with people not to seem to be afraid of the idea -- particularly if other people are a bit afraid of it. Secondly, to make it quite clear that when we talk about Jesus being raised by God from death it was not just a putting into reverse of the process of death, not a bringing back to old life, but a bringing to life which was something new. Then, in his case, there is this next great mystery of what we commonly call the "great forty days". What do these strange stories indicate? Some of our contemporaries, some of our fellow-Christians in this contemporary world will tell us all sorts of things about which are a variety of ways of rationalizing them. They have, of course, got to be rationalized in the proper sense -- we have got to make some sense of them; bring some reason out of them. I think it's a pity that so many people put such a lot of goodwill into rationalizing them away because surely part of what they indicate is some of the characteristics of new life -- of eternal life -- of risen life. That is to say, some of the qualities of living which we hope perhaps ourselves one day to enjoy. This is the sense surely in which death is a valuable idea used as Paul uses it in relation to baptism. The common,

now commonly used ever since he did it, figure of the going down into baptism is the going down into death with Jesus and up to new life -- up on the other side to something new -- new garments, new life, new everything after this.

I think that new life means, and probably rightly, different things to different people. And probably they all have to themselves decide what these qualities are.

To bring this very personally down to questions -- I get the impression that you are all fairly open-speaking about these things -- what is the thing about yourself that you most regret? Because, you see, this is your death; this is your present dying and to look forward into a future which of course could be tomorrow possibly in which this particular thing is redeemed, changed, or whatever it is -- depending on what it is the change is of a different kind, it may be a complete turn round, it may be a new growth, it may be something else, but anyway its going to be different. This is what new life means and some of these people that we are all so bothered about; people who really think that that button is going to be pressed, that we're all going to be killed (mind you, I can't think why they worry so much about it because if you know if that's what they're like they might as well be dead anyway) and the bingo and all this. Now, if only we could get them to be articulate, how would they like life to be different for them? This is the thing for us to discover. But even if they aren't articulate and explicit about them its possible to talk to people in quite general terms in the way I'm talking to you and say now how would you like life to be different; what sort of things do you think ought to be different in life? I'm assuming that you've gotten some sort of talking point. Is this not a going-in point for talking about life when the word means the opposite of death. I think possibly it is. Anyway I find it well worth trying and quite often this works.

Then, you see, the next stage in this argument is: "If this is where we are and that's where we would like to be how do we get from 'A' to 'B'?"

Well, it may be by a psychiatrist's couch; and in some cases I'm sure that that is the right route. But putting answers of that sort on one side what word has the Gospel here? And I think, you see, the Gospel has tended to be, so to speak, as though it was all one turnstiled-- we've all got to go through to get from here to there, and this turnstile has always been or it has too frequently often been this wretched business of getting your sins forgiven. And I think that there are a whole lot of turnstiles of which this is one and for some people you see the furthest turnstile into new life is perhaps a willingness to trust somebody that you haven't trusted before. One can have thousands of examples of this sort. This is an enormous release for people. This is a kind of new life; a bit of newness in life and the turnstile through which you go to get from mistrust to better trust is a turnstile of redemption. It is a turnstile which has got to have the label reconciliation on it -- redemption. And surely it must be the experience of many of you already that in trying to enrich people's lives in this sort of way they do get going along a series

of these turnstile points where sooner or later the one that the typical Christian preacher has had his eye on all the time about forgiveness of sins has got to be gone through certainly. This becomes quite a long time before the sort of awareness of any kind of personal inadequacy begins to grow, and a long, long time before you can read the passage that I read from Paul and expect it to ring bells with people who haven't been brought up in the sort of church life that we are so familiar with.

So my number two stage briefly is this, and thus hitched on to my number one stage -- my number one stage was a plea that we should preach the Gospel of the greatness of mankind and at this particular juncture his potential as the master of the technological age. Inevitably from that I had to go to the other side of the picture, if you like, or the more realistic aspect of the picture. The sheer fact of death as the opposite of the life which I am speaking about. And so from death to look at the traditional, conventional preaching of new life through repentance, confession, awareness of sin, forgiveness, reconciliation, to salvation; suggesting that this has got to be enormously broadened -- not so much broadened out, but varied. We need to see that there are many places where the relevance of the Gospel of Reconciliation is quite clear so long as we see that the Gospel of Reconciliation is not just confined to this sin, disobedience, forgiveness particular turnstile, but that the reconciling work of God, the bringing of new life to man through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ applies along the whole front of human affairs and that this may first of all be applied by us to people's needs in ways and matters which puzzle us because they are not our needs and which we find difficult to identify ourselves with because they seem so much less important than things which seem important to us. And all the conversation you had this morning about the "spiritual life" is I suppose entirely without meaning to the majority of the world's population. And this is the way we see it and we are called upon to appreciate anew that the Gospel of Reconciliation -- a much wider and more comprehensive word than just the Gospel of Forgiveness -- is relevant along the whole front, everywhere where you can see where we are and assess it and regret it. And you can see where we might be, or would like to be, and in the terms of what I said before we Christians believe that we might be and ought to be wanting to be there and this is how we get from here to there along the whole front.

So, if I may just finish by a crude example taken from your question. When all our telephone exchanges are fully automated a piece of redemption will have been done because men and women will have been released from a particular kind of slavery. And released for what? For new and more human living; for a new freedom to be more human because they haven't got to do those mechanical, impersonal, dehumanizing jobs. So that I think if one encourages people to believe that we have got the ability to do these things that this is part of the Gospel that the church ought to be preaching. And this particular little bit of it is obviously very tacked on with what I said this morning. The alternative is death.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE GOSPEL
IN A WORLD OF RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE
 (III)

You will remember that I suggested right at the beginning that if we start from Professor Dodd's great emphasis on the preaching as analyzed by him in his book which has now become practically standard reading we find ourselves with this sentence that "God raised Jesus from death" and I suggested that this preaching, this Gospel, makes no impact whatsoever until the words in which it is expressed have been filled out with some content. Therefore I suggested to you that I would do what in fact so far, I have stuck to-- to take the three words God, Jesus, death (that is to say all the words in the sentence except the verb) and look at them one at a time and I looked at the word "Jesus" through looking at the word "Man" and suggesting to you that we need an expression of the Christian Doctrine of Man tailored up to our modern world.

Secondly, I suggested to you that there is no preaching of life which is going to make any impact on anybody at all unless death is a really faced, and understood, idea. And so I tried to talk a bit about life, or rather to lead us towards talking a bit about life through talking about death. Incidentally, of course, in both cases but particularly in the second, I talked about sin, or evil, or whichever word you choose and I suggested that man's failure has to be looked at on the whole front of human experience and that the doctrine of redemption and reconciliation correspondingly have to be seen on the whole front of human experience. Some people use the word "evil" for the over-all estimation of man's failure to be human and within it include sin. Other people use these words differently. I suggest that there is a quite useful classification that some people use -- taking the word "evil" for the over-all concept of man's failure to be human and four sub-headings then on this line which are sometimes treated thus separately are: a) sin ; b) ignorance; c) suffering; and d) ugliness.

One of man's biggest and most continuing failures is this failure to communicate with his fellow-man. The reconciliation of human relationships at all sorts of levels and places is a noticeable need in the present day. A great deal of it arises out of a failure to communicate with one another. A part of this is because of the way in which we don't, as a matter of fact, make sure before we talk, that the words that we use are going to be understood in the sense in which we are using them by the people to whom we are speaking them.

And when I come to my third word -- God -- this is noticeably so. But I can't resist an obvious, immediate, relevant example to myself about the use of words. I spent twenty-four hours in this city when I arrived a week ago and I walked down the street and I saw ahead of me a notice that said "Subway" and it didn't enter my head that I would not know what a subway was because subway does mean something definite to me. Now, to me a subway is just a pedestrian crossing under the street and fortunately most of your subway notices do serve this purpose incidentally though so I was alright. But that was just luck. So the first time I set out to use the subway I went down and when I got down there I discovered that this

was what I always called the "Underground" or "Tube" and that the corresponding notice in London would be a blue-lighted notice saying "Underground".

Now, the main point of that is that it didn't strike me to question what "subway" meant and if any of you had said to me "take the subway" I would have assumed that you meant that you'd got some extended underground pedestrian route which would save me a lot of road crossings and I wouldn't have stopped to say "what do you mean by 'subway'?" And so, when we talk to people about God they don't stop to ask us "what do you mean by 'God'?" I think that this is a good deal of our trouble because both for ourselves and for others the word carries a great deal out of the past, much of which should I think have died and gone. Certainly much of which is not appropriate to the present day.

Now, incidentally to my talking about man I said that God is not a being whose nature, etc., etc., etc. I used the word "being" and I suspect that a very high proportion of the thinking and writing and talking about God -- that is to say theology in the narrowest sense of the word and most properly academic sense -- has been about the nature of his being. A great deal of this lies behind all the "Honest to God" conversations. There is a question as to whether the being of God can properly be described in this-that-and-the-other sort of way. I would like to suggest that the thing for Christians to try to do now is to get away from talking about the being of God and to replace this conversation by a conversation about his activity. What does he do?

I said this recently -- in a slightly different form, but making the same point -- in a conversation with a small group of people including one or two elderly gentlemen whose thinkings about religion belonged to a couple of generations back and who could not be persuaded that most people take the existence of God for granted but they have very strange ideas about what he does.

Now, you may agree. Perhaps this will come up later. You may agree with them that our battle-ground is on the spot of arguing the existence of God. If that is what you think, then you will be disagreeing with everything that I say from now on -- and that's not a bad thing.

The real issue is not whether God exists, but what He is like. And what he is like is judged by what He does exactly the same way as what we are like is judged by what we do. And so it is not just, you see, chancy that when I took the sentence "God raised Jesus from death" that I picked out the words "God", "Jesus", and "Death" to speak about and left the word "raised" which is the verb which makes it a sentence to bring the whole thing together at the end which is what I must do now as well as try to talk about God. So that on the basis of this thesis I'm not going to be talking about God -- abstracted ideas of being -- but God always with a verb. In this case the verb is God raised Jesus from death. This is a thing that God did and at the moment I am speaking about this in the ordinary historical sense. Christians believe this to be true. They believe that Jesus was raised from death; that this was done by God; and that certain results follow about new life which I will come to in a minute or two.

What other things do people say that God does? Some people say He created the universe. It is better to say, of course, that He continually creates the universe and this is generally the first thing that we say about him. It is of course logically the basic thing but that doesn't always necessarily mean that it's the first thing to say. He creates the universe and He likes it. We generally say this in a rather strong form that He cares for it, loves it. I think it's quite a good idea to use the more ordinary common words like "like" because these are more generally and readily understood. It may not be the right word for you, but I take it you know enough of my kind of English even if yours is different to know what I mean. He likes it.

Have you got the little rhyme:

I wish I loved the human race.
I wish I liked its silly face...

and I forget how it goes on. Well, there you've got a little point being made you see about loving and liking. I think, you see, all the ordinary, practical, down-t-earth words have got to be used about God as well as the more exalted additional words like "love". He likes it. And then, of course, you rightly want to come back at me and say but surely He doesn't like as it is and no, of course not. But he evidently likes it enough to go on with it. And then the word "like" doesn't serve you any longer when you come to the particular thing that he has done with it which is to show us the measure of His love for it by sending His Son.

This is the kind of thing God does in the present now, and is now doing and I don't think that in our thinking about the relevance of the Gospel that the presentness of this can be over-estimated. Because I know -- we all know -- that it is much more generally supposed that Christians believe that God started the thing off. Full stop. Perhaps you believe that, but it isn't Biblical to believe that. I'm sure that lots of people who sit in your pews believe it and they might well say that they had always got the idea that this is what you meant by what you said. And, of course, you have to use the past tense, but always to adjust the balance of using the past tense by using the present tense as well and making it clear that the point about putting us into the past -- pre-human past -- this too is what God was doing. God does not come into the picture when man comes into the picture. It is God who is making the picture.

I would like to just throw in here a point which interests me quite a bit about the present debate about creation in the world of physics. I don't know what popular terms you have here, but my popular terms for the alternative, the competing theories, of creation being now debated in the Cavendish laboratory and around places like that in Cambridge is the debate between the continuous creation theory and the big bang theory. To make sure we know what I'm talking about -- continuous creation theory is that the universe is continually being re-fuelled by the addition of so many units of hydrogen -- tiny, tiny number -- but that the wastage and the new creation are continually kept in balance and that this is how it has always been. The other theory is the big bang theory that it all started from somewhere and it's been spreading out in this increasing way ever since.

Now, it is commonly supposed by physicists that Christians are somehow or other tied up with the necessity of the big bang theory and I've heard one or two of them being very gentle in their indication to believers that it might in fact turn out that the continuous creation theory as they call it is nearer the truth, or more likely to be true than the other. I had great difficulty in trying to explain to a person of this sort not so long ago that so far as I'm concerned it doesn't matter two hoots what they decide, because whatever they decide I should still go on saying that God does it. As a matter of fact I'm very much of the opinion myself that I would much welcome the continuous creation theory as more acceptable to me theologically, but the common supposition is, you see, that we are wedded to something which is reflected in Genesis where the great emphasis is on that God began something.

But all this interestingly ties in to the necessity that is laid upon us to say, in season and out of season if there can be an out-of-season for this sort of thing, that God continually creates. Now, we may be in difficulty with the physicists on the word "continuous" here and a very new important point would arise. The physicists' phrase "continuous creation", you see, has got two major theological words in it and they are using them quite in their sense. The challenge of the continuous creation theory as represented physically is, of course, this idea the thing going round and round and in and out, but this is an illusion really because, of course, they are talking about something in terms of change which is what we are interested in too.

So God creates. What else does He do? Sticking now, for a moment, to technical terms he redeems, he reconciles, he re-creates. This is what we believe; this is what we should say. We say this because we believe it to be true because of one particular historical complex of events which we interpret as revealing to us this about the nature of God. But you see instead of doing it in abstract terms of being and saying the nature of God is that he is the kind of God who does redeem, reconcile, and re-create; and this is a part of the nature of his being we go straight in and say this is what he does. We assert that this is his continuing work because he vindicated the redemptive work, redemptive, suffering work of Jesus, in that he raised him from death.

Therefore the Christian claims not only that whatever is happening, whatever is being made, whatever is going on, is being done by God, but the Christian also claims that wherever there is reconciliation being brought about, wherever a situation is redeemed, wherever new life is brought out of old, possibly through death, this too is the work of God and that this is how the Christian indicates to the world what he believes about God. We are talking about what he is doing. And when these things happen -- a bringing a new out of the old, passing through or over a variety of hurdles or turnstiles -- that this is the continuing work of God and that there is a new and particular characteristic of this sanctifying work of God:-- this making things holy -- which calls for Christians to say something particular about themselves. This is the first place, I think that Christians are called upon to say anything particular about themselves.

For a variety of reasons, some of which we have looked at, most of which we can never know; the critical, crucial, redemptive work of God in the Cross and Resurrection of Jesus Christ was not the end of human history, but the beginning of new human history and from that moment on the human race is divided to two sections -- those who believe that this is true and those who don't.

Now, those who believe it is true act on the basis of this belief. This is where Bultmann is surely so right about interpretation -- that it is their interpretation of the historical event of the Cross and the alleged event of the Resurrection which makes them what they are. This new beginning of history is partly, at any rate, handed over by God to these -- fortunate or unfortunate as you regard yourselves as being -- people who carry the responsibility of having this faith. I wonder if you agree with me that it is very much easier not to be a Christian.

Now, here is another popular misconception -- how much preaching has there been in terms of how happy you are if you are a Christian and how your problems are solved and everything is made easier than it was before. Of course there is a sense in which this is true, but there is a very basic sense in which this is not true. How much easier to be able to go through life without the responsibility that we have. The responsibility we have is the responsibility for declaring to the world the Gospel -- preaching this Gospel to the world. And this after all is the only reason why we need bother to make it relevant. If we weren't charged with the responsibility of preaching it, we could settle back to whatever period of Christian history attracts us most. Lots of Christians seem to think it was wonderful in the middle ages. I don't. It must have been very, very cold and uncomfortable in those monasteries. But you know there is an awful lot of romantic nonsense of this sort. Perhaps as you haven't got the ruins of these buildings in your country you don't know much of this. But I am interested in what large numbers of you come to the continent to look at them.

Of course, there is a place for certain kinds of exclusive religious groups -- I'm not saying there isn't. We're talking about the general, all-over front of the world-wide problem of the mission of the church -- at least I am. And the reason that we've got to discover how to make the Gospel relevant is our calling to do this job and our problem is to discover how to do it. Its quite simply reduced, you see, to taking Professor Dodd's basic Gospel statement "God raised Jesus from death" coming through into new life and discovering how to say that to people so that it means something. And this means by taking it to pieces and re-filling the words with meaning which is relevant to this present day.

By the time you've been through all this sort of mill and talked about it a bit it becomes so obvious you hardly really worth going on talking about it. Now, this God who raised Jesus from death which is the Christian interpretation of a set of events some of which are historical and some of which are the interpretation of history and this gives us a lead into the ways in which we can talk about God and I suggest that in the modern world we talk about him in terms of what he does or what we believe he does. We've also got to be able to talk along with this about

what we believe happens in the church because sooner or later, if you make any impression at all on someone with whom you are trying either to argue this case or preach this Gospel the question will come back -- you know -- "Why the church?"

There have been a certain number of books written under that title itself and a lot under titles like it. The answer to this question is the same as the answer to most questions I think -- that this is how we believe God works -- this is what he does; he has made it and it's a common and obvious saying that again if one was doing this oneself who would we have chosen. Well, this isn't the point. "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." This is the thing that is so tiresome for us and this is who we are. And so we believe that God does work in a particular, and in a particularly urgent, way.

Now, I made a fascinating discovery the other day. One of these simple ideas that is so nice when you find it, and I daresay you've found it already. But I'm rather taken up with it and I'm using it rather a lot. There is this phrase "first fruits" which Paul uses and which occurs in one or two rather interesting places around in Cranmer's Book of Common Prayers, but Paul uses it and there is this phrase "We are a kind of first fruits of his creatures."

Now, I understand that it is true of all crops, not only of the grape crop which would be the most familiar in that setting, that the first fruits as a matter of fact are not very good. I was terribly pleased when I discovered this. You see, normally the sermon on "first fruits" is in terms of the offering of the first fruits of the field and the flock, in Old Testament cultic terms and so on -- you know, this all has to be given to God -- but you look into this more closely you will, in fact, discover that at a previous stage at the understanding of this practice there seems to be a pretty clear idea that the purpose of doing this is in order that the full, main, mature crop should be a good one. And whatever you grow -- I grow tomatoes when I'm at home to do it -- the best fruits come in the middle of the crop. They are not the first and they are not the last. I don't think this was what Paul meant when he said that we were a kind of first fruits of his creatures -- perhaps he did -- but anyway there it is. This I think we should take as encouraging, but also noticing that unless there are some first fruits and unless they operate as first fruits there won't be the main crop of the future to which I was looking forward yesterday. This is a way of underlining the fact that the church is the beginning of a new creation. Very young, very immature we are -- if you are thinking of certain crops of course the first fruits are pretty sour too. At any rate tasteless -- not so good. But this is the church.

I want to finish up by reading a passage from II Corinthians which includes the one we've already had yesterday. This is one of the places in the New Testament where my Bible opens most naturally and readily. I had to find it here, because it's a new one.

Chapter 4 -- "Therefore having this ministry by the mercy of God we do not lose heart." and then he goes on to talk about himself in relation to the Corinthians which is a little bit off our main point. "What we preach is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, ourselves as

your servants for Jesus' sake. For it is the God who said 'Let light shine out of darkness' who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ."

I would just like to break off here to comment that I as a member of another church than yours -- and I think this is partly to do with a different ecclesiastical tradition -- never use some of the phrases which crop up so regularly in your conversation. Where you put "service to Jesus Christ" or "loyalty to Jesus Christ," "belief in Jesus Christ" first I wasn't brought up like that at all and I still haven't got used to it. I meet it in other church groups, but this phrase is more like what I would say, therefore I don't have these briefer phrases.

"But we have this treasure in earthen vessels to show that the transcendent power belongs to God and not to us. We are afflicted in every way but not crushed; perplexed but not driven to despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; struck down but not destroyed; always carrying in the body the death of Jesus so that the life of Jesus may also be manifested in our bodies. For while we live we are always being given up to death for Jesus' sake. So that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our own mortal flesh. So death is at work in us, but life in you. Since we have the same spirit of faith as he had who wrote 'I believed and so I spoke' we too believe and so we speak knowing that He who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus and bring us with Him into His presence. So we do not lose heart; though our outer nature is wasting away our inner nature is being renewed every day. This slight momentary affliction is preparing for us an eternal way to glory beyond all comparison..."

Chapter 5 verse 16..."From now on therefore we regard no one from a human point of view. Even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view we regard Him thus no longer. Therefore if any one is in Christ he is a new creation. The old has passed away and behold the new has come."

Now, that verse 16 is a pretty tricky verse to study very carefully and there is a good deal of conversation to be had about what it may have in fact originally and basically meant, but I would like to underline the 16th and 17th together as the clearest and simplest New Testament way of expressing some of the things that I have struggled to talk about. One of the ways of interpreting verse 16 is that there was a time when the full nature and vocation of Jesus was not seen by us -- but that time is passed -- and because that time is passed for us and we see him in this new way we are thus described as being "in him" and this is the new creation of us. So that those of us who no longer regard him from a human point of view are a new creation -- we are the new creation. The old has passed away, the new has come.

And then..."All this is from God who through Christ reconciled us to Himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation. That is God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself."

And again you could debate how that should be punctuated and how it should be read. The gist of it is the same however you read it.

But some would prefer to read it as though; it were -- God, in Christ, was reconciling the world to himself. That has certain advantages -- it avoids certain difficulties of putting the "was" where it is here.

"Not counting their trespasses against them and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation."

Do we always accept the middle phrase of verse 19. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself not counting their trespasses against them and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation." I have the impression that sometimes we don't really believe that that stage has in fact been passed. We think that we're going to operate it.

"So we are ambassadors for Christ God making His appeal through us. We beseech you therefore on behalf of Christ be reconciled to God. For our sake He made him to be sin who knew no sin so that in him we might become the righteousness of God!"

Well, this is what God does. This is the sort of thing that God does, and the Christian's belief about the things God does is pointed up and focussed on and reinforced by, and if you like brought into focus altogether by his one pin-pointed historical assertion that God raised Jesus from death. All that that implies that this wasn't the end but the beginning and from this death Jesus was raised to new life not back to what had gone before. And so in terms of all this we have in this sentence this kind of active God doing all this sort of thing all the time; man whose measure is Jesus not himself as he is; a death whose reality we need to face if we are really to measure up to what the word life can mean; and added on to that the notion of the newness of life that comes out of redemption and reconciliation; and that the bringing of this to the world is laid upon the church to do; and this is why it is urgent that we should be able to express ourselves to people and these are the sort of times in which I think its worth trying to do it.

FELLOWSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL WOMENMINUTES

August 27, 1963.

10:45 A.M.

Following several announcements and the introduction of members of the Fellowship by geographical areas, Lois Boast outlined the procedure to be followed during the six business sessions regarding our discussions on the "General Council Action and Its Implications", "The Future of the Fellowship", and "Participation of Women in the Church". Basically this will be a free-wheeling discussion to be concluded on Friday by any recommendations we are ready to formulate.

Lois then introduced the panel which was to initiate our thinking on the first of these matters: Wilna Thomas (moderator), Bessie Lane, Margarete Emminghaus, and Katharine Hockin. The President reviewed the recommendations and steps which led up to the present remit to Presbyteries and pointed out that following the recommendation that deaconesses come under the authority of the Church -- that the same committee has been asked to consider (and report to General Council, 1964) the place in the courts of the church of women workers who are not deaconesses. The intent seems to be to move us into the life of the church in a fuller way - therefore the question needs to be asked: what should become of the Fellowship? (a) should it remain the same? (b) should it become something different? (c) should it cease to exist?

Mary Urquhart then reviewed the study done by the Deaconess Association to date and stated that a Committee is being set up to study what it means to be a deaconess, the taking of vows, our corporateness and what needs to be done to make our witness more effective.

The Panel then proceeded to present its views on the question "What should become of the Fellowship" with the chairman reminding us that each member was presenting her personal viewpoint. Bessie Lane emphasized the inspiration and information received through the Biennial Conference planned by the Fellowship but pointed out the danger of a Fellowship group becoming exclusive when we are seeking to become more a part of the church.

Katharine Hockin sensed that in our discussion so far something very much and alive in terms of a searching and discovering of the meaning of this Fellowship seemed to be present and elaborated then on two very different types of "orders" she was aware of which would be worthy of study: (1) "The Grail" Women's Movement in the Roman Church or with a mother house in Loveland, U.S.A., in which women who are doing various work under non-church auspices have come together; and (2) The Sisters of the Church of South India, which was set up within the structure of the new church when it came into being. The strength of the latter seems to be from within and centres around the head sister (or two) who is the channel through which mutual concerns are shared, pooled and exchanged but not related to employment, salaries, etc. Katharine felt that we were not at the stage to consider a formal structure related to the church in the same way as the Sisters of South India are.

Wilna Thomas spoke briefly of the Companions of Brother Lawrence in North India -- a fellowship for Christians who are busy (men and women) in which they pledged to use "specific occasions" for prayer and recollection. Another interesting requirement in their Common Rule is that "By the practice of planned neglect they make provision for recreation, reading, and sleep..."

Margarete Emminghaus reminded us that although there is a Deaconess Order we are all a part of a Fellowship with common concerns -- many of whom work in isolated areas and/or in their living lack the opportunity for the strength of the family relationship. The sort of fellowship which will strengthen all our members in their life on the Church can't be legislated but is a living thing and must grow out of experience.

Katherine Hockin pointed out that the idea of being exclusive which seems to bother some holds within its meaning the concept of quality as well and that we need to be flexible and permissive within any framework.

Wilna Thomas in concluding the panel said that she felt the Fellowship should not remain as it is now.

The meeting was then opened to discussion from the floor in which the following thoughts were voiced:

- ideals emerging are too big for us to make conclusions immediately: good healthy experimentation is required.

- relationship to the Fellowship needs to be more than mimeographed letters -- the intangible in a fellowship is real and permanent.

- the intangible was very real within the old W.M.S. set up, and the more isolated you were, the more real it was.

- any visit of one W.M.S. worker in another W.M.S. House automatically resulted in "family prayer".

- there is some fear of "structure" because the Holy Spirit just doesn't stay within it.

- it seems that we do need structure of some sort to accomplish our provision of the intangible.

- perhaps there is the need of one head sister to fulfill the role of the head sister in the Sisterhood of South India.

- can we create a fellowship or does it arise out of a common commitment?

- we do have a common commitment to a Person, but we are also human and the promise of one person to another to keep a common discipline helps us to be true to it.

- there were several who voiced their disturbance that we do not find this fellowship of study, prayer, common concern and commitment in our local churches.

- some have found it in the Courts of the Church, particularly in Presbytery.

- perhaps we as a group can be and should be a spearhead for fellowship experiences which could move into the courts of the church.

- in our commitment we need to include the discipline of relating ourselves to one community work.

- the strength of a prayer group behind you in your life and work is very real.

- the sharing of different patterns of devotion would be helpful to individuals in the deepening their own spiritual life.

- more guidance and counselling in the area of the devotional life should be given students during the time at Covenant College.

Lois Boast in concluding the meeting pointed out that in seeking to discover what our future as a Fellowship will be, we need to hold in tension these widely diversified views as we have during the proceeding discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 for lunch.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGARET QUIGLEY.

MINUTES

August 28, 1963.

10:45 A.M.

The meeting opened with the circulating of the Treasurer's Report. Comment was made by K. Hockin, Treasurer. The report noted a balance on hand of \$1,072.12. This report was received for information.

Katharine Hockin also mentioned available information concerning the African Defence Fund.

Questions on the financial statement are to be dealt with on August 29th by the Treasurer.

Lily Uyeda reported that the following people had been asked to act on the Study Committee to deal with the meaning of being a deaconess and the nature of our corporateness:

K. Hockin	F. Ward
L. Boast	W. Thomas
D. Ovens	R. Tillman
E. Gamble (later appointed convener)	

Corresponding members were to be added from Montreal, Winnipeg, and Vancouver.

S. Harrison suggested a corresponding member be named from the Maritimes. The name of Margarete Emminghaus was suggested by S. Burry.

L. Uyeda moved that this be the committee. The vote was taken by Mary Urquhart. Carried.

C. McKeen reported on yesterday's discussion emphasizing that there were two things we ought to take care to distinguish (although they are related):

- (1) Biennial Conference
- (2) The Future of the Fellowship

She reminded us that some people were talking of the Conference and not the whole Fellowship. We should ask ourselves what the Fellowship has not provided, which the Deaconess Order has. We should also ask ourselves what in the future it ought to provide. Also, if we are in the courts of the Church, do we need a Fellowship? We need to remember that we are a part of the Church regardless of the extent to which we as individuals are able to participate in its groups. What ought we to expect to receive from the Church? What can we give? The dangers and values of "exclusiveness" need to be considered. There is a need for something continuous besides mimeographed letters!

Other things needing consideration are: corporativeness; flexibility to be involved in the life of the community; other groups from whom we may learn.

We were reminded once again of the morning scripture I John 1: 1-7 (N.E.B.) which is very relevant to our situation.

The Chairman in thanking Catherine McKeen for this summary reminded us that we all listen from our own point of view. We need to pray for God's grace in listening to one another and to Him.

At this point we were divided into discussion groups by S. Harrison. Each group was asked to have a recorder to report one clear point, and to keep a written record to be submitted to the steering committee for their noon meeting.

Following the group discussion the following points were made by the various recorders:

- We need fellowship more now than ever whether the group be determined by sex, or function.
- Fellowship should be maintained. We ought to combine the Fellowship and Deaconess Association. The name Deaconess should be retained.
- There are values in a Biennial Conference. There is a satisfaction in knowing that they are going on, whether one is able to be present or not.
- There is too much emphasis placed on the Fellowship. Fellowship is to be found in the Church. This should be the Association of Deaconesses and Professional Workers".
- One group needed for study and as a 'sounding board'.
- We need a Biennial for people doing a common task, and a minimum structure to carry on through the year.
- This "something" we need would need an organization as an aid in carrying it out.
- At this point the Chairman commented that it does look as though we want something, and the nature of this needs to be pursued further.

General discussion followed these comments were made:

- The idea that we need one fellowship is coming through.
- There are two pictures of what a continuing fellowship could be:
 - (1) People with common work.
 - (2) People with common concern for the spiritual life.
- There is tension here but we live in an age of tension.
- Many people who need the kind of fellowship suggested are the only ones in their particular sphere of Church work, therefore we mean not those doing the same kind of work, but 'Church work'.

- Social workers and others with church related jobs were mentioned.

- It was suggested that units draw in people with common concerns and are not too rigid.

- We ought not to take hasty action in these matters, but consider our decisions carefully.

- Thinking of such things as the theological and sociological implications of what we are doing.

- We need to clarify what we mean by professional worker.

- We need to experiment to find out what this "something" is.

- The question was raised as to the basis for membership in the Fellowship now.

- The Chairman read the Constitution and mimeo copies were made available.

- The question arose as to whether or not new members are approved by the National Executive of the Fellowship.

Mrs. Campion reminded us that names are submitted.

The question arose as to whether or not members are notified when their names no longer appear on the active list. It was discussed that lists are mailed out periodically.

The Chairman suggested that it would be necessary for us to have more time to consider these suggestions in smaller groups.

Re the New organization, L. James asked if it would not be better, in place of an experimental period, to have the Conference Executive amend or change the Constitution as it sees fit.

Respectfully submitted,

L. HELENE MANNING.

MINUTES

August 29, 1963.

10:45 A.M.

Miss Lois Boast, President of the Fellowship, introduced to the group Mrs. Richard Simpson, who is to be the new Women's Editor on the staff of the Observer. Ruth Tillman spoke briefly regarding the sharing of books during the Conference.

Miss Boast introduced the Panel, consisting of Mrs. Gordon Coburn, Treasurer of the Board of Women; Mrs. J.L. (Genevieve) Carder, of the Board of Christian Education; Rev. Harriet Christie, Principal of Covenant College; and Miss O. Jessie Lace, our guest leader at the Conference, who was to help summarize at the conclusion. Miss Dorothy Young of the Board of Women chaired the Panel.

The total panel discussion was recorded on tape.

Miss Young introduced the topic to be discussed -- "Participation of Women in the Church". She stated that such a topic is relevant in the church in the whole world, and not just related to the United Church of Canada. The panel was to participate in this discussion, and then, if time permitted and it was desired, we would go to small groups and discuss further and then come back together again. The first question she asked the panel was: "Why did you agree to go on this panel?"

Mrs. Coburn's first reply informed us that she had recently been to a Conference. She asked such questions as why did the Creator give gifts that society will not let women use? She is concerned as she sees young women growing up.

Mrs. Carder felt that the question of the place of women in the world and society is very important today, and that the Church should take a creative part in helping her find her role.

Miss Christie said that she is interested partly of course, because of her job; and she is interested as to the future, professionally, of her students.

The discussion continued in reply to the question "Does this topic have validity for professional women Church workers?" Ideas were expressed such as the fact that women workers are sort of go-between for lay women and the Ministry in the Church; also that women workers should help competent person. The possibility of danger was felt in pushing for "women's place" in the Church. To think of women's "special place" may be a bad phrase, as every individual person has her own needs and abilities. Yet it was felt that it is legitimate to find out what our abilities are and find our place. Men and women should accept each other as persons. This is a question relevant to all minority groups.

Miss Young asked whether our educational programmes in the Church are really preparing women for responsible jobs in the Church. Mrs. Carder

felt that all sorts of responsible jobs are open to women, but too often we hesitate to undertake them. We should stop clamoring for opportunities and quietly do our jobs adequately. We should be prepared to take as much training academically as men. Miss Christie added that we should remember not to emphasize only academic training, but that experience in the world in various fields of work is important too -- and maybe men should have this also. Mrs. Carder emphasized that it is persons in these categories, and not men or women. The fact that Covenant College is now open to men is a good thing.

Miss Young led the discussion then in the direction of women's place in the total life of the Church and not just Professional workers. Several Points were brought out. One opinion was that women should not think "like men" but like women. Also that women shouldn't move in too fast with too big a contribution.

The implications of a new total role for women were discussed.

The Church must help women to accept changes if we are to grow. Yet tradition doesn't want things changed. An atmosphere conducive to change is needed. We must accept the changes that fuller participation of women means. The Church's Commission Report on women working was mentioned as being very interesting at this point. There are problems because of stereotyped roles of men and women, and there are stereotypes in all of society. Miss Christie mentioned the difference in attitude between the eastern world the the western world. At a recent Conference it was Canadian men who felt that women going overseas did not need to be trained. Eastern men felt that both man and woman were missionaries. Mrs. Coburn contributed some of the thinking from the world conference she recently attended. Mrs. Carder felt that men and women together must work at this. Mrs. Coburn told of the Bible Study at the Conference, and how they discussed sexuality in God's world and in relation to His Church. Dorothy Young asked whether the Ministry of the Laity has anything to say in this whole question. Also the question was asked as to whether lay women in the churches want to study "theology". Mrs. Coburn feels that many lay women would like to, but perhaps under a different term than theology.

Miss Jessie Lace spoke to us at this point. She said that in her talks when she had mentioned mankind, she meant the human race. Men and women are both human -- this is one of the new understandings our science, etc., brings to us -- and the church should be here too. There are social and historical explanations. Men had to go out and hunt, and women were not free. Now that we have automated the production of food, men and women are both free in our society. She said that she felt that in England they have laid already one of the major problems for a future generation -- by overplaying "motherhood" they have underplayed "fatherhood". We agreed that this was true in Canada also. She emphasized that we must see things as a whole. She recommended a study which she once did on Galatians 3:28 regarding particularly the phrase "male and female".

Her second point regarding women in the Church was that it is difficult to dissociate women workers, lay, etc., without a study of what the Ministry is. Are men and women equally eligible for membership? This

is never discussed in the New Testament. The original group already had both men and women in it. All functions in the Church are open to all members and so open to either men or women -- and so all talk re the place of women is irrelevant. It should be on the basis of gifts and abilities. And so a Church which says women cannot be Bishops is not the Christian church. The church should be saying that "she" is a human being -- not that she is a woman.

Miss Lace said that she personally came up through school at a time when it had recently become possible for women to come up as full members at University, etc. She was brought up with brothers and there was no difference made in their home regarding opportunity. When she came out of teaching into the Church it was a shock to find that many things were denied, and it was the first time she had felt like a woman.

General discussion followed. The point was brought out that often movement within the Church seems to be in two contradictory directions regarding women's work. It was pointed out also that we have solidified what we think men should do and what women should do, and that this needs to be shaken up.

Other comments were made. Then Shirley Johnston asked to what extent we felt women in the modern world really wants to move freely and to accept responsibilities, etc. Or is it just recognition that she is looking for? Mrs. Carder mentioned the book "The Feminine Mystique" as being a good insight into what the average woman is feeling today in our society. Mrs. Coburn said she felt women resent their place as a sexual plaything. Miss Lace, in reply to Shirley Johnston, asked to what extent men really participate in public responsibilities, etc., in the modern world.

Miss Gamble brought up the question as to what extent the problem is our own image of ourselves. Do we really find doors closed or do we just think this? Further comments were made. Dorothy Young asked if people in overseas situations would care to tell us a bit about the situation there. Shirley Johnston said that in Africa there is a beginning inquiry among African ministers as to what women might do in the church. In some areas women are coming into their own and moving into it together with the men. The situation in Trinidad was explained also.

Getting back to Miss Lace's question as to what extent men really participate, Miss Gamble inquired as to what kind of participation we were talking about. At what level? It was agreed that many women want to be members of courts of the church but never say a word. It was also pointed out that many men do not take part either. Miss Lace commented that we cannot overcome tradition overnight. In a society like ours, women spend time at home talking only to children, and men spend the whole day conversing with their peer group. Therefore it is harder for women to break the pattern. Nancy Edwards mentioned that there are pamphlets available re this whole area in other countries. Also a tape from India is available.

Thelma Dixon asked the question as to whether recognition is not a big thing here. Do we need to get the chip off our shoulders? What is our motivation? Could it be our own defensiveness? She suggested that we have a study at some Conference regarding our own problems -- e.g. sexuality, personal concerns, etc. (1) What is our real concern here? (2) What lies behind it?

Miss Christie commented that in our society there does seem to be embarrassment and self-consciousness between men and women -- especially when one group is in the minority.

Miss Lace told us that there are both men and women at William Temple College; also a woman principal, woman senior member of staff, and a man warden. The College was originally just for women, but has received both men and women students ever since they moved to permanent premises. She said that they have more important things to talk about -- e.g. what should theological education be. They make one concession to this debate we are discussing here -- they do try to have a balance of men and women on the staff.

Lois Boast thanked the panel and closed the discussion. Regarding the supper for Mrs. Campion, it was agreed to present her with a corsage along with the further money collected. It was agreed to change the timing on Thursday afternoon sessions to:

3:00 - 3:30	Deaconess Association
3:30 - 5:00	Fellowship business
5:00 - 5:30	Deaconess Association.

MINUTES

August 29, 1963.

3:30 P.M.

Miss Lois Boast opened the meeting with prayer and presented a suggested outline for the Agenda for our next sessions. On motion of Mrs. T. Campion and Miss Marion Thomson the Agenda was unanimously approved.

The Treasurer's Report had been presented at a previous business session and at this time the President called upon the Treasurer, Katharine Hockin, to move its adoption which she did noting one error (stationary to read stationery). Seconded by Sara Harrison. The Treasurer then pointed out that the statement on the Conference Fund was not as of today and that at present it stands as follows:

Receipts:	\$ 2,596.46
Disbursements:	<u>1,524.34</u>
Balance on hand:	<u>\$ 1,072.12</u>

Miss Boast reported in connection with honoraria for our three guests at this conference -- that Miss Lace would be given \$100.00 plus a gift, and Dr. McMillan and Dr. Newberry will be given \$50.00 each plus travel expenses. The Treasurer's Report was then approved and it was agreed that a completed report go out with the report of this Conference.

A question was raised re the Bequest Fund and Mrs. Campion reminded us that there is a motion on the books to the effect that at the time of every Biennial there be a transfer of funds into the bequest fund from the general fund (if possible) in the minimum amount of \$200.00. The constitution was read giving the purpose of this fund. Katharine Hockin raised the question whether in the light of the new patterns of recruitment and training it is still our function to administer such a fund. It was agreed not to act in this connection at this point.

Jean Angus raised the question of whether our funds were low in the light of only receiving one subsidy this year instead of two as in previous years (W.M.S. and C.O.D.O.). The Treasurer pointed out that the Conference fee had been raised this year over previous years but that there still would not be as much as usual of a balance on hand to help with future conferences.

Nancy Edwards reminded us that tapes have been made of the addresses given by Miss Lace and Dr. McMillan and asked (1) what we wanted done with the tapes; (2) how much of these addresses we want in the total report. Since the Berkeley Studios provides free service (engineer) to the Boards of the Church for taping, the approximate cost of the master tapes will be \$22.00 and these will be placed in the Berkeley Distribution Centre. On motion of Catherine McKeen and Alma Gomez it was agreed that we ask the Berkeley Studio to make tapes of these addresses available to us for sale or rental through their Distribution Centre. After some discussion re the second question, Eileen Graham volunteered to type and

mimeograph Dr. McMillan's and Miss Lace's speeches. On motion of Marion Thomson and Mrs. Campion it was agreed that a completed mimeographed report of all sessions be mailed out to members of the Fellowship.

Hazel Heffren was then called upon to present a summary of the discussions in our buzz groups (which she did under the following headings):

1. Need to develop and give expression to our mutual concern for each other.
2. Need for an organization to help us in our obedience to our commitment where we are.
3. Need to clarify the meaning of deaconess.
4. Need to continue one association of both deaconesses and other professional church workers.
5. Need to continue Biennials in some form.

We must not have this Fellowship take the place of the fellowship in the Church.

REPORTS OF THE SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

A. What needs to be done:

- I. Develop and give expression to our mutual concern for each other.
 - A) Send Birthday Cards, Prayer Calendars. These are not enough unless we give more reality and depth to our relationships.
 - B) Need a head -- a travelling "head sister", a central person with a personal concern.
 - C) Need of a centre -- more of a centre house or mother house than an office. Covenant College is really in this position for us because our common training binds us together.
 - D) Continue and expand the care of retired church workers, both W.M.S. and deaconesses (and possibly others).
- II Give us help in being obedient to our commitment where we are:
 - A) Provide a discipline or Rule of life and obedience. (Some want quite a detailed Rule and some a very flexible one -- open to others not deaconesses: no objectionable exclusiveness.)
 - B) Provide for experimental use of various kinds of rule -- or discipline. (some suggested a five-year, and some a two-year period.)
 - C) Provide contacts with and personal interest in individual church workers around the world.
 - D) Provide a vehicle for our contributions to the world's need.

III Clarify the meaning of "deaconess" in the United Church of Canada.

- A) Find what is the significance of the name "deaconess" (still one objection that it is an awful name.)
- B) Find what is the nature of the recognition by the Church of the "Deaconess Order".
- C) Define our relationship to the local congregation as well as to Presbytery, in the same way ministers' relationships are defined by the Manual.
- D) Clarify the relationship between deaconesses and (1) trained but not designated people and (2) untrained but functioning-in-a-paid capacity people.
- E) Interpret the nature of the "Call", and permanency or changeability of the call to be a deaconess, define the conditions upon which deaconesses are no longer such, and decide what kind of standing they may continue to have.
- F) Give some basis for comparison between our system and those of other churches.

IV Continue the Biennial Conference in some form.

- A) For a sounding board.
- B) For study.

V Continue One association of deaconesses and other professional women in the church.

- A) Some see a minimum of organization geared largely to planning for the biennial.
- B) Maintain a clearing house and inter-communication between local groups.
- C) Put an emphasis on openness and inclusiveness in regard to membership by interested people from other ministries.
- D) Leave leeway for the future membership of men or the recognition of a candidate organization of lay men working in the Church.

B. What must not be done:

1. We must not become exclusive and withdraw ourselves from the fellowship which we find in the church because we are Christian.
2. We must not focus on this organization nor any discipline or rule as an end in itself, but only as a way of helping us to be more obedient to our original commitment to the service of Jesus Christ and His Church.

The President pointed out that the two basic agreements in our buzz groups are our common calling in the church in the world and a desire for a Biennial Conference. However, there is a great variance in the amount of structure and common discipline needed to be set up between Conferences and a real flexibility seems to be requested.

On motion of Mary Urquhart and Mrs. Campion it was agreed that the Secretary of the Deaconess Association be asked to read to this meeting the motion passed at the Deaconess Association. Jean Carr then read the following:

"It was moved that the National Deaconess Association be prepared to be incorporated with the Fellowship of Professional Women Workers into a single organization which will fulfill the responsibilities laid upon it by the members of the two existing organizations."

In the light of the action of the Deaconess Association, and in the light of the discussion at this Biennial Conference of the Fellowship, it was moved by Jean Carr and seconded by Catherine McKeen that the Fellowship of Professional Women Workers be prepared to be incorporated with the Deaconess Association into a single organization which will fulfill the responsibilities laid upon it by the members of the two existing organizations. Carried unanimously.

Much discussion followed out of which the following questions, thoughts, and motions emerged:

Since the Nominating Committee appointed by the Fellowship is made up of representatives of the Deaconess Association and the Fellowship the slate they present would be the Executive for the new organization.

On motion of Eleanor Gamble, seconded by Heather Dau, it was agreed that the slate of officers for the new organization be presented and elections held tomorrow and that the old executive work with these officers until it and the present business of the now existing organizations is completed.

It was pointed out that a name for the new organization needs to be chosen by tomorrow to facilitate the work of the executives in their consideration of the function and structure of the organization and the technicalities involved in administering funds.

Catherine McKeen as chairman of the Nominating Committee asked for guidance re the officers required particularly in the light of no longer having an executive secretary. Alice Philip suggested considering appointing vice-presidents from other parts of Canada to help make the tie of the National Executive with all members closer. It was noted that the Presidents of local units are members of the executive and that possibly there will be a great deal of rethinking in the units in the coming year which will make the tie even more important.

Margaret Silver suggested that perhaps we need to consider what we want in this new group before the Nominating Committee will be able to

complete its task. It was agreed that the slate as previously outlined be presented tomorrow and that any changes needed could be made then.

The question re the relationships of the study committee set up by the Deaconess Association to this new organization was then raised. After much discussion it was agreed that the total fellowship also needs to consider what the meaning of its corporateness is too, and that the new executive would be the people to study this as they carry on with the considerations we have been studying and discussing here, but that the Deaconesses still need to do this study as Deaconesses separately from the total fellowship. On motion of Dorothy Young, seconded by Helen Mack, after careful consideration, it was agreed that we authorize those who will be appointed as the executive of this new organization to proceed immediately to form a minimum constitution which will permit it to give to its members such direction as is necessary before the next two years and also that it continue to study the structure and function of the new organization in the light of discussions at this Biennial Conference.

A concern was voiced regarding the necessity of the Study Committee to work closely with the new executive as they both seek to carry out their assigned tasks. On motion of Florence Ward, seconded by Alma Gomez, it was agreed that all members of the new organization be sent frequent reports of what is happening in the Study Committee and as the new executive continues the study begun here, that the members also be brought into the study itself through consultation. Two questions were raised but not discussed: 1) Would the cost of this be more than our funds could manage? and 2) Should the Chairman of the Study Committee be on the Executive?

Before the meeting adjourned for the afternoon Jean Angus made the suggestion that since we have the Baby born, over the supper hour we should think of a name for it so that we can call it something else but "It".

Alice Philip moved the meeting be adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGARET QUIGLEY.

MINUTES

August 29, 1963.
8:00 P.M.

The meeting re-convened following a banquet in honour of Mrs. Campion. Following brief announcements, Mrs. Campion addressed the group.

Included in Mrs. Campion's remarks was a sense of thankfulness and gratitude for the opportunities which she had shared through the years in working with so many people. She cherished the chance to talk with workers and share in their joys, frustrations and problems. Through the years she has been concerned for retired women workers. It was her prayer that somehow she might direct the committee, but also keep retired people in mind. She expressed her keen sense that "All of us are in this together and must do something about it". She prized most of all the confidences which people have shared with her and which she considered to be privileged communications. Mrs. Campion expressed her concern for women's place in the Church. She recalled certain people and instances and what they represented. She recalled the pioneer spirit of women. She has been conscious of our need for "new patterns for new needs in new times". She reminded us that the Church needs the insight and point of view of women. She expressed the hope that women will be seen in the courts, and policy making levels of the church. We have to continue to be intolerant of unfairness wherever we find it, and continually deepening our faith, widening our vision and deepening our compassion for people.

The group was greatly amused as Mrs. Campion told of a parcel of clothing arriving addressed "The United Church of Women, 761 Queen St.". The parcel came !!

In conclusion Mrs. Campion reminded us of the need to rededicate ourselves and make sure that the service we give is our best.

At the beginning of the business session, Bessie Lane moved, and Margaret Quigley seconded, that Helene Manning be secretary of this session.

It was suggested by Miss Lois Boast that Mrs. Campion be made an honorary member of this new organization, but was reminded by the nominating committee that in their report tomorrow they were prepared to suggest that she be made an Honorary President.

The following reports from the units were received. Margaret Smith, reporting for the Montreal Unit, reported that they have a membership of twenty. They have heard several speakers during the year and had made visits to several institutions. A picnic was held at "Sugaring Off" time in the Laurentians.

The report from the Vancouver unit was given by Alma Gomez. Their group is about the size of the Montreal unit. Three interesting sessions were held dealing with the General Council findings. The group was fortunate in having one of its members, Bessie Lane, in attendance at General Council. An interesting retreat was held on Easter Monday in Nanaimo under the leadership of Miss Jessie Oliver. At conference time a new deaconess and a newly ordained woman were welcomed.

At this point it was suggested by Nancy Edwards that travelling workers would like to know when the various units hold their meetings. Marg Smith suggested it would be well to have a central place to submit the plan of the various unit meetings.

There was no one present from the Winnipeg unit, but greetings had been received in a letter from Edith Macdonald.

Dorothy Ovens, reporting for the Hamilton Unit, said they have a membership of about twenty, in their interdenominational fellowship. The group has been studying Bonhoeffer's book "The Cost of Discipleship". The group was saddened during the year by the death of Evangeline St. George.

Alice Philip reminded us that the Directors of C.E. in Hamilton also meet about every six weeks.

Activities of the Toronto unit were reported by Rosalene Sallman. This unit has heard several speakers. Nancy Edwards finished the report by giving an hilarious account of the unit's visit to Pioneer Village!

Various members of the group mentioned that there are C.E. Directors meetings in Toronto, Calgary, and Saskatchewan.

Miss Jean Stewart gave an interesting report on a similar type of fellowship in Trinidad for professional women workers and ministers' wives. There are two such groups in Trinidad, and every year they have one meeting together.

Lois Boast reminded us that the next two years should continue to be interesting as we move forward together in the various units.

A discussion of the communion offering followed. The Chairman had received a letter from Dorothy Young with suggestions. It was first decided that we would have an offering (A. Gomez moved, and Dulcie Ventham seconded: motion carried) and then Dulcie spoke of the need in Hong Kong for a retirement home for missionaries. It was suggested that we might make a tangible contribution toward the furnishings or the beauty of the place.

M. Brown, former missionary in China, reminded us that in previous days there Chinese missionaries were part of family units. Now that many are cut off from home, the need for such a home is more imminent than ever.

Another suggestion for the offering which had been raised by K. Hockin early in the Conference was raised again by Lois Boast. This "African Defence and Aid Fund" was discussed briefly. One suggestion was that we divide the offering between the two. We were reminded it is possible to purchase Christmas cards in aid of the Defence Fund. The question of the aid of Negroes in the South was raised and several other worthy suggestions were made. Ruth Tillman was asked to bring some information on the Martin Luther King Fund.

S. Johnston made the helpful suggestion that if we contributed to the Hong Kong Retirement Home, it would be a gift from a group of Canadian Church Women to another group of Church women.

It was moved by M. Mossop and seconded by B.A. Caldwell that we send the offering to the women of Hong Kong, to be used for the setting up of their home for retired church workers. Carried.

The place of the next Biennial was discussed. Lois Boast recalled that since the opening of Covenant College it had been customary to hold every second Biennial Conference there. It was suggested that we consider holding the next Biennial Conference in Vancouver. We were reminded that the Banff School of Fine Arts had been suggested at the last Conference. Discussion of this matter of fees and financing was to be held the following morning.

The group then adjourned to the Chapel.

Respectfully submitted,

L. HELENE MANNING.

MINUTES

August 30, 1963.

10:45 A.M.

The Business session on Friday morning was chaired by the President, Miss Lois Boast. Miss Barbara Elliott was appointed recording secretary for this session. Miss Nancy Edwards made an announcement regarding available literature on the programmes "When a Child Asks" and "Tell Us a Story". It was announced that the Study Committee was to meet following the morning session.

Rev. Harriet Christie explained something of the Order of Service to be used at the Communion Service on Friday afternoon, along the lines of the Service of the Church of South India.

The report of the Nominating Committee was presented by Rev. Catherine McKeen. This is to be an Interim Executive for a new organization for Professional women for the next Biennium.

Honorary Presidents:

Mrs. W.J. Campion
Dr. Jean M. Hutchinson
Dr. Winnifred Thomas

President:

Ferne Graham

Vice-President

Ruth Tillman

Recording Secretary

Jean Carr

Corresponding Secretary

Mary Urquhart

Conference Secretary

Catherine McKeen

Treasurer

Katharine Hockin

Representative of Covenant

Harriet Christie

College

Members-at-Large:

Representatives from each Conference where there is no unit.

Esther Highfield (concern for Home Missions)

Wilna Thomas (concern for World Missions)

Ida McKenzie (rep. retired people)

Lois Boast

Moved by Catherine McKeen and seconded by Sara Harrison that this report be accepted. We voted on the receiving of the report and it was carried. The President called for further nominations or questions. She asked if there was any reaction to the suggestion of members-at-large. Miss McKeen explained that they had started to put in third, fourth, etc., Vice Presidents, but had decided that Unit Presidents would be members anyway and it would be better to call them members-at-large. Where there are city units, they will likely take the place of Conference representatives. On motion of Rev. C. McKeen, seconded by Ruth Tillman, it was agreed that the Convenor of the Study Committee should be made a member of the Interim Executive. There was a word of explanation that the new President, Ferne Graham, was presently ill at home. Sara Harrison moved a word of appreciation to the Nominating Committee for the good job they had done on this

Interim slate. Moved by Florence Wellington, seconded by Alic Philip, that this slate be the Executive. Carried. Catherine McKeen announced that they might meet briefly on Friday before disbanding.

A discussion followed regarding fees. It was felt that at least an experimental one should be looked at. It was explained that in the past there had been a difference between what Deaconesses paid and what non-Deaconesses paid. Deaconesses have been paying \$3.00 and non-Deaconesses \$2.00; the difference being because of extra expenses Deaconesses have -- e.g. books for new Deaconesses, etc. It was clarified further that retired Deaconesses and Missionaries have paid .50¢ a year.

Ruth Tillman expressed the opinion that the fee should be uniform now. The problem was raised that we don't know what our expenses will be now. Mary Urquhart clarified that the present fees pay to the end of the calendar year. By then this new Executive will have more idea re the fees needed. The question was asked as to whether the church is saving money by closing the Deaconess Order office, and if so whether any of this would be available. It was cautioned that this idea would be dangerous, as we are to be a part of the Church as Deaconesses, and this Association is a voluntary one, and we shouldn't mix the two. Nancy Edwards clarified that her idea was that General Council might put out some material for us, etc. But it was felt generally that we have to stay within the voluntary framework. Clarification was asked regarding associate members, and the reply was that they have been paying the same as full members.

Moved by Lily Uyeda, and seconded by Marion Thomson, that the fees be \$5.00 a year for full members except for full members who are retired. Carried. It was suggested that the retired members might like to suggest their own amount. Moved by Miss Stella Burry, and seconded by Miss Palethorpe, that retired members pay up to \$3.00 per year. Discussion followed. Among other things it was felt that we should not let retired people make this motion. Also the idea was suggested that as the fee for full members is now roughly doubled, why not just double the .50¢ previously paid by retired members. The motion was defeated. More discussion followed. Moved by Miss LaLa James, and seconded by Dorothy Ovens, that the fee for retired workers be \$1.00 per year. Carried.

Discussion was carried on regarding associate members. Miss Boast read the constitution to clarify for us who are associate members. Associate members have no vote. It was noted that in other organizations the fee for associate members often is less than for full members. The thought was expressed that in a way no permanent decision can be made anyway as things may change in the new organization. It was moved by Mary Urquhart, and seconded by Hazel Heffren, that the membership fee for associate members for this biennium be \$3.00. During the discussion which followed, Marion Thomson asked the question as to whether we really need to make a distinction between members and associate members. It was felt that at present we do need to, but it was agreed that the whole business of associate members should be re-thought... The motion was carried.

The question was raised concerning to whom we pay our fees. One opinion was that everyone should send their fees individually and directly

THE FELLOWSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL WOMEN

Report

of the

COURTESY COMMITTEE

Our thanks is extended to many people for making this Conference possible and valuable:

To the Principal, Rev. Harriet Christie, her colleagues, and the kitchen staff for their courtesies and the use of Covenant College.

To Dr. Kenneth G. McMillan, Miss O. Jessie Lace, and Dr. J.W.E. Newberry in stirring us to new thought and resolve.

To Rev. Catherine McKeen, the organist and various units of the Fellowship for leading us in worship.

To the President of the Fellowship, Miss Lois Boast, her Steering Committee and the executives for their fine leadership.

To panel members and those responsible for book displays, tape recordings and the trip to the Theatre at Stratford.

To Mrs. W.J. Campion for her personal interest in each of us throughout the years of her service as Secretary of the Committee on the Deaconess Order and Women Workers.

One of the delegates who has attended every one of the Biennials was overheard to comment, "I do think this is the best Biennial I've ever attended."

Mildred Mossop
Pearl Willows
Heather Dau

August 30, 1963.

to Toronto. Another person felt that it was easier in "units" if the total fee was paid to the local unit and then sent in a block to Toronto. In some units it is confusing because some people do it one way and some another. It was clarified that all the \$5.00 is to go to Toronto. Moved by Eleanor Gamble, seconded by Esther Highfield, that the fee for the National Fellowship be sent to the Treasurer of that National Organization except if a particular local unit wants to send it in en bloc. Carried.

After brief discussion it was moved by Florence Ward, and seconded by Marvel Clapham, that overseas missionaries pay fees only in their furlough year and that they pay \$5.00 in that year. Carried.

Margaret Silver suggested that the name of the new association be "The Association of Deaconesses and Other Professional Workers." Another suggestion was that "Full-time" might be a better word than "Professional". A further suggestion was the Fellowship of Deaconesses and Associates. Some discussion followed, and it was felt that suggestions could be sent in, as we were not really ready to make a decision on this. Florence Ward insisted that for convenience sake we should have a name for now. Moved by Florence Ward, and seconded by Marg Silver, that we have an interim name for the next two years and that this name be "The Fellowship of Deaconesses and Other Women Workers of the United Church of Canada". Discussion followed. It was mentioned that we do need a name which shows some link with previous organizations. The motion was carried.

Regarding the time of year of the Biennial, the question was raised as to whether it is now held rather late in the summer. Discussion followed. One comment was that we might alternate dates similar to places. Possibly there could be a winter Conference some time. Would it be possible to come through the working year? It was felt that our relations with the employing Boards would need to be looked at in this whole regard.

It was moved by Catherine McKeen, and seconded by Alma Gomez, that the study committee be appointed as a sub-committee of the Interim Executive, and the Chairman of it be a member of this Executive.

Sara Harrison suggested that we send greetings to those who are ill -- e.g., Frances Bonwick, Eunice Peters, Fernie Graham, Agreed. Ruth Tillman expressed concern over not knowing when people are ill, or die, etc. Eleanor Gamble suggested that the class year should always be included in news lists, etc., to avoid confusion. Catherine McKeen suggested that this is part of the task of the new executive in determining how we become closer, etc.

Heather Dau reported on behalf of the Courtesy Committee. (Report attached in full.) Miss Dau moved adoption of this report. Miss Dau then presented a gift on behalf of the Fellowship to Miss O. Jessie Lace. Miss Lace expressed her thanks and her appreciation of participating in our Conference and discussions, etc.

This Biennial was adjourned, the official ending to be the afternoon Communion service, conducted by Rev. Harriet Christie according to the order of the Church of South India.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL WOMENFINANCIAL STATEMENTNovember 1, 1963Katharine Hockin,
Treasurer.Conference FundReceipts

Balance	\$ 462.86
C.O.D.O. & W.W.	500.00
Conference Fund	1,154.00
Travel Pool	472.60
Unexplained Receipts	<u>18.36</u>
	\$2,607.82

Expenditures

Mimeographing	\$ 22.12
Exchange	.45
Receipt books	6.80
Programmes	54.89
Travel Pool	1,351.20
Conference Leader	25.00
Honoraria	200.00
Gift	5.15
Dinner & Conf. Hosp.	82.34
Mailing	<u>24.67</u>

\$1,772.62

Conference Fund

Vancouver Unit	\$ 20.00
Anonymous	18.00
2 @ 2.00	4.00
7 @ 5.00	35.00
1 @ 6.00	6.00
143 @ 7.00	1,001.00
1 @ 8.00	8.00
5 @ 10.00	50.00
1 @ 12.00	<u>12.00</u>
	\$1,154.00

Receipts: \$2,607.82

Expenses: 1,772.62Balance: \$ 835.20General FundReceipts

January Balance \$	\$1,126.18
Fees	420.00
Contributions	3.00
Interest	<u>75.39</u>
Total	\$1,624.57

Expenditures

Letterhead	\$ 16.01
Mrs. Campion -	
Farewell Exp.	122.26
Harcourt's	72.10
Stationery	<u>22.01</u>

Less Expenditures 232.38

\$ 232.38

Balance \$1,392.19

Isabella Haddock Davidson Bequest	\$ 676.00
Addison Memorial	54.00
Conf. Fund (excl. items as Stratford, etc.)	835.20
General	<u>1,392.19</u>
Summary of Balances	\$2,957.39

IN ATTENDANCE AT THE BIENNIAL CONFERENCEAugust, 1963.

Jean Angus
Lois Boast
Margaret Brown
Betty Ann Caldwell
Harriet Christie
Edith Clark

Viola Daly
Joan Dee
Nancy Edwards
Margaret Erratt
Margaret Fulton
Eileen Graham

Sara Harrison
Hazel Heffren
Katharine Hockin
Doreen Hooper
Shirley Johnston
Isobel Leith

Joyce Matheson
Mildred Mossop
Janie Nottle
Alice Philip
Muriel Richardson
Rosalene Sallmen

Margaret Silver
Helen Struthers
Wilna Thomas
Mary Urquhart
Florence Ward
Pearl Willows

Jennie Begg
Edith Bolton
Pearl Budge
Tena Campion.
Ethel Chantler
Dulcie Cook

Heather Dau
Margaret Dempsey
Margarete Emminghaus
Betty Facey
Eleanor Gamble
Ferne Graham

Margaret Halliday
Mildred Herbert
Mrs. Lois Holton
Ruth Hudgins
Ethel Ketcheson
Helen Mack

Evelyn Mathews
Ida MacKenzie
Dorothy Ovens
Margaret Quigley
Evelyn Ricker
Betty Scott

Margaret Smith
Grace Sykes
Marion Thomson
Lily Uyeda
Florence Wellington
Sophia Wong

Mary Blair
Olive Brand
Stella Burry
Jean Carr
Marvel Clapham
Elinor Cox

Joan Davies
Barbara Elliott
Vera Enticknap
Bessie French
Alma Gomez
Aileen Gunn

Etta Hart
Esther Highfield
Belva Howatt
Sarah James
Bessie Lane
Helene Manning

Maureen Mayne
Catherine McKeen
Emma Palethorpe
Aileen Ratz
Ishbel Ross
Hide Shimizu

Jean Stewart
Phyllis Sykes
Ruth Tillman
Dulcie Ventham
Mary Lois Williams
Dorothy Young

