4-1-1959

A Comparative Study of Progressive Education with Contemporary Religious Education

Melvin N. Olson

APPROVED BY

Major Professor: Robert D. Bennett

Co-operative Reader: Nobel V. Sack

Professor of Thesis Form: Mildred Wynkoop

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION WITH CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

by

Melvin N. Olson

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the

Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Divinity

Portland 22, Oregon

April, 1959

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During this writer's years spent in the several areas of seminary study, a growing interest has developed concerning the basic philosophical structure of education, whether secular or religious. A realization has grown upon this writer that no educational viewpoint or system developed without being based upon some particular philosophy. This was evidenced by both secular and religious systems of education.

A class in "History of Christian Education," and limited study on the history of progressive education brought to this writers focused attention the fact that basic presuppositions in an educational theory profoundly effect the final outcome. With this in mind, as well as a desire to study further into the philosophical structure of progressive education, the question arose as to whether there was any relationship between modern progressive education and contemporary religious education.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to (1) review the backgrounds of modern progressive education; (2) to come to an understanding of the philosophy that structured progressive education; (3) to show the implications in educational theory; (4) to make a comparison of progressive education and its philosophical implications with contemporary religious education in America; and (5) to discern any effect progressive education may have had upon contemporary religious

education.

Point three in the above paragraph refers to the implications in educational theory that naturally result from the foundational structure of both progressive education and religious education. This survey will point out how the underlying structure, or philosophy, of secular progressive education will determine in what manner the person is considered and treated. The basic tenents of liberalism, neo-orthodoxy and evangelicalism have a natural carry-over in the respective educational program of each. This natural relationship between theory and actual educational practice is what is referred to when the purpose to show educational implications was mentioned.

Justification for the study. Any study of secular education of this type should answer these questions: What is man ultimately considered to be? Who or what is God? Does such an one exist? If so, what relationship does He have with man? The views held concerning these factors determine how and what man ought to be taught.

Likewise, in a study of religious education, the content of any particular theological persuasion must be a reflection of what it believes concerning God, man, provision for salvation, if such is needed, authority and other related matters. These, in turn, determine how and what is to be taught. The basis of any system or theory is its belief, which is, in reality, its philosophy.

The issues involved in education are of tremendous import. It is inevitable that secular and religious education should exert influence upon each other. Sometimes it may be agreement, other times it may show itself in antagonism. An investigation of a comparative nature between

the two fields of secular progressive education and contemporary religious education seems justifiable.

This study has been undertaken with the hope that an investigation into the respective area of each field may broaden this writers understanding of the implications involved in each. To do this a comparative study has been made between secular progressive education and the three main streams of contemporary protestant religious education.

Limitations of the study. Education is a field of such broad proportions it is necessary that the scope of this study be defined. This study has been limited to the underlying structure or philosophy which forms the basis of secular progressive education. From this limited aspect the consequent implications to education have been considered.

In the same manner the basic tenents of liberalism, neo-orthodoxy, and evangelicalism have been investigated with consequent educational implications considered. By so limiting the bounds of this study it has been necessary that methods, curriculum and administration be excluded.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Progressive education. When speaking of progressive education reference is made to that segment of education which is antagonistic to all forms of authoritarianism and absolutism. The primary forms revolted against are traditional theories of epistemology, religion, ethics and politics. This group is melioristic if not optimistic of man's own natural powers and abilities, particularly his self-regenerative power to face continuously and to overcome satisfactorily the fears, super-

stitions and bewilderments of an ever-threatening environment.

Pragmatism. Pragmatism is primarily an attitude, a method which became a philosophy. Pragmatism emphasizes ends and consequences rather than principles, first things and ultimate realities. Pragmatism is primarily a method concerned with scientific observation and operation for all of life. The prominent features of pragmatism are its concern for the biological and social sciences.

Religious Education. By using this term, reference is made to that process of religious instruction which is commonly conducted by church groups or religious associations. The primary purpose of religious education for any group is to instill a belief of their doctrines in their followers. This is necessary if their belief is to be conserved and perpetuated.

Each one of the three groups in Protestantism which have been covered in this study would insist that their education be called "Christian" education rather than religious education. Yet there are areas which are distinctive to liberalism alone. Neo-orthodoxy has doctrinal views which are distinctively their own. Evangelicals likewise subscribe to doctrines which they feel entitle them to use the term "Christian" education.

Due to this situation it has seemed wise to use the term religious rather than "Christian" education since the purpose of this study has not concerned itself with this phase of the problem.

III. REVIEW OF THE FIELD

To the knowledge of this writer, there is no work available which compares the field of progressive education directly with contemporary religious education. Much literature has been written pro and con, concerning progressive education, clearly stating their position. However, the production of materials which state clearly the positions of various groups in the religious field are significantly small.

IV. HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

Since the early Greek philosopher, Heraclitus, thinkers have attempted to find, by reason and by natural powers, what constitutes the basic structure and elements of the world in which they lived. This study commences with Heraclitus who is thought to have been born about 530 B.C.

Nothing new is proposed in this study. Rather, the purpose is set in new light, at least to the writer of this paper, the comparable tenents of progressive education and contemporary religious education.

The problem has existed throughout the centuries as to what the premise should be for an adequate education. History has witnessed the educational pendulum as it swung from one extreme to another. The basic question which has always determined the direction and goal has been this: does one begin with God or man?

V. METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Materials and data used in this study have been taken primarily from the stacks in the Western Evangelical Seminary Library. Use also

was made of valuable books from the personal libraries of this writer's professors as well as his own.

The procedure was to read through standards in the field and of recognized authors and authorities, both secular and religious.

VI. ASSUMPTIONS

The assumption has been made that the reader of this survey will be acquainted, at least to some degree, with both the fields of education and Protestant religion. As a result of that assumption, words which would have been included in a glossary, had the reader been a novice to the field, have been assumed as understood by the reader.

CHAPTER II

AN HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

I. ANCIENT INFLUENCE

Progressivism in education and pragmatism in philosophy did not drop out of the educational sky unprecipitated. Rather it has many roots in history, some of them quite ancient. The ancient roots begin with Heraclitus.

Heraclitus.

The ancient Greeks produced many of the world's greatest thinkers. One of the first was Heraclitus. His life span is not known for sure. Windelband places his birth between 540 and 530 B.C., and says that his death could scarcely have occurred before 470 B.C.[1]

Little is actually known of Heraclitus except that which is gathered from the fragments of his work, and quotations of him made by Plato and Aristotle. Of the little that is known of him, it is evident that he expressed the belief that all reality is characterized by constant change, and that nothing is permanent except the principle of change itself.[2]

Heraclitus observed that nothing stayed the same. Everything constantly changed. He noted that many things were opposites:

---

[1]W. Windelband, History of Ancient Philosophy, quoted in J. Donald Butler, Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Education and Religion, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), Pp. 395-396.

[2]Theodore Brameld, Philosophies of Education In Cultural Perspective (New York: The Dryden Press, 1955), p. 94.

> The soul and water, water and earth, day and night, winter and summer, war and peace, satiety and hunger, fire and air, the living and the dead, the walking and the sleeping, the young and the old, the cold and the warm, the moist and the dry.[1]

Yet these opposites did not appear to him as ultimately separated opposites. Rather he saw in them appearances that passed one into the other. Earth becoming water, water becoming soul, day becoming night, and night becoming day, the young becoming old, and so on, infinitely.[2] The world, then, to Heraclitus was a constantly changing process, all things flowing and nothing abiding.

Protagoras and the Sophists.

Protagoras agreed with Heraclitus, that all things change, and he defined knowledge as sense perception.[3] He held that the knowledge of the world came to man by the stimulus and response method. Yet these stimulus-response situations never remain constant, and consequently cannot be considered to represent a reality. All of the stimulus-response experiences are simply a part of the constant flux everywhere in the universe. These sense perceptions, however, are the closest that one can come to reality. The problem of determining what is true and of value is highly doubtful, if not impossible. What is true, then, is whatever sense perceptions one has at a given time. The Sophist Protagoras stretches the theory that both truth and value are relative to time and place.[4]

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 396.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 399.

[4]Brameld, op. cit., p. 95.

CHAPTER II

AN HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

II. MODERN INFLUENCE

Francis Bacon.

A leap of a number of centuries brings us to Francis Bacon, the one credited with contributing much to progressivism.

Bacon was an Englishman who lived in the Elizabethan age. He roused the world with his revolutionary approach to human knowledge. Bacon regarded the beliefs of men as being to a great extent the workings of their own minds with too little respect for actual reality.

Bacon felt that one of the primary reasons for man's erroneous view of knowledge was because he held a homocentric view. Man had gathered a great number of beliefs and practices about him, which, though very impressive, were actually of little or no value, because they were false. Consequently Bacon insisted that men shake off these false notions and put in their place a system of simple observation and the scientific, experiemental study of nature. This system was to be achieved by using an inductive approach to logic. Knowledge was to be approached by observing things simply as they are. Thus particular things have value and when generalizations are made, these values are lost.

To follow a historical continuity of progressive ideas in education, it is necessary to follow the work of other Europeans also.

John Amos Comenius.

John Comenius was born in 1592, in Moravia. He stands in the stream of progressive education because he was a great innovator of educational method.

Comenius was to know much heartbreak and bitterness in his

personal life. Orphaned at an early age, and defrauded of a small inheritance, he lived in the home of an aunt and attended the local elementary school which was anything but a satisfying experience for the young lad. The teaching of his day failed to take into consideration the needs, interests, and natural abilities of children. Teaching was thoroughly content with little or no relation to life.

Comenius continued his schooling at Hebron College with the expectation of qualifying for the ministry in the Moravian Brothers. While here, Comenius read Ratke's, "Essay on School Reform," with suggestions for correcting the defects in the current system of teaching which had so thoroughly chafed Comenius.

Ratke recognized that there was order in nature and that order was also evident in the growth of the child. He concluded that this order ought to be sought and followed. He also advocated many other changes, among which were no constraint by the teacher, questioning and understanding rather than memorizing, experience of the individual, contact, and inquiry. These were to become the child's authority.

It was around these suggestions that the life purpose of Comenius was to crystalize.

Comenius' contribution has been summarized by Coulter and Rimanoczy.

> It might be said of Comenius that he gathered up all that had preceeded him and made it practical....He knew the past, understood the present, and anticipated the future. His educational aim was: to inculcate the highest ideals of education; to make learning a pleasure, and to produce good citizens; to point out the way to interpret and teach all that is valuable in knowledge.
>
> In the larger sense it was to prepare men for "Eternal Happiness with God." To that end, all knowledge to him was valuable. He collected it and systematized it in an

orderly fashion.[1]

It should be remembered that Comenius was a church man. He became a bishop in the Moravian Church. In contrast to many who were to follow him, Comenius' purpose and aim in his educational philosophy was that the ultimate end of man is beyond this life; life is a preparation for eternity.[2]

Jean Jacques Rousseau.

Some forty years after the death of Comenius, Rousseau was born, who was to cause a stir which has never completely died down.

While Rousseau is classified in the same historical stream as Comenius, his secondary reasons were far different. Rousseau's primary reason for his works appears to have been a rebellion against the formality of his time, which saw all of life so formalized that it seemed to be bound hand and foot in chains.

Coulter and Rimanoczy make the observation that

> it must be remembered that his times were formal, the church was formal, the court was formal, dress was formal, and education was so formal that parents scarcely knew their own children; so that any suggestions for the breaking down of informality, however imperfect fell on receptive ears.[3]

Rousseau did not present any systematized and logical theory of education, but rather presented his theories in a haphazard fashion in his writings.

---

[1]Charles W. Coulter and Richard S. Rimanoczy, A Layman's Guide to Educational Theory (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1955), p. 92.

[2]Ibid., p. 93.

[3]Ibid., Pp. 98-99.

His famous Emile was stated to be a child study. It made Europe child conscious as no writing had done for centuries and became an inspiring source of 18th century reforms.[1]

It was Rousseau's contention that "everything is good as it comes from the hands of the author of nature, but everything degenerates in the hand of man."[2] In Emile, he takes a young boy and attempts to develop him in a way that will maintain his pristine goodness.

Natural Education to Rousseau was rather a negation of any formal education in the child until he was twelve years of age. He was to do as he was moved to do with no external interference. Education was to be purely negative in its earlier stages. It consists of shielding the child's heart from vice and his mind from error.

While none of Rousseau's observations in education were new his

> significance lay not in his originality but rather in his ability to formulate current tendencies with such emotional fervor and rhetorical skill that they gripped the hearts of his readers and stimulated them to do something to correct the maladjustments indicated.[3]

While Rousseau's theories may have been full of holes and inconsistencies, yet he did recognize the child as an individual with different interests and abilities. He recognized the natural aids to learning which had been paid only the slightest heed by the educators of his time.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 99.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., Pp. 100-101.

Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century, closely following Rousseau's emphasis on naturalism and individualism in education, and not entirely unconnected with it, came the sense realism (learning by working with the hands) emphasis of Pestalozzi and his two disciples, Herbart, and Froebel.

Until Pestalozzi's time, education had been largely a matter of hearing about things by verbal process. He did not agree with this. Knowledge, he held, came through one's senses, not through verbal formulas and signs. Pestalozzi held with the sense realists that "sense impression is the absolute foundation of all knowledge."[1]

This so-called new concept in education, that knowledge came by sense experience only, naturally negated any religious aim such as Comenius held. To Pestalozzi education was the organizing into a harmony the instincts, capacities, and powers of the growing child.

Education, then, rather than religion became to him the power for the regeneration of society.

> Looking upon the child as a unity made up of separate faculties of moral, physical, and intellectual powers, he believed that education should consist in the natural, progressive, and harmonious development of all the child's powers and faculties....Since it is nature that gives drive to life, the teacher's task is one of adapting instruction to the individual child accordingly as his nature unfolds in the various stages of natural development.
>
> In the education of children it was necessary to rely at the earliest stages upon observation of actual things and natural objects rather than upon books and reading.[2]

---

[1]R. Freeman Butts and Laurence A. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953), p. 380.

[2]Ibid.

Activity was a highly important word to Pestalozzi. To him education was the result of activity, not activity as an aid to education.

While Pestalozzi did not go to the excesses of Rousseau concerning individual freedom, yet his philosophy of naturalism would logically deny any external authority from that which was resident in each individual child.

Friedrich Wilhelm Froebel.

Froebel was a contemporary and a student of Pestalozzi. He was born in 1782 and neglected in his youth until a maternal uncle gave him a home. At the village school he was considered a dunce because of his constant questioning.

From here Froebel went as an apprentice to a forester. It was while he worked in the forest that he gained an insight into the unity and uniformity of nature. He became dominated with the idea of the unity of nature which possessed him all of his life.

Froebel viewed man as a part of this unity of nature. In his work in Pestalozzi's school, Froebel became what is known as the discoverer of childhood. He was the champion of the child.

In the history of the Middle Ages as well as some reformation groups, the child was believed to be depraved, to a degree at least, by some, and totally so by others. Froebel reacted against this and maintained that the child was not depraved. If he seems wicked, it is because he has been mislead, mishandled, and misguided. Froebel had no patience with teachers who assumed natural depravity in children and treated them accordingly.

While he may have gone too far, as indeed he did, in propounding

the inherent goodness of children, yet it was a reaction to the popular thinking of Europe which considered the child a little barbarian, inherently destructive, disorderly and miserably depraved, a notion resulting from the church's doctrine of original sin.[1]

Froebel conceived of the mind as activity. To him education was concerned about life. Education was not preparation for, but rather participation in the life around one. For Froebel, activity, doing things, was the basis of education.

Froebel felt that the proper time to start the educative process was with the small child of three or four years. The kindergarten is an institution of his creation. The idea was to provide an atmosphere where children could grow. Play was the highly important thing in this school. He felt play to be the highest phase of child development.

> This new respect for the child, for his individuality, and for the dynamic and active qualities of his nature obviously involved a lessoning in the traditional rigidity and formality of school atmosphere. The emphasis upon manipulation of objects and freedom to explore and to express one's self produced a greater accent on activity in place of intellectual pursuit. Furthermore, his notion of group activity as a natural means of expression led to a realization of the importance of good social relationships as a desirable outcome of school and community life.[2]

Auguste Comte.

The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte, a Frenchman, is an important link in progressive education, especially the later type of pragmatic educational philosophy. He was born at Montpellier in 1798.

---

[1]Coulter and Rimanoczy, op. cit., p. 118.

[2]Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 381.

Educated in the Ecole Poly-technique in Paris, he distinguished himself as a brilliant student.

The positivism of Comte is a kind of naturalism which is quite common today. Laws and relations are regarded as fundamental rather than physical or spiritual substance of any kind.[1]

This can be better comprehended when Comte's three stages of progress are understood. He held that man passes through three distinct levels, or stages, of intellectual insights. As he passes through these three levels, his thinking develops and becomes more refined. These stages in the order of progression are the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive.[2] The third level is the highest level to which men attain. Comte says that the three stages of progress all served valuable purposes in bringing man to maturity in his ability to cope with society.

Butler gives them here:

> The theological philosophy: at this early level of thought man could not have comprehended laws as such, and would have floundered hopelessly had he not been able to grasp at the belief in supernatural power as a source of help.
>
> The metaphysical stage: it was a transition between the theological and the positive, and as such provided no far-reaching beliefs nor did it determine any social structures. It was a period whose coming and going were both gradual.... The attempt in the metaphysical stage to provide substantial substitute for the belief in the supernatural cushioned the shock of the conflict between the theological and the positive, and provided an intellectual medium in which positive philosophy gradually gained the ascendance and theological philosophy gradually declined.
>
> The positive stage: brought a recognition that there are laws which govern social and political relations just as

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 406.

[2]Ibid.

> there are laws of physiology, chemistry, physics and astronomy. Consequently, according to Comte, the summit of intellectual insight is the realization that man can cope with society by discovering these laws and working in harmony with them.[1]

The contribution of Comte is important in the stream of contributors in that two facets of his philosophy have followed into twentieth-century American pragmatism. They are the positivistic treatment of metaphysics and an intense interest in social relations.[2]

III. AMERICAN INFLUENCE

Progressive education in America is so intertwined with the philosophy commonly known as pragmatism that it is all but impossible to consider them separately. In this section it will be necessary to consider both as we trace the growth of progressive education.

Charles Sanders Peirce.

Peirce is usually considered to be the founder of pragmatism in America. He was influenced by Kant and gave serious consideration to the way in which problems of metaphysics can be solved if one gives attention to the practical consequences of ideas.[3]

The pragmatic movement precipitated itself in a paper by Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914) on "How to Make Our Ideas Clear."[4] Peirce

---

[1] Ibid., Pp. 407-408.

[2] Ibid., p. 408.

[3] Harold H. Titus, Living Issues In Philosophy (New York: American Book Company, 1946), p. 253.

[4] Vergilius Ferm, ed., A History of Philosophical Systems (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1950), p. 387.

was not well known in his day, and his real impact is only now being understood by the posthumous editing of his papers.

The later pragmatists, James, and Dewey, carried his root idea to much more radical extremes than he himself would have done.

It was from Peirce that James gained and developed his central philosophic principle: that ideas are meaningless unless they make a difference in experience, unless they work.[1]

Peirce's criterian of ideas was not so much a test of the truth of ideas as a means of determining what the content or essence of an idea is.[2] It is doubtful if his intention was to build a full-fledged philosophy of his proposals, although Peirce was thoroughly scientific, naturalistic and empirical in his thinking.

William James.

William James was contemporary with Charles Peirce. He was born three years before Peirce and died four years before him.

James was a very popular philosopher who was also an excellant teacher and speaker as well. Pragmatism, as a philosophy, came to life with James. Twenty years after Peirce had written his article stating his principle, James brought it forward and used it in connection with religion. From this point forward, James was to provide the initial force to pragmatism.

James was a qualified enthusiast for pragmatism by his own vital conviction. In the very depths of his own personal life he had applied

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., p. 96.

[2]Butler, op. cit., p. 412.

the pragmatic principle to such good effect that it had meant the difference between insanity and mental health; at least this was his own judgement.[1]

The background for this conviction of James' was: When he was approximately thirty years old he was experiencing difficult times in that his philosophical doubts had overburdened an already weak body. James came to the place where life was unbearable. There were times when even suicide seemed a change for the better. He was near insanity, or at least he experienced visions of himself falling into a dread type of insanity he had become acquainted with while studying medicine.

At this point James came upon his now famous "will to believe."

> Men often face crucial situations in life where they must choose and act. In many of these situations they do not have all the evidence available, and they may not be able to find it. Consequently, they must act without adequate evidence. This is where their will to believe may enter and create new truth or new value simply through the will to believe. Life is more than logic and more than theory. Life's values are empirical and are found in experience as men test them. The belief tends to create the fact. This will to believe in turn leads to discovery and to conviction or belief.[2]

It is evident, then, that God and religion are not ruled out of James' philosophy. James asserts that experience shows that the hypothesis of God "certainly does work" and therefore is true. He cites his own book as a witness that his kind of pragmatism cannot be charged with being atheistic.[3]

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 413.

[2]Titus, op. cit., p. 256.

[3]Butler, op. cit., p. 416.

At the same time James' God was not an infinite, Supernatural God, but rather a finite God. James was impressed with the novelty, freedom, individuality and diversity of our world.[1] Because of this it was necessary for him to insist upon a God who was neither infinite nor absolute.

> Pluralism means that there are real possibilities for good and real evils in our world. No good, all-powerful God could have created the world as we know it. When God is part of the world rather than all of it, divinity and humanity have more in common. God is moral and friendly. James' doctrine of meliorism implies the belief that man can co-operate with God in struggling to create a better world.[2]

In other aspects James follows in the historical stream which started with Heraclitus. Reality was continually in flux and change. Reality, to James, was just what it was experienced to be. He looked toward end results and facts rather than to first things or ultimates. Experience to James was fragmentary. James, as others before him, held to the plurality of the universe rather than a monistic or dualistic universe.

Knowledge is founded on sense perception or on experience, which is the continuous, flowing stream of consciousness.[3] James, in contrast to other pragmatists, invested truth with some degree of permanence once experience verified it.

---

[1] Titus, op. cit., p. 256.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 254.

John Dewey.

John Dewey was a New Englander, born in 1859. His home was in Burlington, Vermont, where his father was proprietor of a village store. Dewey grew up as a normal child, with the usual boy interests. Occasionally he did odd jobs, and on Sunday he dutifully attended church.[1] Apparently Dewey was not exceptional intellectually during his years in public school education.

> In fact he was a college junior before his mind showed signs of any potency. Then, in a physiology course, a book by Thomas Huxley came to hand. The blunt materialism of Darwin's great contemporary shook young Dewey. He had always believed, as an impeccable Christian, that man's life was shaped by moral will; never, certainly, had the thought assailed him, as the scoffing Huxley now asserted, that life's determining forces were unalterably material.
>
> For Dewey the gulf between these views was not only startling; it was also distressing. During the following senior year, as if obsessed, he toiled far into the night to reconcile it. Though the answer evaded him, his scholarship benefited, propelling him to the pinnacle of his class with the highest marks in philosophy.[2]

At the University of Vermont, where Dewey took his undergraduate work, he became acquainted with Professor H.A.P. Torrey, who held a type of realism imported from Scotland.

Upon graduation Dewey taught high school for two years in Oil City, Pennsylvania, and one year in a county school in Charlotte, Vermont. Then, after this three year intermission in his studies, he returned to his alma mater for a year of private study in philosophy with Professor

---

[1]Adolphe E. Meyer, An Educational History of the American People New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957), p. 249

[2]Ibid.

Torrey.[1]

From his year of private study Dewey went on to do graduate study at Johns Hopkins University. This was in 1882, and by 1884 he had completed his Ph.D. requirements, with a dissertation titled, "The Psychology of Kant."

At JohnsHopkins he came under three different influences which were all additional to the Scottish realism of Torrey.[2] These influences were to form the cast upon which Dewey grew as a philosopher. The first and most important in these early days was the influence of George Sylvester Morris (1840-1889) who was in close agreement with English idealism and Hegel. The next strongest influence was that of G. Stanley Hall and his experimental approach to the study of psychology.[3] Charles Sanders Peirce was the third great influence on Dewey. He did not, however, touch him much at this time. Peirce was at Johns Hopkins lecturing on logic. Dewey seems to have dismissed Peirce as a formal logician, and at that time his own interests were quite antithetical to formal logic. He was predominately influenced and guided at this time by Morris, with whom Dewey shared idealist sympathies. At the same time he was touched with the teaching of Hall and his view on psychology. This influence was to prove of great importance to the formulation of Dewey's famous viewpoint.

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 417.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

It is Butler's belief that:

> Apparently both Morris and Hall were on trial at Johns Hopkins at that very time; both were being given the opportunity to display their wares and show what they could do in their divergent ways while the university officials decided which direction Hopkins should take. Should it be the historical-philosophical emphasis, or should it be the experimental-scientific? By 1884 the question was answered; G. Stanley Hall and the experimental-scientific approach won out. And accordingly, Professor Morris left Johns Hopkins for the University of Michigan.[1]

At this time Dewey left Johns Hopkins to go with Morris to Michigan where Dewey began his career as an instructor. By so doing, Dewey was agreeing to the idealist emphasis in philosophy.

J. Donald Butler has suggested some of the implications of Dewey's choice of holding with Morris and idealism:

> Sympathy with Morris meant disagreement with British empiricism, a disposition which apparently stayed with Dewey after he forsook idealism. It meant a somewhat reluctant respect for Kant, with Hegel being elevated above Kant as supplying in metaphysics that which Kant could not supply, the doctrine of Universal Mind. It meant a profound interest in ethics, and a recognition that ethics and theology are necessarily related. It meant a prime interest in each individual as a metaphysical ego, and the conception of the chief end of each man as the realization of the personality which it is in him to become.[2]

Hegel's teaching, that there was in reality, no distinction between mind and matter, because matter was only illusory, served for the time to satisfy Dewey. The universe and everything in it, from the pipefish to the whale, Hegel contended, was based in "spirit," and life was the never ending upward struggle toward the Universal Mind of God.[3] It was Hegel's

---

[1] Ibid., p. 418.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Meyer, op. cit., p. 250.

influence, through Professor Morris, that was to hold Dewey somewhat firm after contacting the works of Thomas Huxley.

By 1894 Dewey had taken up the new position as head of the Department of Psychology, Philosophy and Education at the University of Chicago. He assumed this position convinced of Hegelian philosophy.

The inescapable facts of life in the bustling atmosphere of a great midwestern city such as Chicago altered his thinking. Here was a vitality that promoted swift political, economic and social change.[1] Through the freest enterprise men were becoming wealthy in a short time. A companion feature was privateering of many descriptions, with its accompanying evils. While Dewey was still at Chicago, the Middle West experienced hard times, which resulted in great numbers suffering poverty. In such a fermenting world, and especially in Chicago, where things altered before his very eyes, Dewey found it more and more difficult to reinforce his confidence in the comfort of the Hegelian moonshine wherein reality was not matter, but an absolute and unalterable spirit.[2]

These were the circumstances that caused Dewey to shift to empiricism. However, by the time Dewey came to Chicago, his change over from idealism was considered quite complete.

> The single greatest step in this transition was the forsaking of theism and the exclusion from his outlook of the doctrine of a Universal self as superfluous. And quite parallel to this, as far as the individual self is concerned, he came to feel that individual selfhood could be described in a thoroughly behavioristic fashion. He dropped the conception of the self as a spiritual ego or soul, and no longer regarded the indivi-

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

> dual will as an efficient cause which produces changes in the events of the world.[1]

As time went by, his thinking began to lay more and more stress on social reconstruction, and particularly on the conflicts generated when the forces of democracy, science and industry collide.[2] Dewey began to think of the individual as a concrete social phenomenon whose acts are part of a social stream of interactivity and not individually caused by free will.[3] Another aspect of his turning away from the idealist metaphysics of Universal Mind was to consider cultural environment as having pervasive influence in forming the ideas, beliefs and intellectual attitudes of individuals.[4] Dewey no longer thought of intelligence and the world as being unified by the metaphysical substratum of Mind, and came to emphasize the social function of intelligence instead.[5]

The interest of Dewey shifted from metaphysical problems to the methods, attitudes and techniques for biological and social progress.[6] Philosophy, then, was to work for the improvement of human life and its environment. He eventually came to hope for the time when science would be applied to all the worlds problems, the social and moral, as well as the technological, for in science he saw the method by which intelligence

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 419.

[2]Meyer, op. cit., p. 250.

[3]Butler, op. cit., p. 419.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Titus, op. cit., p. 257.

could become effective in the world.[1]

The Laboratory School experiment of Dewey's while in Chicago, was the first time he had the opportunity to put many of his ideas into practice. This experiment was a great factor in the rise of progressive education in America.

Dewey left the University of Chicago in 1905 for Columbia University, where he was a distinguished philosopher for twenty-five years.

Dewey became famous for translating this philosophy into an educational theory. Education came to be his keystone. Education was the fundamental method of assuring progress and social reform. Through the school, society was to determine its course. This, he felt, was the essence of a democratic society. By contrast, the handing-down of prefabricated dicta-moral, religious, social and political--was the hallmark of an autocratic society.[2]

To sum it up, Dewey held that (1) education is actual living and not merely getting ready for eventual living; (2) education is the process of growing; and so long as growth is at hand, education is at hand; (3) education is the constant organization and reorganization of previous experience; (4) education is a social process, and to promote and further this process the school must be a democratic community.[3]

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 420.

[2]Meyer, op. cit., p. 255.

[3]Ibid.

IV. SUMMARY

In this chapter the history of the main stream of thought now called progressivism in education has been shown. It has been noted that progressive education did not appear unannounced in the educational sky. As far back as Heraclitus a view has been noted that contributed heavily to the modern day of John Dewey. Heraclitus expressed his belief in saying that all reality was characterized by constant change, that nothing was permanent except the principle of change itself. Both he and Dewey saw the world as a constantly changing process, all things flowing and nothing abiding.

Following Heraclitus the Greek Sophists defined knowledge as sense perception. Knowledge gained by this route made any knowledge of ultimate reality impossible in that stimulus-response never remain constant and consequently could not be considered to represent a reality. Dewey likewise concurred with this view. While it was impossible to have a knowledge of ultimate reality by sense perception, this, nevertheless, was the closest that one could come to reality. On this premise, the Sophists held that both truth and value were relative to time and place.

Francis Bacon, an Englishman of the Elizabethan Age, caused no small stir with his approach to human knowledge. Bacon contended that simple observation and scientific, experimental study of nature was the system to be used, rather than accepting beliefs and practices based on false concepts. Knowledge, then, was observation and use of facts, gathered by scientific methods and applied to all the problems of man.

A group of continental scholars, viz., Comenius, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel each contributed in the attempt to put the child,

as a person, back into the educative process.

Comenius' primary contribution was to make learning a pleasure, and to produce good citizens. To do this he collected and systematized all knowledge to that end.

Rousseau's primary purpose was to break education out of its formalized prison. He made Europe child conscious. He contended that the child was by nature good. Let the child grow naturally, unmolested by the degenerating hand of man, was his theme. Rousseau's primary contribution was his emphasis upon the natural aids of learning rather than the unnatural concepts of adults.

Sense realism, introduced by Pestalozzi, influenced Herbart and Froebel, who followed. In reality, Pestalozzi was a realist and not a pragmatist of the twentieth-century stripe. Yet he was an important contributor. Knowledge, he held, came through one's senses, not through verbal formulas and signs. Sense impression was the absolute foundation of all knowledge according to Pestalozzi. Activity, then, under him, gained much attention as valuable in education.

His student, Froebel, saw in the world a unity and uniformity in nature. Man, he held, was a part of this unity in nature. The child was all-important to Froebel. He was not a depraved, wicked animal but rather a person needing proper handling and understanding. Under Froebel the child gained respect as an individual. His learning was to be guided in activity. Hence play became the highest phase of child development. To Froebel education was not preparation for life but rather participation in the life around one.

Auguste Comte and his positivist philosophy greatly affected pro-

gressive education. He did so especially in his "three stages of progress," the theological, metaphysical and positive, the positive being the highest stage. It was the scientific stage in which man was able to govern life by his own natural abilities. Both Comte's philosophy and modern pragmatism lean heavily on evolutionary hypothesis.

In America, the three men who contributed most heavily to this stream were Peirce, James, and Dewey. Peirce gave it birth as an idea, James gave it understandable form, and Dewey gave it an educational system whereby progressive ideas were given working room. The underlying problem for these men was attempting to determine the meaning of an idea. It was their belief that for an idea to have meaning it must be put into practice. The consequences which follow constitute the meaning of the idea. The truth and validity of an idea was its ability to prove itself in a given situation.

The next phase of this study is to consider the philosophy called pragmatism and to observe it as an educational philosophy.

CHAPTER III

PRAGMATISM AND PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

CHAPTER III

PRAGMATISM AND PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

I. INTRODUCTION

To separate distinctly pragmatism as a philosophy and progressivist thought in education is somewhat difficult, for pragmatism, while definitely a philosophy, is also an educational theory.

The chief formulator and advocate of pragmatism was John Dewey. In him was combined both a brilliant philosopher and an educator. Under his guidance this philosophy became the most influential philosophy of education in America for well over a quarter of a century.[1]

As was stated earlier, Peirce and James preceeded Dewey in pragmatism. In its American form, pragmatism had precipitated itself in a paper by Peirce on "How to Make Our Ideas Clear." For some years this article received little attention until it was popularized by James in a lecture entitled, "Philosophical Conceptions and Practical Results."[2]

James' lecture was followed by a debate both criticizing and defending this "new" thought. In this debate both in this country and abroad, Peirce's original statement of the theory was misrepresented. The name given to this thought was often used, so he complained, "to express some meaning that it was rather designed to exclude."[3] Peirce did not want to be associated with those whom he felt were making a

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., p. 89.

[2]Ferm, op. cit., p. 388.

[3]Ibid.

travesty of this movement so he publicly renounced the name and substituted Pragmatism, a name which, as he remarked, "is ugly enough to be safe from kidnappers."[1]

At this time a group of scholars at the University of Chicago had been thinking along these same lines - Dewey was their leader. The members of this group, the "Chicago School of Thought," had independently adopted the philosophical method that Peirce had named "pragmatic."[2] This is why different names are often quoted to refer to the same system of thought, viz., pragmatism, instrumentalism or experimentalism.

The group at Chicago

> emphasized the efficacy of ideas, as intellectual tools, employed in experimental operations for the solution of problems. The movement gave rise to a logical theory known as Instrumentalism. It was a generalized theory of human intelligence as a name for the competent procedures of reflective thinking wherever it may occur. The experimental techniques of the laboratory sciences could be extended into all fields of inquiry, and more effective controls and safeguards of inference could be instituted in the practice of solving problems.

One of the reasons for the difficulty in stating clearly where pragmatism stands is that it does not claim to have a system of philosophical doctrine. Rather this philosophy places greater emphasis upon method and attitude. Pragmatism is the modern scientific method taken as the basis of a philosophy. Its affinity is with the biological and social sciences, however, rather than with the mathematical and physical sciences.[4]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Titus, op. cit., p. 253.

Of all the sciences that have contributed to pragmatism, biology, anthropology, psychology and physics, stand out.

> Biology - because man is seen as an evolving, struggling organism interacting with his animate and inanimate environment. Anthropology - because man is also an organism with a very long history of interactions with his fellows living together in cultures. Psychology - because man is a behaving thinking animal, subject, no less than other animals, to experimental understanding. And physics - because by means of this and allied sciences man has proved his astonishing capacity to come to grips with nature.[1]

Pragmatism received impetus from the theory of evolution as propounded by Darwin. The theory of evolution challenged the religious doctrine that the world and man were specially created by divine intervention and that the human being is a form of living being absolutely different from the rest of nature.[2]

> From Aristotle to Hegel educators had looked upon reason or intelligence as something primordial. Hence its exercise or its education was an end in itself. According to the Darwinian hypothesis, human intelligence was a relatively latecomer on the world scene. It emerged as a means of making superior adjustment to a precarious environment. Following this lead, Dewey worked out a theory of education in which people are taught to think, not just because thinking is good in itself, but because it is a means or instrument for solving problems of adjustment in a precarious world.[3]

Pragmatism was contending that by natural processes the simpler forms of life were becoming more complex, and that man as well as all other creatures were simply branches of a common stock of life.

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., p. 93.

[2]R. Freeman Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., 1955), p. 475.

[3]John S. Brubacher, A History of the Problems of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1947), p. 129.

Religion was not the only area to be challenged by pragmatism. Idealism's entire philosophical position was attacked by this new philosophy. Pragmatism was diametrically opposed to the view of German idealism, which influenced most American philosophers, that held the universe to be monistic. Pragmatism opposed the premises that everything in the universe had a fixed place in relation to the whole, and in which truth was looked upon as uniform, fixed and eternal.[1]

Dewey was constantly critical of the traditional and classical types of philosophy with their search for ultimate reality. Dewey stated in his book, The Quest for Certainty, that man has escaped dangers and gained security by using two ways. One way has been to appease or to conciliate the powers around them by means of ceremonial rites, sacrifices, supplication and religion.[2] This, obviously, for Dewey, is the outmoded, unscientific way, which progress in society has surpassed. The second way has been to invent tools by means of which the forces of nature can be controlled to man's advantage. This is the way of science, industry and the arts, and it is the way approved by Dewey.[3]

Progressive education, with its philosophy, was possessed with an aim. This aim was the better organization of human life in the present. Technological, experimental and this worldly view shifted pragmatism's emphasis from metaphysical problems to the methods, attitudes and techniques for biological and social progress.[4]

---

[1]Butts, op. cit., p. 476.

[2]Titus, op. cit., p. 257.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid.

II. PRAGMATISM AS A PHILOSOPHY

In making clear what is meant by progressive education it is necessary first that pragmatism as a philosophy be examined. Pragmatism is the structure upon which progressive education is built. In the context of this paper they are, for practical purposes, inseparable. However, to adequately comprehend progressive education it seems advisable to attempt consideration of each aspect by itself. Four areas of pragmatism will be considered, viz., epistemology, metaphysics, logic and axiology.

Pragmatism builds on the intuition that experience is the proving ground in which the worth of things is made plain.[1] Experience as a guide to worth has, since the beginning of mankind, been respected. In that sense pragmatism is nothing new. What pragmatism has done has been to translate this confidence in experience into the language of the schools, to intellectualize it and make it at home in the ranks of the learned.[2] Other philosophies have built on such things as Nature and her orderly working, the reality of self, and independence of reality of mind, but pragmatism has staked its claim on experience and has said it is the real test of all things.

A. The Epistemology of Pragmatism

Epistemology deals with the possibility and methods of gaining valid knowledge. Also, it is concerned with the origin, nature and limits of knowledge. J. Donald Butler contends that it is approximately

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., Pp. 422-423.

[2]Ibid., p. 423.

correct to say that pragmatism is primarily a theory of knowledge. Because of this, we study pragmatism first of all by looking at its epistemology, and allowing this to be the gateway to an understanding of its metaphysics, logic and theory of value.[1]

The traditional pattern of philosophy will not fit the pragmatist theory of knowledge. Such labels as rational, empirical and inductive or deductive cannot adequately be used. What pragmatism has done is to completely reconstruct philosophy. There is a sense in which this philosophy lies in a midway position between rationalism and empiricism. Rationalism in epistemology, holds that reason is the chief instrument of knowledge while empiricism says that sense perception is the means whereby knowledge comes to us. These two positions are antithetical; pragmatism combines within itself some of the overtones of each while rejecting the extremes of each.

Pragmatism Compared to Rationalism:

The "mission" of the pragmatic movement in philosophy was complete opposition to intellectualism and totalatarian thinking in all of its forms. James states its attitude positively, "of turning away from first things, principles, 'categories,' supposed necessities, and of towards last things, fruits, consequences, facts."[2] Pragmatism, then, is not rationalistic.

> It does not begin with universal truths or principles and then deduce specific items of knowledge from these. By contrast, pragmatism is leery of all generalizations, whether

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ferm, op. cit., p. 397.

> a priori or a posteriori. It regards experience as radically specific and particular. Particular things are so markedly individual that no universals can do justice to them.[1]

It is important to note, however, that pragmatism does not loose itself in particulars. Pure hard facts, apart from any continuing relationship or pattern, are unacceptable to pragmatism as of little or no value. The pattern for organizing facts, which constitutes the care of knowledge, is a hypothesis which works successfully.[2]

Pragmatism Compared to Empiricism:

Pragmatism is not empirical in the traditional sense. To insist that all knowledge comes from experience is not only futile, but positively misleading,[3] say the pragmatists, so long as the "experience," from which knowledge is said to be derived, is conceived in terms of separate and distinct sensations or sense data.[4] The point here is, that if data were given to a receptive mind without any prior activity of selection, comparison and discrimination,[5] it would be of little value unless experientially related to the person.

Pragmatism is empirical in the sense that knowledge must be gained by the sense-perceptual experience as opposed to predisposed principles of reason. Sense perception is his frame of reference. As a matter of fact the pragmatist insists on this point so strongly that there is no

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 424.

[2]Ibid., p. 425.

[3]Ferm, op. cit., p. 391.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid.

willingness to accept knowledge verified in the past at face value, even if the verification is scientific.[1]

Facts, apart from a method of interpretation, and held in storehouse fashion, are considered by pragmatists to be a vice rather than a virtue.

Pragmatism and Experience:

In the section on metaphysics the means of using experience as directing the individual toward reality is covered. The object here is to consider experience as it relates to the gaining of knowledge.

The world, to the pragmatist, becomes meaningful only as he experiences it. The only means whereby this is possible is through sense perception. The pragmatist does not say that if he cannot experience somethings they do not exist. Nature was there in the world aeons of time before the species Homo sapiens emerged on the evolutionary scale. In remote areas of the heavens and even on our own earth, elements exist that have never once come within the scope of human observation - and perhaps never will.[2] The point made is that experience is the key to knowing whether a certain thing is available or not.

> But, says the pragmatist, having made clear this qualification, all of us distinguish between the foreground and the background of reality. The distinction is between experience that is in the focus of awareness and that which hovers on the dim periphery. Backgrounds shift to foregrounds as they become resources of reflective processes; foregrounds become backgrounds as they recede for the time being from the field of sharp attention.[3]

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 426.

[2]Brameld, op. cit., p. 104.

[3]Ibid.

Later, under metaphysics, it is noted that for all practical purposes, the background receives scant attention from the pragmatists, his interest being primarily foreground.

For pragmatism, it is only as we are engaged in active experience with things that qualities come to light in such a way that we "know" them.[1] The objects with which people come into contact with are also in experience. This keeps it from being a subjective affair. It is the experience of both ourselves and the objects that a meeting place is provided. Experience is a kind of ocean in which selves and objects are afloat, and which provides the medium for all meetings of selves and objects.[2] Experience it follows, it not an objective affair. I do not possess experience privately; it engages me; I am possessed by it.[3]

Knowledge that may be gained by the pragmatist is not an unchanging, always true sort, but rather it is limited, approximate knowledge, always relative to a present unit of experience.[4] This is so in that experience is a process of acting, doing, living, rather than primarily an affair of knowing.

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 426.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 427.

[4]Ibid.

The Act of Thought:

Knowledge, whatever its source, must be gained through the mind. Mind, for the pragmatist, is based on a naturalistic interpretation that mind is the function of the living organism. Mind is put back into nature and becomes part of it. The neurologist traces first the effect of stimuli along the bodily nerves, then integration at nerve centres, and finally the rise of a projective reference beyond the body with a resulting motor efficacy in renewed nervous excitement.[1] Pragmatism was highly influenced by physiology and experimental psychology as is evident in Peirce's theory of inquiry as a "struggle," arising out of an initial "irritation of doubt," to the end of attaining a "calm and satisfactory" state of belief.[2] Thinking, simply stated, on this basis is a response to a stimulus that intrudes upon the habitual routine of activity to the point that one must exercise a conscious struggle to free oneself of the state of perplexity and pass back to a state of patterned adjustment. In bare outline, the Act of Thought may be said to contain five elements: (1) Activity, (2) Problem, (3) Data, (4) Hypothesis, (5) Testing. For a better understanding of these elements, we shall consider each one separately.

1. - Activity: This step may be considered the normal activity of moving in an orderly, familiar world. Many small things may come in the path of smooth activity, but of so small consequence, that one is hardly aware of an interruption. If a particular obstacle stubbornly

---

[1]Ferm, op. cit., p. 396.

[2]Ibid.

persists it demands that something new or different be done. This situation leads to the second step.

2. - Problem: At this point one is wide awake to the fact that ones conscious powers are challenged. We stop, and we observe just what it is that interferes. We recall similar, though not identical, experiences. We weigh, measure, take apart. In short, we estimate the obstacle with whatever care its persistence and its size demands.[1] These obstacles, tensions, and problems in experience are the times of great importance, for a new direction is determined, and the direction chosen affects all the subsequent flow of experience. The reflecting upon similar experiences prepares one for the third element.

3. - Data: Here one or two or perhaps dozens of suggestions for conquering the measured obstacle flash across our minds. Such suggestions, when they have reached a point of quite definite specificity and clarity, eventually develop into what Dewey himself sometimes liked to call ideas.[2] As each suggestion from experience is evaluated, the next element comes into action.

4. - Hypothesis: The imagination now takes each suggestion and follows it through, anticipating the consequences that are most likely to follow were one to act upon one of the suggestions presented. To the pragmatist, it is not a blind trial-and-error activity. To him the patterns of action are purposive ways in which the different aspects of the problem

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., p. 105.

[2]Ibid.

situation can be woven together to get--it is hoped--a satisfactory result.[1] When, however, the most likely suggestion is decided to be the most promising, it then must prove itself in trial, for there has never been another situation exactly like this. Now for the final element.

5. - Testing: This is the step where one overtly carries through. Now the success and failure of the chosen hypothesis is proven. If the chosen avenue of action restores the person to the previous equilibrium it is judged as a true idea. Failure to restore smooth experience judges the course of action as untrue, making it necessary to reconsider another hypothesis.

Butler concludes that:

> This is the pragmatic method of knowledge. It yields two things: (1) knowledge, to the limited extent of a sense of the particular way of acting which is acceptable in a particular unit of experience, and (2) value, to the extent that there is action in addition to judgment or conclusion, and something is done which yields changes and brings needed results.[2]

While it would be acceptable at this point to consider pragmatism's theory of ideas and thought more fully, these are covered in the section on logic.

B. The Metaphysics of Pragmatism

Metaphysics concerns itself with the ultimate nature of things. Some have contended that pragmatism does not have a metaphysics, yet

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 429.

[2]Ibid.

several works have been published.

> In 1931 Professor John L. Child's book, Education and the Philosophy of Experimentalism, was published. In Chapter III, entitled, "Has Experimentalism a Metaphysics?" Dr. Childs, who is one of the most loyal exponents of pragmatism today, assumes that there are several general assumptions in experimentalism concerning existence, and he tries to make some of them explicit.[1]

Dr. Butler has outlined the metaphysics of pragmatism reminding his readers that the world view is a refined naturalism.[2] In his outline, which he gives first as a brief series of ten propositions, Dr. Butler states that in each of these ten assertions, the word, "world," will be used to refer generally to the process or order within which man lives.[3] He continues his definition further by saying:

> the term world as used in these statements might be regarded as roughly synonomous with the words cosmos, nature and reality. The equivalence cannot be exact because pragmatism does not dwell upon orderliness as implied in the word cosmos, nor upon an independent subsistent reality as implied in the words Nature and reality.
>
> The ten propositions are as follows:
>
> 1. The world is all foreground.
> 2. The world is "characterized throughout by process and change."
> 3. The world is precarious.
> 4. The world is incomplete and indeterminate.
> 5. The world is pluralistic.
> 6. The world has ends within its own process.
> 7. The world is not, nor does not include, a transempirical reality.
> 8. Man is continuous with the world.
> 9. Man is not an active cause in the world.
> 10. The world does not guarantee progress.[4]

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 430.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 431.

[4]Ibid.

These ten propositions will be expanded in the same manner in which Dr. Butler handled them.

1. The world is all foreground.

This statement is not meant to be absolute. The pragmatist does not deny that there is a background, but rather holds that since experience focuses on the foreground, it naturally receives the attention. Foregrounds and backgrounds flux, meaning that what is foreground today may be background at some future time. Experience, activities and action are not dependent on background in general, consequently background is secondary at best.

Butler points out:

> Pragmatists are not concerned with the discovery of some all-embracing reality which is the background for every experience and for all human activity. Their closest approach to such a general background is to insist that the recognition that there is no such all-inclusive reality is the general background within which individuals and societies live if they are to be effective...society is the ongoing human stream in which significant events take place.[1]

2. The world is "characterized throughout by process and change."

By this statement pragmatism goes deeper than simply the observation that time and events wait for no man. We are to understand that there is nothing which is static or permanent; there is nothing which is outside the flowing river of life's changes.[2]

Pragmatism recognizes the reality of change, seeing it as the natural and universal fact of experience.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 432.

[2] Ibid.

> Even truth was seen to derive from experience, and accordingly, to take on that aspect of changeableness and relativity which is a fundamental characteristic of experience. So truth is relative and subject to change in the light of experimentation and new experience.[1]

Everything, including the concepts which were considered fixed by classical systems of thought, is in flux and movement.

> The things which change more slowly, and seem sometimes to be permanent, are regarded as structure. The things which change more rapidly constitute process. But, though at different rates, both structure and process change and all things flow onward.[2]

3. The world is precarious.

In a world in which all things change there can be no complete security; for change means unpredictability and hazard. Uncertainty and precariousness must be accepted therefore as inevitable.[3]

4. The world is incomplete and indeterminate.

A world of flux and change cannot be a world considered with a closed, fixed system. Pragmatism repudiates any attempt to find or describe what James called a "block universe" - a fixed, forever-the-same, pre-designed reality.[4]

In the world the pragmatist does not regard man as having freedom of choice, but he does find room in the flow of events for man to engage in experimental activities in such a way as to change the direc-

---

[1]John S. Brubacher, ed., Eclectic Philosophy of Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 59.

[2]Butler, loc. cit.

[3]Ibid., Pp. 432-433.

[4]Brameld, op. cit., p. 101.

tion in which events flow.[1]

Experience is always the key word. Ontalogical beliefs that are founded on experience may be said to possess a strong evolutionary quality. Experience is struggle. Life is action and change. Chance, the unexpected, the novel and unforeseen always play a major role.[2]

Pragmatists in many of their writings criticize all doctrines of absolute reality. In fact, pragmatists question whether even the term "universe" - a term implying that existence is one vast, completed cosmos - is anything more than a mere verbalism.[3]

5. The world is pluralistic.

The flowing world in which the pragmatist believes is a world of many different things, a world of multiplicities, strictly speaking, a multiuniverse rather than a universe.[4]

6. The world has ends within its own process.

By this characterization of the world the philosophy of pragmatism attempts to explain the place of objectives or values in life.[5] There is no such thing in pragmatism as a fixed value or objective. In an evolutionary world, where nothing remains fixed, change itself is of more value than other values. If one particular point would be selected it might be said to be growth. Growth is relative to itself

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 433.

[2]Brameld, op. cit., p. 102.

[3]Ibid., p. 101.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Butler, op. cit., p. 433.

and therefore intrinsically good, but it is also relative to further growth and therefore is instrumentally good.[1]

Apart from this one aspect it may generally be said

> objectives and values are not ultimate; they are terminals in experience which are more or less transitory. Some of them are quite clearly means to other ends, toward which experience directly flows onward, once they are realized. Others are values to be possessed for what they are at the time, as ends in themselves, but from which we pass on to other things, although these ends do not become means to other objectives.[2]

7. The world is not, nor does not include, a transempirical reality.

This proposition explicitly declares the nontheistic, nonmystical, nonspiritual character of existence as conceived by contemporary pragmatism.[3]

According to this philosophy the extent of reality is the here-and-now. Dewey's philosophy is of and for daily experience.

> Experience is the whole human drama, and it includes the total process of interaction of the living organism with its social and physical environment. Dewey refuses to transcend human experience or to believe that anyone else has ever done so....Dewey insists that 'experience is not a veil that shuts man off from nature;" it is the only means men have of penetrating further into the secrets of nature.[4]

8. Man is continuous with the world.

Butler analyzes that this proposition is intended as a refutation of the traditional dualism between the inner rational experience of man, on the one hand, and Nature, on the other.[5]

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., p. 115.

[2]Butler, op. cit., p. 434.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Titus, op. cit., p. 257.

[5]Butler, loc. cit.

Boyd H. Bode, speaking on the materialism of behaviorism, has stated concerning this psychology, that "mind" could be ignored, not merely because it was irrelevant to the purposes of the psychologist but because it was really non-existent. The assertion was made that what is called mind is in reality reducible to a bodily process.[1] What this amounts to is that mind and matter are fundamentally the same thing. Everything that we call experience is reducible to forms of movement.[2]

John Dewey was very emphatic when he said it would be impossible to state adequately the evil results which have flowed from this dualism of mind and body, much less to exaggerate them.[3]

The concept of evolution meant that there is no break or gap between the organic and the inorganic, and likewise no separation could be assumed between a mind and the conditions of its development, both physical and biological.[4] The theory of evolution was one of Dewey's chief evidences demonstrating the continuity of man and Nature.

> Accepting this theory as a valid explanation of the way in which new species have come into existence, he extends it so that it yields the further conclusion that man is an integral part of Nature. Much less than being a creation given birth from a source higher than Nature, and even less than a new kind of creature emerging in Nature, man is described as completely and totally a child of Nature, born both within and of Nature.[5]

---

[1]Boyd H. Bode, "Materialism of Behaviorism," Eclectic Philosophy of Education, ed. John S. Brubacher (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 71.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ferm, op. cit., p. 395.

[5]Butler, op. cit., p. 435.

9. Man is not an active cause in the world.

Pragmatism takes the middle-of-the-road position in the age-old argument between exponents of free will and determinism. Contemporary pragmatism neither takes the side of free will nor does it accept a complete determinism which leaves no room for man to influence the direction which events in the world take.[1] Man is not regarded as an active cause in the world, an initiator of movement which sets events beyond himself into motion,[2] but at the same time man is capable of a kind of interaction with the world which changes the direction of events at certain crucial points.[3]

Pragmatism is not so naive as to believe that all of man's action can be adequately described by the simple and efficient stimulus-response bond. Man is not just a machine which responds automatically each time an appropriate action in accordance with the stimulus is received.[4]

> Though much action does go on at this level of automatic response, there is in addition an important level of action at which responses are delayed long enough for them to be the result of a sufficient comprehension of the situation for the action to be a somewhat total response, instead of an automatic response which is partial at best and therefore inadequate to the situation. In the course of building this delayed response, an important reconstructing or redirecting activity goes on in the experience of man which affects the course of events flowing from the response. This reconstructing or redirecting is not a cause of the events which follow from it; it is a kind of handling of causes or forces, of which man is a part, which helps

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 436.

[4] Ibid.

> determine their future direction without effecting any essential change in them.[1]

10. The world does not guarantee progress.

Pragmatism again takes a middle-of-the-road stand on this issue. It takes a stand neither with pessimism nor optimism. The stand of pragmatism is characterized by the term meliorism. According to it, the world does not offer positive guarantees on which man can securely base his hope.[2]

Meliorism holds that the world can be made better by our efforts. Man cannot sit idly by and hope to see an indeterminate world move so as to give him benefit. Rather, man must face the world, he must engage actively in the events of the world, if there is to be any redirecting done, and if anything determinate is to be brought of the world's indeterminacy.[3] The most acceptable course for man to take is to apply himself and do the best he can to bring out the best in life. The end is not guaranteed, but he will have had the best possible for him.

In concluding this section on metaphysics we shall make one further reference to experience. One can hardly over-emphasize the role of experience in pragmatic philosophy. Experience is "the" contact with ontological reality. Dr. Theodore Brameld has listed the typical attributes of experience:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 436.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 437.

1. Experience is dynamic. It moves at varying rates, pauses at temporary resting places, then once more is on its way. This characteristic suggests that its dynamic action is also rhythmic - a kind of alternating, but never merely repetitive, process of adjustment and readjustment, which ever continues because such is the way of nature. Life is never static. Change is everywhere, though rates of change vary immensely.

2. Experience is temporal. As planets, forests, animals, cultures emerge and develop, they are never quite the same today as they were yesterday. And it is certain that they will be different in the days and years and centuries to come.

3. Experience is spatial. While experience pushes forward it pushes also outward, spreading fanwise ever more widely, yet never reaching the outermost limits of the universe because there are no outer-most limits, at least so far as man's capacity to embrace their full meaning is concerned.

4. Experience is pluralistic. It is composed of a vast network of multiple relations, which are just as real as the things related are real. At once spiritual and material, complex and simple, intellectual and emotional, experience enfolds all of the natural world within itself - the pebbles of the beach, the beasts of the forest, the simplest peasants and wisest statesmen of the human realm.[1]

C. The Logic of Pragmatism

Good's Dictionary of Education defines logic thus: (1) in general, scientific (or systematic) study of the general principles on which validity in thinking depends; deals with propositions and their inferential interrelations; (2) the science of inference and proof; (3) the science of implication.

Traditional theories of logic were of no value for pragmatists, at least for the scientific age. Complete reform was necessary in patterns of thinking. The necessity for a new system of logic is in

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., p. 103.

keeping with pragmatisms acceptance of the evolutionary hypothesis. The passing of time has brought progress which by its very nature renders traditional systems obsolete. Aristotle's logic, which was the pattern for Kant in the nineteenth century, is superceded by the new philosophy, pragmatism. In the past Nature was considered closed and dependable by the naturalists. Now with pragmatism, the world is in flux and movement with absolutely nothing remaining the same, including patterns of logic.

Pragmatism admits that traditional patterns of logic may have been acceptable in their day, in that they functioned in line with these old views of science and culture. What is needed, says Dewey, is a new logic to adequately serve a new day, a new scheme of things.

> It must provide a form or medium of communication between the science of our time and the common-sense habits and activities in which people of all walks of life engage, regardless of level of education or understanding. More specifically, the demand on the new logic is that it be "a unified theory of inquiry through which the authentic pattern of experimental and operational inquiry in science shall become available for regulation of the habitual methods by which inquiries in the field of common sense are carried on."[1]

This new logic advocated by Dewey is the pattern of experimental method. The logic of pragmatism is difficult to separate from pragmatisms epistemology. The experimental method is the connection between the two. In the experimental method there is a form of inquiry which can mediate between the technical science of the research laboratory and the everyday common-sense inquiry of home, field and market place.[2]

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., Pp. 438-439.

[2]Ibid., p. 439.

The pattern was given earlier under the heading, "The Act of Thought." This comprised five elements: activity, problem, observation of data, organization of data to form hypotheses and the testing of hypotheses. For the purposes of this study four aspects are considered: (1) Thoughts, (2) Ideas, (3) Truth, and (4) Intelligence.

1. Thoughts: It is important to bear in mind the "continuity of development" postulate of pragmatism. This stems from the evolutionary hypothesis of Darwin and contends that there is no break or gap between the organic and inorganic, and likewise no separation could be assumed between a mind and the conditions of its development, both physical and biological.[1] Thought, then, is itself a continuing process, an "on-going activity."

The whole of pragmatism as a philosophy is built on the assumption that mind is not super-sensory, but rather that mind functions as a living organism. The implications that naturally follow in this theory is that "the whole function of thought is to produce habits of action," and that in order to develop the meaning of a thought, "we have simply to determine what habits it produces, for what a thing means is simply what habits it involves."[2]

The relationship of thinking to thoughts is very close. Thoughts are habit producing functions while thinking may be said to be the whole process of solving problems. Thinking is initiated in the first element, activity, in which a tension or obstacle is encountered. The habit

---

[1]Ferm, op. cit., p. 395.

[2]Ibid., p. 397.

formed in result of this tension encountered becomes a thought.

2. Ideas: Ideas, in Dewey's philosophy are purely instrumental. Since mind is not a separate faculty for thinking, but rather stated in terms of doing, activity, and results, knowing only is possible in such situations. Likewise, ideas are only involved in "doing." Ideas are plans of action and do not exist apart from activity. They are not independent hypotheses or abstractions.

3. Truth: For an idea to be called true, it must satisfy both personal and social needs as well as meet the requirements of objective things. An idea may be called true if it leads to more satisfactory conditions for all those whom the idea concerns.[1]

But even ideas that produce the consequences desired never remain permanently true.[2] Some ideas may hold to be more durable than others yet each new problematic situation in which these ideas are used will be different enough so as to require a reinterpretation of the idea.

There are no permanent, universal truths that remain throughout time absolute and unchangeable. The pursuit of truth in Dewey's philosophy is not that Truth which is the source of all lesser truths. With him the pursuit of truth through problem solving is a much more piecemeal affair.[3] In fact, truth is continually changing since it is integrally a part of experience, and the reconstruction experience constitutes

---

[1]Ferm, op. cit., p. 259.

[2]Brameld, op. cit., p. 108.

[3]Brubacher, A History of the Problems of Education, op. cit., p. 130.

education itself.

Simply stated, in true pragmatic fashion, if an idea does not work out the way it purports to work out, the idea is not true.[1]

4. Intelligence: Dewey has often emphasized his preference for the term "intelligence" to such terms as "knowledge," "truth," or "mind," freighted as they are with historic connotations that pragmatism rejects.[2] These terms are too closely identified with the traditional definitions of universal and absolute import to be comfortably used by pragmatism. Intelligence is, in essence, the experimental way of living, the central method of human interaction with environment.[3] Intelligence is showing favorable results in problem solving situations. Problem solving and intelligence may be practically synonomous terms. One who is most consistently able to expeditiously solve problems would be considered intelligent to a high degree.

In a brief way, the major principles upon which valid thinking occurs have been pointed out. It should also be pointed out that the pattern of logic is ultimately united with society and culture as a whole. This process is social, for individual thought can never be isolated and continue to function.

---

[1]Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 342.

[2]Brameld, op. cit., p. 110.

[3]Ibid.

D. The Axiology of Pragmatism

Contrary to what one might feel about a system which so opposes all authority and absolutes in the traditional form, pragmatism definitely does have values. Ethical and moral values are very prominent in this philosophy, although they must be understood within the pragmatic frame of reference. Two general areas will be discussed in this section: the pragmatic foundation, and the criterian of value.

1. Pragmatic Value Foundations:

Where do values come from, and in what is their existence rooted? It will be seen that pragmatism does not define values as though they existed in any ultimate or final form.

Values arise out of desires, urges, feelings and habits of the human being - values that he possesses because he is at once a biological and social animal.[1] In this sense values are related to beliefs about reality. In another sense values are related to beliefs about knowledge.

> If the test of ideas is the effectiveness with which they bring readjustments to immediate experience, then one may, indeed, contend that an idea is true when it is ultimately good and good when ultimately true. For values are, after all,"identical with goods that are the fruit of intelligently directed activity..."[2]

For Dewey, values were never private, that is, values only arise in a social situation. The sphere of the value problem for Dewey was the "situation" (more specifically the social situation) in which environ-

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., p. 112.

[2]Ibid.

ment and a number of persons, possibly a whole society, were involved.[1] When a conflict arises within a situation, a value problem develops. The conflict is bad. A reestablishment of harmony in the situation is good through satisfying the various conflicting interests.[2] In satisfying the conflicting interests Dewey was concerned with the broader view of a state of integration or harmony, rather than a mental state. Pragmatism prefers a behavioristic approach to value problems so as to avoid imputations of privacy or subjectivity for their studies.[3] A theory of values for pragmatic philosophy is a science like any other which is open to observation, hypotheses, and verification.

Values exist by virtue of their relation with individual-social activities. They have existence to the extent that they function in, or accompany effective functioning in, the individual-social flow of events.[4]

Social inter-action being a cornerstone of pragmatism presupposes that there be a language for which meanings are communicated. Language, communication, is the distinguishing feature that sets man apart from and above other animals. For pragmatism, the language aspect is a requirement before self-hood on the part of individuals. It is by being able to communicate with one another, particularly by words and speech, that conditions are provided for the emergence of selfhood.

---

[1]Ferm, op. cit., p. 498.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Butler, loc. cit.

The principle means, then, by which a self is attained is through the acquisition of meaningful symbols. When an individual is able to respond to another individual by means of a significant symbol, it may be said that, at this point, he is developing his mind. For example, a mother and child are able to understand each other, for they have meanings in common. The child is learning to become a self; he is developing a mind; and he is entering upon the task of thinking by employing symbols to deal with events either before or after an event takes place.[1]

The paramount importance of society and social intercourse is better understood when one realizes that the significant symbol is a social learning, and thus mind is a social learning. An individual has to be a member of a social group that has symbols in common in order to become a self.[2]

As a result of communication man comes to distinguish himself as unique and to refer to himself by a variety of personal and possessive pronouns which language has provided him.[3] A sense of being a part of the moving flow of events comes to him. He develops a sense of past, present and future. He is able to connect himself with life situations and he comes to accept or at least recognize that as such a being he is both responsible and accountable for what he does.

---

[1]Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 341.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Butler, op. cit., p. 445.

> Within the context of experience which possesses these conditions - language, selfhood in individuals, and the objective and social counterpart of selfhood - values can arise. It is experiences having these conditions which provide the basis of existence for values.[1]

2. The Criterian of Values:

How can a person judge the value of a value? Is there only one kind of general value, or are there several? Dr. Brameld classifies two main types of values in progressivism. These are instrumental and intrinsic. Strictly speaking, instrumental values are those we attach to experiences that serve as a means to some desired end other than themselves.[2] Brameld used an appendicitis operation to illustrate an instrumental value. A person doesn't relish the experience for its own sake, but consents to the unpleasantness of the ordeal because his health will be restored. Health may be taken to exemplify an intrinsic value. A normal person cherishes good health because it is immediately satisfying. In this sense, we may speak of health as a kind of good in itself.[3]

Progressivism warns that it is difficult if not impossible to make any sharp distinction between these two classes of value. Actually in some instances, the two may interchange. One type of value can hardly be placed above the other in that each is dependent upon the other. In the "experience" situation an instrumental value may seem to be of greater value, but in a reflective view an intrinsic value may be of greater import.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Brameld, loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 113.

Pragmatic axiology is not based on short term, selfish desires. Its treatment of value is more critical, more objective, and less personal than this.[1]

Critical examination of values is insisted upon by pragmatic axiology. This is necessary if wise decisions are to be made. Wisdom of such a nature demands that one ascend to the level at which a consistent principle of selection is operative.[2]

> It might be said that there are two perspectives which are involved in the guiding principle of value adopted by pragmatism: these are (1) the perspective of the present situation in which a value selection is to be made, and (2) the perspective of possible future situations to which the outworking of the present may lead.[3]

Due to the nature of a problematic situation in which tension develops, there naturally follows a desire for some personal relief. But in accordance with true pragmatic value, the situation, not the isolated individual self, will determine the value which saves the situation from a purely selfish satisfaction. Value is better described as being satisfactory to the situation than as being satisfying to the person or persons involved in the situation.[4]

Being based upon the ever-changing, evolutionary theory, pragmatic values are constantly developing in the interplay between fresh personal experiences and cultural deposits - experiences that only real

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 446.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Ibid., p. 447.

individuals, after all, can have, examine, direct.[1]

The axiology of pragmatism has no dogmatic commands and rigid moral codes. Values, as an integral part of experience, are relative, temporal, dynamic.[2]

The greatest value to Dewey was growth, as was stated earlier in this study. In growth Dewey finds the nucleas of all pragmatic values.

> ...the process of growth, of improvement and progress, rather than the static outcome and result, becomes the significant thing. Not health as an end fixed once and for all, but the needed improvement in health - a continual process - is the end and good. The end is no longer a terminus or limit to be reached. It is the active process of transforming the existing situation. Not perfection as a final goal, but the ever-enduring process of perfecting, maturing, refining is the aim of living. Honesty, industry, temperance, justice, like health, wealth and learning, are not goods to be possessed as they would be if they expressed fixed ends to be attained. They are directions of change in the quality of experience. Growth itself is the only moral "end."[3]

Before closing this section it might be well to consider the two particular values, religious, and social, for they each have a definite bearing upon the remainder of this study.

a. Religious value: Pragmatism and John Dewey reject any ground whatsoever for supernaturalism and grounds religious values solely in man. In this sense pragmatism is naturalistic.

Dewey had little or no use for religion or particular religions, but he did use the adjective, religious, to describe those values through

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., Pp. 114-115.

[2]Ibid., p. 115.

[3]Ibid.

which ones personality is integrated and enriched.[1]

There can be no relation whatsoever between orthodox Christianity and pragmatism because

> the instrumentalist or experimentalist approach contends that such spiritual values are relative. The origin of such values is to be found, not in an order "eternal in the heavens," but in the slowly evolving experience of the human race, where the values have been found to be, not necessarily the Good, but the highest good yet experienced.[2]

Terminology peculiar to religious groups is rejected in content while being reused to express pragmatic ideas. Any activity pursued in behalf of an ideal, because of an abiding conviction of its genuine value, is religious in quality [3]for the pragmatist.

Religion is a sign of human weakness, for dependence upon any external power tends to weaken human effort. The term, God, may be used if it refers to the unity of all ideal ends in their tendency to arouse us to desire and action.[4]

b. Social values: Social values are fundamental in pragmatic philosophy. Learning to communicate, becoming a self, fitting into the world stream, is all a part of society. To live in the thick of life is the highest good.

Generally speaking, then, the dependence of the individual upon society is a fundamental social value, for because of it most other values,

---

[1]Titus, op. cit., p. 260.

[2]Philip Henry Lotz; ed., Orientation in Religious Education (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, MCML), p. 58.

[3]Titus, loc. cit.

[4]Ibid.

if not all other values, have their origin.[1]

In its own context, pragmatism has very high social values. They might even be called their moral values. Dr. Butler lists seven particular values an individual is to maintain as a member of any community.

1. He will have a high regard for cooperation.
2. He will both covet cooperation in others and at the same time be ready to cooperate himself.
3. He must know what self-denial and temperance mean.
4. He will value bravery and courage.
5. He will know the worth of kindness and love.
6. He will prize generosity and loyalty.
7. He will value duty to the group, for in this the community is strengthened.[2]

Social values, raised to such high levels, require an atmosphere in which they can be properly developed. The singular agency for this is the school. For this consideration the implications of pragmatic philosophy is considered as educational theory.

III. PRAGMATISM AS EDUCATIONAL THEORY

Pragmatism is unique as a philosophy in that it is at the same time an educational theory. John Dewey, who gave this philosophy its greatest impetus in America, was both a philosopher and an educator. His teaching positions gave Dewey the opportunities to give his theories practical testing and wide hearing. In 1916, Dewey published his thinking in a book which became famous and influential. This book, Democracy and Education, in which he defined philosophy as the general theory of education, included Dewey's view of education, what education was to do, how education was to be practiced and the purpose of education.

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 454.

[2]Ibid., p. 455.

To say or imply that Dewey should receive all the credit for the thought in this movement would not be quite proper. The attack upon the traditional concept of education was being made all across America. Those who voiced dissatisfaction toward the classical, traditional, concepts were not, however, able to see any large degree of growth because of limited opportunities to interact or share together. It was for this reason that the "Progressive Education Association" was brought into being. Headquarters of this new group was Washington D.C. In the beginning the membership was only a few hundred, but by the late thirties the enrollment had grown to around ten thousand, and it became the strongest single voice for the cause of Progressive Education in America.[1]

While it is true that John Dewey was considered the leading exponent of this theory, there were others of no small ability propounding similar viewpoints. Boyd Bode at Ohio State University was expressing the experimentalist-progressive philosophy and psychology, while William Kilpatrick at Upper Manhattan and Columbia, was working and active in similar patterns.

Endowed with a talent for fluent and engaging exposition, Kilpatrick familiarized thousands of teachers, both native and alien, with the liberal currents of American education.[2] Kilpatrick was gifted with the ability to give clarity and acceptance to Dewey's ponderous writings. He was known for his own work as well, for Kilpatrick is credited for being the first to note the significance of the project method, which

---

[1]Meyer, op. cit., p. 316.

[2]Ibid., p. 317.

he helped to bring to its present position.

Led by such men as these just mentioned, the Progressive Movement grew and formulated into a powerful block known for their psychological and sociological emphases in education. The Progressive Education Association was their collective voice. The leaders of the movement advocated and put into practice the following beliefs:

1. Education at any age should be a natural growth involving experiences - physical, mental, moral, social and spiritual - adapted to the age, health, interests and abilities of each pupil.

2. Genuine education develops, not through imposed formal learning from books and lectures, but only through self-directed, spontaneous activities, perferably pursued in group situations.

3. Interest aroused in an atmosphere of freedom is the proper incentive to effort, not the external compulsions of authority, penalties and rewards.

4. The finest education is that which through inspiration and opportunity stimulates and releases native power, resulting in original thinking, action or creation.

5. Educational processes, like processes of growth, involve continuing change and are subject to improvement through experimentation.[1]

Keeping in mind the aims of this movement and its philosophical structure outlined in the forepart of this chapter, it is necessary to consider the object with which progressivists have to work - the pupil.

A. The Pupil

The forces which constitute existence for the pragmatists can best be explained if one keeps in mind that existence, whatever it may

---

[1]"Pragmatism," Encyclopaedia Britannica (1955 Edition: New York: 1955), XVIII, 565.

be, is part of a great mammoth river, an ever-flowing stream. All existence is in flux and movement, nothing ever remaining the same.

Butler illustrates this principle:

> Individual people are best typified, in the figure of the river, by the whitecaps which surge to the top on the crests of the wave. They are of the river of flux and change, not separate from it. They rise out of it for a brief transitory distinctness as a self, then merge back into the indistinctness of the flowing stream.[1]

To translate this analogy to the classroom situation, it may be said that students, like the whitecaps on the waves, rise to the top for the present, momentary years as distinct and concrete centers of experience who need guidance so as to reasonably be at home in the all-embracing flux and flow of which they are a part. However, this present distinctiveness and concreteness should not mislead one to think of the individual pupil as a private, self-substantial mind and soul, possessing an inner subjective realm of their distinct and separate from the all-embracing flow of social events. In time, like the whitecaps, pupils merge back into the stream or process which gave them temporary distinctiveness.

Here is noted a seeming incongruous situation in progressive theory. While it is true the individual is not an independent, self-substantial mind and soul, but a part of the larger social aspect of the all-embracing flow of existence, yet the individual is of primary consideration with progressives. This is born out by the heavy emphasis laid upon the importance of individual differences in educational circles today. Individualism is so significant in life and experience, that it

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 458.

is impossible to apply any general rules to individuals as a group. In the flow of experience there is virtually an infinity of individuals. All such pupils must be dealt with as unique even though they are a part of the life process in which the individual and social are organically united.

Let us consider three aspects of the pupil, viz., the biological, psychological and the sociological.

1. The pupil biologically considered:

It is well nigh impossible in pragmatic theory to dissect the several aspects of a person and study each one separately. Persons are an organic unity, not body, soul and spirit, as some contend.

The influence of Darwinian thought has been great in progressivism and consequently in American educational thought. Under this influence, man came to be viewed as a reflection of the natural world and describable by the methods of science. From this view came the biological conception of the human mind and learning. Even man's

> intellectual and moral achievements were developed in the natural processes of biological adaptation and adjustment to his environment, that man's mind as well as his body emerged as a product of a long period of growth from simple beginnings to more complex forms through natural selection, survival, and gradual variation.[1]

Individuals are not two forces of mind and body, but rather one organic unity. Children in school are not to be disciplined in body so as to passively pour rigid patterns into the mind. Rather they are ever

---

[1]Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 333.

and always reaching out to engage in the flow of experience.[1]

Activity for this biological organism brings mind into existence. Mind is simply a way of behaving and adjusting. The complexity of behavior and adjustment to situations which the human is capable of, distinguishes man from lower animals.

2. The pupil psychologically considered:

Man is distinctive from the lower animal forms because he is able, as an organism, to participate in meanings. It is this quality of man that provides valuable experiences which lower animals do not have. In the section on axiology the value experience was discussed. Already, it has been pointed out that the first great achievement of man, was the emergence of communication through language.

The passing of time, age after age, gradually brought with it the emerging ability of creatures to recognize symbols and identify them with things experienced. In the process, these symbols became shortened syllables which symbolized a whole group of experiences. In the march of time, this ability continued to grow until the time came when there were multiplied thousands of these symbols in syllables. These syllables became a vocabulary. With a vocabulary came more refinement, such as subjects, predicates and sentences. Something amazing and remarkably new had emerged in the life process.

3. The pupil sociologically considered:

The emergence of language brought with it something even greater. Now self-hood emerged, for the existence of a language gave people the

---

[1]Butler, op. cit., p. 459.

means whereby they were able to conserve and retain experience with a limited group. This brought with it the additional features of carry over from the past experiences which gave a person the opportunity of reflection and a focus of his own consciousness. This awareness of self-hood brought the realization to a person that by studying other experiences he could, to a degree in similarity, bring certain ends to pass. With this realization brought the consciousness of responsbility.

The pupil is conceived as a unit of organic existence for progressives. The pattern indicated above, that the pupil is first of all biological who through growth and development reaches a physiological level; then he acquires a language which makes it possible for him to communicate and recognize meanings between individuals and groups. Finally the pupil emerges as a self who is conscious of a pattern in experience.

B. Educational Objectives

Prescribed, specific objectives of a traditional sense are foreign to progressivism. The nature of this educational theory makes impossible any attempt to state definite, unified specifics. There is no all-inclusive objective that can be termed completely adequate as a general aim. The problem is presented because of the pragmatic belief that each individual experience and situation in life's process is independent and unlike any other. Thus it would be impossible to find any general objective that would be comprehensive enough.

Progressivism does have an objective, however. As has been

stated before, the scientific method is the means to effective education. A primary objective may be said to be the use of the scientific method in every area of experience. The limitation imposed by laboratories is not to be imposed on this broader more liberal view. Rather this method is applicable to all of personal and social life. It is not so much a precise science as it is an attitude in which all the pressing problems of humanity are to be solved. It is a spirit of open inquiry, of tireless investigation, of willingness to listen to opposing ideas and give them an opportunity to prove their worth.[1] The attitude sought for is one in which a person is confident of his ability to meet and solve his own problems by the use of his own skills, powers, and active intelligence.

Education, for the progressivist, is the constant reconstruction of experience. In this context education itself is an objective, and it if often said of progressivists that the general objective of education is more education. The point is every learning episode becomes a means to new episodes of learning which find their consummation in succeeding experiences.

Another way to state this principle is to say the objective of education is to provide for the learner, experience in effective experience. For it is felt that it is effectiveness in coping with an ever-changing experience that is actually the only residue a person carries with him from one experience to another.[2] Actually all that the single experience can contribute is a hypothesis for another similar situation.

---

[1]Brameld, op. cit., p. 90.

[2]Butler, op. cit., p. 463.

The only thing a learner is able to carry with him is a greater stock of hypotheses and more experience and practice in coping with indeterminancies.

Emphasizing as progressives do, both the individual and social aspects of life, and that all such existence is grounded in the social process, one readily recognizes that social efficiency is the closest approach to a definition of the general objective of education.[1]

Since the school is the social institution of greatest potential, it should provide the pupil with opportunities for genuine progress in each of these objectives. Through them people are able to learn the scientific process, and to act experimentally in overcoming obstacles that come in the movement of life. Through the expansion of the experimental, scientific and liberal way of thinking, the progressivist contends, democracy is able to exist. In reality this is democracy itself.

C. The Process of Education

If this section appears heavily repetitive, it is because the educative process in progressivism uses the experimental method as its method of thought as well as its method of learning. Another reason, for a seeming repetition, is the consideration given to pragmatic epistemology and logic previously discussed in this paper.

Learning, for the child, is a response with a unitary organism. He learns with his body as well as with his mind. In a truer and stricter sense he learns with neither, separately, since mind is developed only in relation to activity. Thinking, then, takes place in activity in

---

[1]Butler, loc. cit.

problem solving. The pupil must enter the learning situation at a particular point in the cycle of thought. If no problems are evident to the pupil in need of solving, the teacher's task then is to help the members of the group to examine the indeterminate elements intently enough to come to see the problem or problems which they constitute.[1] The early stage of the learning movement may be called the point of interest. Interest cannot artificially be concocted either by pupil or teacher. Genuine interest is gained by discovering the relationship of the pupil to tensions that are present in his experience.

> Interest is a moving, active and dynamic element that children have when they become identified with certain events or tasks or projects and when goals seem important to them. Interest is not something to be added to formal subjects. Effort is not something that is extraneous to interest; it is the achievement required to attain goals in the face of obstacles or difficulties.[2]

Once the problem becomes real and is understood clearly, learning moves to the next stage. Here the pupil deals with the indeterminacies by studying them in their relation to one another. The similarities and differences that exist are noted and compared with other experiences the pupil may have had. All of this is taken into consideration in attempting to find solutions to the existing problem.

In this stage of the learning cycle the pupil is challenged to use his reasoning powers, for at this point entirely new patterns are born. Consideration is here applied as to how the data can best give guidance to a most satisfactory solution.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 464.

[2] Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 345.

Hypotheses are now worked out in an atmosphere of imagination, which is born right in the situation itself. The pattern is entirely new, for it is in conjunction with an entirely new situation. Each possible hypothesis is weighed and given merit according to deepest insight that the pupil is capable of. It is out of this that the final stage is reached.

Now the pupil is prepared, according to this theory, to test his hypotheses. He is now ready to test their truth by their workability. The test of hypotheses is their adequacy to resolve the confusion and ambiguity of the situation now in conflict. In other words, the ultimate test of all ideas, principles and ethical intuitions is their ability to make good.[1]

If a particular hypothesis is not able to prove effective, it is discarded; then those which are able to solve the situation satisfactorily without causing jeapordy to future experiences, are given sanction.

Evident immediately is the fact that this concept of learning will require new methods of learning and different content, from traditional viewpoints. There will be no rigid, unalterable procedure. Rather, like the cycles of learning, there will be freedom, variety and flow, with ever changing newness. Effective teaching will be teaching that is cognizant of the flucuating cycle of learning, and that fits into the pattern itself, rather than forcing the cycle to predetermined limits.

In an atmosphere such as this there will be creative and constructive projects. Discussion will have its place, for by this, group think-

---

[1]Brubacher, Eclectic Philosophy of Education, op. cit., p. 120.

ing, and social problems are met and solved. In the real air of living, problems are grappled with, and struggle in the group teaches valid lessons for life.

Contrary to thinking in some quarters, facts and subject matter do have a relevance in progressive theory. Data of all nature is grist for the problem-solving mill. The more data available, the better qualified one is to formulate hypotheses that will test true and good. Certainly all of needed facts will not be discovered or catalogued at the school itself. This fact sends the pupil beyond the classroom into living and real life situations. When properly understood, the progressivist's aim is to make vital use of all materials at his disposal. In this light, pragmatic-progressive education makes greater use of laboratories, libraries, content materials and subject-matter mastery than their opponents are often willing to concede.

SUMMARY

Covered in this chapter is pragmatism as a philosophy which is also an educational theory. The first section dealt with pragmatism and the second section dealt with progressive education which is structured by pragmatism.

Charles Peirce is usually considered to be the precipitator of pragmatism. His view was later given great impetus by William James, a popular and able philosopher-educator. Not until Dewey came into prominence did pragmatism gain national attention. Yet, contemporary with, and independent of Dewey, others were also moving in this same direction.

Pragmatism was built on the evolutionary hypothesis given such

great vogue by the work of Charles Darwin. Consequently, supernaturalism in all its forms was discarded in favor of naturalistic sciences and philosophies.

Traditionalism, universalism and authoritarianism in all its forms were attacked by pragmatism. According to this new school, man possessed the ability to meet and adequately care for the exigencies of life.

Experience, the trademark of pragmatism, was to be the final proving ground in which the worth of things was made clear. On this premise, pragmatism staked its philosophical life.

Knowledge, and its attainment is a real necessity for pragmatism, as it is with any other philosophy. Pragmatism's departure from rationalism is in its test and concept of valid knowledge. None of the traditional patterns or terms adequately fit this new theory of knowledge. Pragmatism holds a position midway between rationalism and empiricism in epistemology. While rejecting the extremes of both, pragmatism combines overtones of each.

Last things, fruits, consequences and facts are the concerns for pragmatism. Universal truths or principles are discarded in favor of specific and particular experiences. At the same time, pragmatism is not lost in particulars, for it sees a pattern in organized facts and data useful in formulating hypotheses.

In resisting the main tenents of rationalism, pragmatism does likewise with emiricism. Sense perception, apart from an active mind, one active in selection, comparison and discrimination, is not tenable. It is only a frame of reference. The findings of sense-perception

require verification in experience.

Pragmatism is not so naive as to contend that if one has not experienced a particular thing, it does not exist. It does hold that to become meaningful a thing must enter into experience with a person. Experience is the key of knowing a thing, not the creator.

The world, for pragmatists, is a constantly moving, fluctuating existence. All of life's processes share this characteristic. Consequently, knowledge is not something permanent and unchanging, but is limited and approximate. Knowing is experience, a process of acting, doing, living, rather than a static affair of knowing.

Paramount in importance is the so called Act of Thought. Pragmatism holds that mind does not exist apart from doing. It is not a separate entity, but a function of a living organism. The Act of Thought is thinking, - problem solving. Thinking does not exist apart from this function.

Basically, pragmatism would not be classed as a metaphysical philosophy, for its interest is not in ultimate causes and nature. Yet pragmatism does have a world view.

Pragmatism's metaphysics may be briefly summed up thus: The world is primarily foreground, for this is where experience takes place. Process and change characterize the world. Everything is in a state of flux and relativity. Nothing is static or permanent.

By virtue of constant change, there is unpredictability and hazard. This is inevitable. Flux and change make a complete and determinate world impossible, consequently, pragmatism repudiates any attempt to find a pre-designed reality.

A multiuniverse would better describe the world than universe. The world is filled with multiplicities and individual, different things.

Within the world pragmatism finds no fixed ends. The only end, considered of a permanent nature is growth, for growth leads to greater growth. There are no ultimate, permanent values. This leads pragmatists to deny any transempirical reality in the world. The full extent of reality is the here-and-now. This being so, it naturally follows that man and nature are one. There is no distinction between mind and bodily process. There is no gap between organic and inorganic.

Man is not an active cause in the world, an initiator of events, yet interaction of himself and events determine the course they take. On this basis there can be no guarantee of progress. This does not mean despair however, for by concerted efforts, man is able to make things better.

Pragmatism's theory of logic required an entirely new approach. The old patterns were superceeded by the progress of time. A new logic was formulated to conform to the new scientific age. The new logic was the experimental method. Attention was given to this in the aforementioned Act of Thought. The new system was built on these assumptions; first, that mind was not super-sensory, but rather the function of an organism, making thoughts merely habit producing functions. Second, ideas are purely instrumental. Ideas are plans of action and do not exist apart from activity. Third, truth is the ability of an idea to prove itself workable, to meet needs and requirements satisfactorily. In the nature of pragmatism, truth is always relative. Fourth, intelligence is the experimental way of living, the central method of human

interaction with environment. The more adequately one meets life, the more intelligently he may be considered to be.

Values have a definite place in pragmatism. They are primarily of two types, social and individual, although never private. Values are identical with goods which are the fruits of intelligently directed activity.

Only in a social situation can values arise. Values are methods which adequately restore harmony to conflicting situations. They only have existence in the function of the individual-social flow of events.

Language is considered to be of paramount value in pragmatism for it gave rise to self-hood and society for humans. The context of experience possesses the conditions in which values can arise, namely, language, self-hood and the objective and social counterpart of self-hood.

Values are judged by the present situation in which they are made, and the affect they will possibly have on future situations. There are no rigid, dogmatic, moral codes. They are relative, temporal and dynamic.

Upon this premise, values are grounded in man and not in supernatural or religious grounds. Religious values are non-existent. Dewey called religious values those with which one's personality is integrated and enriched, whatever they may be. The term, God, may be used if it refers to the unity of all ideal ends in their tendency to arouse us to desire and action.

Social values may be considered to be the highest values, for all other values have their origin in society. The school, which is primarily a social institution, is the best atmosphere and locale available for providing proper learning of social values.

Pragmatism, as an educational theory, was unique in that it fused together a philosophy and an educational theory. Dewey defined philosophy as a general theory of education.

Contemporary with Dewey were others who shared similar views on education. Those who were of this persuasion came to form an association called the Progressive Education Association. Thus banded together they were able to influence many educators favorably toward their progressive movement. This movement became known for its psychological and sociological emphases in education.

The pupil is the working stuff of progressives. He is momentarily a distinct, concrete center of experience who rises to the top of the all-embracing flux and flow of which he is a part. Yet the pupil is not a self-substantial mind and soul distinct from the all-embracing flow. His distinction is only temporary as an individual apart from the stream of process. To lose the pupil in this stream is to misunderstand the progressive position. He has individuation and this makes it impossible to apply general rules to him. Consequently individual pupils must be treated as such even though they may be integral parts of the social whole.

The pupil is considered under three headings, biological, psychological, and sociological. Biologically he is conceived of as an organic growth from simple to complex forms. The pupil is not mind and body, he is one organic whole. Mind is simply the pupils way of behaving and adjusting and does not exist apart from activity. This ability to adjust behavior, however, distinguishes the pupil from lower animals.

Psychologically, the pupil is able to participate in meanings.

Man's ability to communicate through language made possible for self-hood to arise. Self-hood provided the basis of human society, for herein man felt his responsibility through reflection and self-consciousness.

The pupil acquired his self-hood after first acquiring a language. Progressives hold the reverse of traditional viewpoints on this matter.

Experience is the key word in education, and education may be said to be the constant reconstruction of experience. Progressivists aim, then, at providing the most conducive situation in which experimental activity may take place. Since all existence is grounded in social process, social efficiency may be said to be the closest approach to a definition of the general objective of education.

Simply stated, educational process is the experimental process. By becoming aware of real problems, the pupil will, with proper guidance, develop interest. Interest is gained by discovery of relationships between the pupil himself to tensions existent in his experience. When the pupil understands the problem clearly, he moves through the learning cycle, or Act of Thought, until he is able to successfully solve or resolve tensions by testing hypotheses.

Experience gained in solving tension producing problems becomes the net gain in learning. This is all the pupil is actually able to carry with him, for the next problem will be enough different that he cannot automatically apply some preconceived solution to the situation.

An adequate education must, of necessity, allow great variety, freedom and flow if the pupil is to successfully learn to meet life. Data must be secured if hypotheses are to be formulated. If hypotheses are to prove valid, they must be tested and examined to prove their worth.

Old traditional means and methods can never meet this challenge, for a new approach is needed. Progressives feel they have the answer as far as one is able to go at the present.

CHAPTER IV

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

CHAPTER IV

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

I. INTRODUCTION

The term "religious" education is used here advisedly. In defining terms in Chapter One it was pointed out that each area of influence referred to in contemporary Protestantism wished to term its educational program "Christian." Since each of the general areas have content which is distinctive to itself alone, the term "religious" education has been used simply to refer to the religious instruction of each group.

The three general areas of Protestant influence on religious education will be considered in this chapter. The basic premises of each will be presented. Consideration will then follow of the implications these premises have to the respective educational programs of each.

The following chapter will give the comparison of secular progressive education with contemporary religious education.

We have chosen to call the three general areas of Protestant influence: (1) liberal, (2) neo-orthodox and (3) evangelical. Obviously there are many shades of belief and thought in any one of these three. For the purpose of this study, it is sufficient to limit consideration to what might be termed the "mean" of each group. Everyone recognizes that there are extremes in any category. For example, William Hordern in his book, A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology, has noted four trends in liberalism, viz., humanism, empiricists, historical Jesus group, and evangelical liberalism. Great difficulty is encountered when

one attempts to separate liberals into each of these designations. The reason is obvious, for any one person's belief may spread itself into two or more categories. Therefore, premises given will be those of the opinions of the middle-of-the-road - or "mean" of each group.

First to be considered is the liberal Protestant. Modernist is the term given by A. E. Burtt to what we have called the "mean" of the liberal group.[1]

II. LIBERAL PROTESTANTISM

To define liberalism is not a simple matter, for tying this particular religious philosophy into a neat package is really not possible. The very nature of liberalism disallows any such conclusive definement. Basic to understanding this segment in theology is the recognition of two elements. First, the method of liberalism, a method that means liberals probably will come to somewhat different conclusions,[2] and second, the refusal of liberalism to accept religious belief on propositional authority. It insists instead that all beliefs must pass the bar of reason and experience.[3]

Rather than being distinguished for what it accepted, liberalism became noted for what it rejected. Liberalism was, more than anything else, a reaction to the spirit of much that came to be known as Fundamentalism. Theologically, historical traditions were rocked with the im-

---

[1]Edwin A. Burtt, Types of Religious Philosophy (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 280.

[2]William Hordern, A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology (New York: The Macmillian Co., 1955), p. 78.

[3]Ibid.

plications of science, and rather than retreating and regrouping to counteract, liberalism accepted the large part of science. Liberalism felt that it must keep its mind open to all truth, regardless of its source. Their central position must be remembered - man's reason and intuition are the best clues and valid approaches to knowing God's mind.

A brief survey of the history of contemporary liberalism must be made in order to adequately comprehend its present position.

By 16000 A.D., orthodoxy was already being attacked by radicals. Fausto Socinus, an Italian lawyer, was forced to flee his country to escape persecution by both Catholics and Protestants. He took refuge in Poland where he rallied some followers who were labeled Socinians. This movement was the forerunner of both modern liberalism and modern Unitarianism.

Socinus rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, which denied the diety of Jesus. Original sin was denied, and the sacrifice of Jesus for the sins of others was considered absurd.

Objections were also raised against orthodoxy, by Socinus, on the ground that orthodoxy was irrational and uncritical. A reaction, on the basis of modern science, was not to come until the late 1700's and Friedrich Schleiermacher.

The following three statements should be considered in their historical setting. First, it should be noted that religious liberalism gradually and cautiously grew out of Protestant orthodoxy. There is no real point which can be referred to as "the time and place of departure." Philosophers, such as Spinoza, Hume, and Kant, laid foundations by degrees rather than by bold, radical departures.

Second, liberalism has made extensive concessions to the dominant

intellectual force of contemporary times - modern science. This circumstance is the main key to its interpretation.[1]

Third, why did liberalism capitulate to modern science? One can be reasonably sure that it was not a climatic surrender. Rather, the seeds were sown by the philosophies of Spinoza and Kant. They said in effect,

> The old foundations are no longer intellectually defensible and must therefore be abandoned, but no matter; what is really significant in religion is consistent with science and can be established on a more enduring basis than ever if the full validity of science be recognized.[2]

During the nineteenth century the atmosphere was either an open rejectance or acceptance of scientific methods and assumptions. These appear to have been the only alternatives. Extreme Fundamentalists and Catholics took the first alternative. They believed the vital religious values would be lost in conceding to science. On the other hand, the liberals felt that the elements in orthodoxy, which scientific findings threatened, were not essential to the vital religion. The liberals did not turn to science and forsake religion. Under the challenge of science they adhered to what they felt to be essential in religion at the cost of parting with what was not.[3]

Friedrick Schleiermacher.

Schleiermacher was born in 1768, and was the son of an army chaplain. He was a theologian primarily, not a philosopher, and his contri-

---

[1]Burtt, op. cit., p. 282.

[2]Ibid., Pp. 282-3.

[3]Ibid., p. 284.

bution to liberal theology is decisive. Kant and he were contemporaries, Kant being the eldest of the two.

The task taken up by Schleiermacher was to rehabilitate religion among the intellectuals who had, for the most part, forsaken it during the eighteenth century.[1]

Schleiermacher contended that all the problems that gave rise to great debates in religion were on the outside fringe of religion. Proofs for existence of God, miracles, authority of Scriptures and many other topics were not the heart of religion for him. Schleiermacher said that feeling, which he called absolute dependence, was the heart and center of religion, rather than rational proof and debates.

How did Schleiermacher then propose to make religion acceptable to intellectuals?

Before we answer this, it is important that we recognize the assumptions science was making. First, science was using the hypothetical method. This method holds all premises only tentatively. Therefore no one is under any obligation to remain committed to any definition, even if he built upon a certain one originally. E. A. Burtt has said,

> Science has clearly assumed the right and the responsibility to proceed in this way. If it had not done so, scientists would become agnostic about the existence of any entity whose previously accepted definition fails to square with the latest empirical evidence. As soon as traditional concepts of space, matter, electricity, energy, etc., prove no longer admissible, they would reject such entities as unknowable, and confine scientific investigation to other things whose established definition still seems to command some verificable evidence.[2]

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., p. 49.

[2]Burtt, op. cit., p. 287.

Obviously all these ideas mentioned have undergone great change since they were first conceived. If science had always held to its original hypothesis on all points, it is needless to say that progress would have ground to an early halt. Burtt poses the question:

> Why should not religion have as much right as science to provide its major concepts empirical reference by redefinition? Why should not theology be reconstructed so as to become systematically responsible to whatever human experiences do in fact underlie man's religious ideas, as the source of their meaning and value?[1]

This question was answered in the affirmative. Religion has the same right to use the empirical method on its beliefs as does science. On these terms no concept in theology can be allowed any absolute rights. All definitions must be open to constant revision and redefinition. God can no longer be allowed to be the central fact of religious experience. His place is taken by the individual whose religious experience becomes the deciding factor and final appeal in testing all theological concepts, including the concept of God. The beginning point for religion is in human experience. It is subjective in that God is brought in as an hypothesis. How this concept proves itself determines just what God is. Man, then, has taken the central place in religious experience. The heart of the liberal method is the application of the scientific method to religious experience.

With this background in mind, and the precariousness of religion, Schleiermacher's purpose was to salvage religion.

Schleiermacher did not consider himself an empiricist. Yet he used the scientific method. He considered himself a genuine Christian who

---

[1] Ibid.

loved Christ with a sincere love.

However, by subscribing to the validity of science in determining religious concepts and truths, Schleiermacher witnessed the crumbling of traditional theological foundations. If he could no longer put his faith in these time honored orthodox doctrines, where could he put them? Schleiermacher knew that religious experience was real, that it could be a part of every person. There was only one safe place in which to put religious experience. This place he called "the feeling of absolute independence." The organ for retaining this "feeling" was the human heart. Here it could remain untouched by the collapsing orthodox structures.

Schleiermacher assumed this "feeling" to be universally possible. It is capable of discovery by any man who reflects carefully on himself and his feelings. Now the being with whom we are in touch in this "consciousness of absolute dependence," is God.[1] By God, he means something other than a personal God. He defines "God" as the universal, all-controlling reality disclosed in our consciousness of complete dependence. The term is simply used to denote a universal factor revealed in human experience, with no rights of its own.[2]

Since God is no longer a Personal Being, He becomes, to Schleiermacher, one and the same with what "God" amounts to. Hugh Ross Macintosh, gives some equivalent names, the World, the Universe, the One and Whole, the Eternal World, the Heavenly, the Eternal and Holy Destiny, the lofty

---

[1]Ibid., p. 291.

[2]Ibid.

World-Spirit, the divine Life and Action of the All.[1]

God was not to be reduced to a subjective psychological factor. God was objective, beyond comprehension, save as he is experienced to the subjective person. Since this was a new and revolutionary approach to God, theology needed to be reinterpreted in light of this. E.A.Burtt states that

> The basic task of theology is systematic interpretation of this experienced relation. Its doctrines will be conceived and verified as items in such an interpretation. It must entirely subordinate to this the traditional method of deducing its doctrines from the authority of some revelation of God contained in ancient Scripture, or from metaphysical principles set up by speculative theology. It is wholly and responsibly experimental.[2]

While there is much more that could be said concerning Schleiermacher, for our purpose in this study, one concluding paragraph will have to suffice.

The mood of Schleiermacher's day was to cast aside religion as unreasonable and irrational. In the opinion of E. A. Burtt

> Schleiermacher's great contribution was his insistence that there is something in the present experience of men and women which gives meaning to the concepts of religion, and that by systematic appeal to that experience we can distinguish the valid meanings and doctrinal interpretations from the erroneous ones.[3]

Schleiermacher, it may be said, rescued religion by making it independent of philosophy and science. These fields could not touch the real basis of religion, that of the individual's personal experience. He was greatly responsible for the shifting of the center of religion from the

---

[1]Hugh Ross Macintosh, Types of Modern Theology (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1947), p. 50.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., p. 295.

Bible to the heart of the believer. Biblical criticism cannot harm Christianity, for the heart of the Bible message is that which it speaks to the individual.[1] Such is the prevailing opinion among liberals.

Albrect Ritschl and Adolf von Harnack.

Another school of thought arose in Germany later in the nineteenth century. The founder of this school was Albrecht Ritschl, (1822-1889).

Ritschl held that for Christianity to be practical, it needed to be based on fact. He welcomed the search for the historical Jesus. He believed that the man Jesus is the greatest fact in the Christian Church. Hordern says of Ritschl:

> God is not to be found in nature, which is red in tooth and claw and speaks ambiguously of its Creator. We find God instead in history, where movements arise dedicated to the values that make life meaningful. The task of theology is to turn men again to Jesus and remind them anew of what it means to follow him.[2]

Philosophical speculations and theological discussions were not for Ritschl. He could see no practical value in dealing with what he considered to be theoretical problems.

For Ritschl, science and religion were sharply divided. Science was to provide the facts, and religion was to pass value judgments upon them. Religion is given the task of determining what facts contain the greatest value. Man is, in fact, a product of evolution and natural processes. Yet he is different from lesser forms in that he has a sense of values. Consequently the universe creates more than matter, it also creates values. As with Schleiermacher, Ritschl claims that God is known

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., p. 51.

[2]Ibid., p. 52.

intuitively. God is the necessary postulate to explain the sense of worth that man has.[1]

There was to be complete compatibility between Science and religion even though they were separate. Ritschl's contention was that neither one should attempt to do the others work. They were both necessary for they both were valid approaches to reality.

Closely following Ritschl was Adolf von Harnack. He did much to make Ritschl's views popular. Harnack made his contribution by simplifying Christianity. He reduced it to three central affirmations.

> First, it affirmed belief in God the Father, his providence and goodness. Second, it affirmed faith in the divine-sonship of man. Third, it affirmed faith in the infinite value of the human soul.[2]

The historical-Jesus view of Ritschl and Harnack is better understood when one realizes these men believed that Jesus' simple Gospel had been perverted. Harnack, for instance, denied the miracles of Jesus and insisted that Jesus did not claim to be the Messiah or divine.[3] The theology about Jesus obscured the theology of Jesus. Paul and later Greek thought elaborated Jesus' teaching. The problem, then, was to get behind all of this to the religion of Jesus.

The influence of Schleiermacher and Ritschl reached America late in the nineteenth century. Together they became the background for American liberalism.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 53.

[2] Ibid., p. 54.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

Since Schleiermacher's time however, three developments have vitally affected the course taken by modern Protestant liberalism. These are the theory of organic evolution, the higher criticism of the Bible and the comparative study of religion.[1]

Earlier we have stated that the heart of the liberal procedure was to apply the scientific method to religious experience. Since the three developments just mentioned are resultant from this method, it seems wise that we state each of the three developments.

The Theory of Evolution.

Publication of Darwin's Origin of Species, in 1859 stirred the theological world to its depths. Historical process was held to be evolutionary in all of its forms. Evolution was supposedly able to account for contemporary institutions, customs and beliefs.

The appearance of man, according to Darwin's theory, is to be explained by four factors, viz., (1) struggle for existence, (2) survival of the best adapted forms, (3) heredity, and (4) variation. The possibility of man appearing in this fashion was to carry like speculation into other areas. Our concern in this paper is to consider the main effects of this theory on religious thought.

The most important specific consequence was that a naturalistic view of man's origin in nature was implied.[2] A new idea about the origin of man was a great consequence. The orthodox view held that man was a special creation. But, this new doctrine taught that man is first cousin to the

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 301.

anthropoid apes and that he is descended with them from common ancestry through a process of natural evolution.[1]

Acceptance of the evolutionary theory removed man from any special category of creation, and also removed a supernatural creator. Being made in the image of God, or the need for a personal God, was no longer needed to explain the facts of existence.

Consequently there was no longer required a supernatural explanation of divine purpose as controlling the economy of nature. The natural adaptation of ends provided a natural explanation.

From this period onward many were to become liberals. Orthodox Protestantism appeared unable to reconcile the evolutionary theory with traditional views of God and Scripture. The problem was especially great for the extreme group or fundamentalists. They held for an verbal-literal interpretation of Scripture. Orthodoxy itself contended that man had a soul. The soul was above the natural realm and its destiny was in the supernatural. Likewise it could not subscribe to the natural implications of the evolutionary theory.

Those who were to become moderate liberals made concessions to science and tried to accomodate their Christian beliefs with Darwinianism. This, naturally, involved profound changes and adjustments.

The liberals felt that the scientists were not being hostile to religion. Rather, they were being true to the facts as discovered by the empirical method. Liberals felt that theology was doomed if it set

---

[1] Ibid., Pp. 301-302.

itself in irreconcilable opposition to their results or methods.[1] Due to the liberal accepting the methods of science as true, they could not be honest with themselves if they did not accept it in all the consequent situations. The purpose of religion was to search for truth wherever it might lead or be found. Adjustment to truth, even if it upset former beliefs must be accepted.

At this point the work of Schleiermacher made a tremendous contribution to modern liberals. Liberals sought to find a way whereby they might clarify and readjust their beliefs in accordance with the theory of evolution. It was clearly evident that great areas of belief would need readjustment. As with Schleiermacher, so with modern liberals, what was of value and really central in religious experience would remain untouched. If a belief required surrendering, this merely gave evidence that it was non-essential. From Schleiermacher's standpoint, no traditional Christian doctrine, however clearly taught in the Bible, is absolutely vital to contemporary religion.[2] The liberal was confident and certain that no matter what scientific truth or fact might destroy, one's own personal religious experience still remained intact.

Higher Criticism of the Bible.

Higher criticism of the Bible was conducted on the premise that the Bible was not authoritative nor absolutely vital to Christian experience. Applying the evolutionary concept to Scripture, they denied the orthodox tradition of an inspired, supernaturally revealed book.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 305.

[2] Ibid.

The liberals came to view the Bible as a product of natural evolution. Rather than the Bible being a record of God's will given to man, it was held to be merely a collection of books displaying man's progressive understanding of God as he grew in moral and religious insight.[1]

Being only a product of man's understanding, the Bible is then no different from any other good religious literature. The same literary tests and conclusions may be applied to Scripture as to the works of Shakespeare.

While the Bible may reveal some, indeed much, of the world's search for the highest qualities in life, yet the Bible cannot be considered an absolute divine disclosure.

Liberals by no means would say there is no value in the Bible. On the contrary, they hold that the Scripture is of supreme value because it relates the record of man's discovery of divine truth. Scripture contains a proven record of religious experience. While it is true that man's progress has antiquated much of its contents, nevertheless, these writings convey to present day men a valid method of divine discovery.

Even though the liberal made great and numerous concessions to the higher critic, he contended that the fundamental things still remained--

> ...that men and women today have religious experiences with the characteristic values which they bring, and that, so far as Christians are concerned, these experiences are primarily aided, renewed, and guided by the record of Jesus' life and teaching contained in the Gospels. As long as these truths abide and are experimentally verified, the liberal is sure that nothing really vital to his religion has been lost, and these evidently do not depend on any special doctrine of Biblical inspiration.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 308.

[2] Ibid., p. 317.

A closing statement concerning liberalism and the Bible is now in order. Since the Bible is not a supernatural book, we may conclude that it was written by men who were in no way different from modern day writers who are moved to interpret life for any who would read his work. In this sense, sensitive souls may add material yet today to Scripture of equal worth. The only greater value that the Bible may claim is in the fact that it has stood the test of time and still awakens and directs the higher aspirations of men.

Study of Comparative Religions.

In light of what has been said above, and because of the denial of any absolute, propositional authority, other religions may be equal to or even surpass Christianity. Pure and unbiased scientific investigation is duty bound to objectively study all religions. An investigator would not carry any predilections with him as to whether a religion may be true or false. No religion can be accounted the privilege of claiming to be the true religion. This could be determined only upon analyzing the facts of a competent investigation.

Schleiermacher supported this position as he said that each religion

> ...develops some natural but more or less distinctive relation to the divine, in which man may feel himself to stand, and it takes all of them together to disclose exhaustively and satisfy entirely the religious nature of man. None could be assumed in advance to enjoy a unique priviledge.[1]

Liberals have noted that all religions have made appeals to supernatural authentication and uncritical claims that cannot bear up in this scientific age. This fact requires the liberal to reject in his belief,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 321.

as well as other religions, that which is untenable after scientific investigation.

With this for foundation, we shall consider the liberal view of four important theological concepts. Our purpose will be to succinctly cover the concepts of God, Jesus, sin and salvation.

God.

God, to Schleiermacher, became an impersonal, objective force, who could be known only by subjective religious experience.

The orthodox position attempted to hold a balance between the transcendence and the immanence of God. God was distinct from the world, yet He was everywhere in the world. However, His speaking to man was considered as special revelation.

In contrast to this, liberalism insists upon finding God in the whole of life and not in just a few spectacular events.[1] Evolution was accepted as God's way of working and doing things. He works by progressive change and natural law. Consequently liberalism denied the supernatural intervention of God in the natural world. In this sense evolution was not contrary to God but a compliment to His orderly working in slowly building up the universe.

A wrong emphasis is left if we imply that God is wholly immanent to the liberal. While the radical liberal may so contend, this is not so for those in our "mean" group. God is spirit to liberals, and this requires a transcendence of God in much the same way man's spirit is

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., p. 81.

able to transcend itself.

However, since the immanence of God is stressed in the spiritual life of man, God becomes, to the liberal, a humanized God. Hordern points out that this does not mean that God becomes a glorified human being or that man becomes God, but it does mean that God is required to have the spiritual characteristics which we consider good in man.[1]

Need for special revelation and supernatural intervention is denied on the grounds of God's presence being found in the world process. Earlier we mentioned that God is not limited to the Christian fellowship, but that other religions also have received revelation. This fact, for liberals, is ample evidence that man at his best is a continuous revelation of God.[2]

Jesus.

Jesus of Nazareth holds an exalted place in the religious history of mankind. Many liberals contend that he was the supreme creation of the evolutionary process in human form.[3] As great an honor as this was, still it denies that Jesus was God incarnate and an equal with God the Father. He is merely a man. The Virgin Birth, for the liberal, is not only unnecessary but an embarrassment, for he finds God at work in the birth of every child.[4]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 83.

[3] Burtt, op. cit., p. 307.

[4] Hordern, op. cit., p. 81.

All men are divine in the same sense that Jesus was divine. Every man receives a part of God at birth. Jesus is actually nothing more to many liberals than a great religious leader. William Adams Brown is quoted by Hordern to sum up this difficult problem of Jesus. Brown

> argues that Jesus has been an authority for Christians in three ways. First, Jesus is the clearest illustration of the life which Christians desire to live and which they desire to see prevail in society. Jesus is an authority because he enables us to see more clearly than anyone else what the world would be like if everyone were loving. Second, Jesus exemplifies to his disciples the kind of spirit that must prevail if the life of love is ever to be a realized fact. We see through him that without the spirit of self-sacrifice, the good society can never be achieved. Lastly, Jesus symbolizes to his followers the resources on which they must rely if they are to overcome the obstacles which impede the life of love. Man needs aid from beyond himself. In Jesus we see one who was flooded by an inrush of divine love and who found that God was able to supply his every need. Thus he was and has become to his followers the symbol of what God is like and the channel whereby the love of God may find access to the spirits of men.[1]

Liberals in great numbers made an intensive search for the historical Jesus, as has already been mentioned. They accused Paul of hiding the simple ethical religion of Jesus behind a complicated theology.

To sum it up, most liberals consider all men as potentially the Sons of God; Jesus is supreme and unique only in that he fulfilled the potentialities of all men more completely than any other.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., Pp. 84-85.

[2] Ibid., p. 86.

Sin.

What is sin? This question seeks an answer from liberals as well as fundamentalists. Schleiermacher was troubled by it. He totally ignored the fact that sin was rebellion against the Divine will. His theory has been summarized in this way, that "in order to spur us on to the pursuit of the good, God works the sense of sin or guilt in us, although for Him there is really no such thing as sin or guilt."[1] Sin for Schleiermacher in reality was simply a non-existent tool, used by God, to further good in the world.

The evolutionary view dismisses the real question of sin by declaring it to be a hold-over from the brute or lower forms in the evolutionary process.

Liberals, as a whole, have usually denied the doctrine of original sin.[2] If no such thing as original sin exists, then it follows that man is basically and originally good. There is no sharp, clear distinction between God and man morally. Imperfection which exists in man is due to ignorance and flaws in human personality.

Education is the prime need of man. By instruction and guidance, man can be brought to a successful place by being taught the ideals of Jesus. That man may never reach perfection, is true. Yet he may ever move in that direction.

No longer concerned with the problem of original sin and its resultant consequences, ethics takes the central place in liberalism. At times, liberals fall back upon a pragmatic proof of their religion.

---

[1]Macintosh, op. cit., p. 84.

[2]Hordern, op. cit., p. 86.

They say the truth of religion is to be judged by whether it makes the world a more ideal place in which to live.[1]

Ethics is deeply concerned with specific sins and imperfections. Arising from the original sin controversy, the liberal contends that he is less concerned with sin in general because he is busy fighting specific sins such as corrupt politics, selfish exploitation, self-righteous dogmatism, racial discrimination and so on.[2]

Salvation.

All major religions have some scheme of salvation. Liberals reacted against the individual salvation preached by the orthodox groups. This would be natural in view of what has just been said concerning sin and their view of it. What has become known as the Social Gospel arose instead. The advocates of this insisted that there is no use trying to save individuals one by one, when it was a corrupt social system that was destroying mankind. Social Gospel advocates desired to see an improvement in society, which was, of course, man, himself. Although these men saw a prodigious task before them, they possessed an optimistic outlook and gave their special attention to three realms, namely, political, social and economic. They contended that salvation was for the here and now.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 87.

[2] Ibid.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

No theology is maintained apart from an educational system. Whatever is believed is propogated by teaching new recruits, or students. Implications naturally follow in education from the beliefs that are held theologically in any religious system. Our purpose here is not to judge or qualify the strengths or weaknesses in the three areas of Protestant thought. Rather, we shall state as objectively as possible the implications of each. This will be done under two points, (1) the pattern of authority in each, and (2) the aims and purposes of each.

Authority.

Liberalism denies the absolute and final authority of the Bible. The orthodox tradition of an inspired, supernaturally revealed book is discounted and denied. God has not set forth propositional commands that are eternally established once and for all.

Authority is recognized, nevertheless, as necessary. The question is, what is the nature of this authority? If it is not the Bible, does that mean there is no objective authority? Is authority an arbitrary will of a person or group? Authority, for liberalism, is attributed to God. God, being in every man, moves him to accept natural authority which is recognized from within man. This authority is not compatible with any external, immovable, fixed standard.

How can this authority be expressed? George Coe has written:

> There is another conception of spiritual authority which is perfectly harmonious with the educational principle of free self-expression. It holds that the immanent God utters himself in the mind of everyone of us in the form of what we call our higher self. Certainly there is that in the self

> which commands, judges, approves and rebukes all that is merely individual to me. My highest destiny can be nothing less or more than to become, in the highest possible degree, this better self which is germinal, yet commanding, in my consciousness. Here is divine authority but it works within the individual as an impulse, not without him as compulsion.[1]

Does this mean that religious authority is purely internal? Coe said, "No."

> There is also an external aspect to authority. For the best impulse does not grow without food; the mind does nothing and knows nothing of itself without the concurrence of an object which stimulates it to activity. We find ourselves only through our objective experiences. Hence anything in our present civilization or in history that actually does call our higher nature and enable it to become dominant in us acquires thereby authority over us. Yet such authority is never merely external; it exists as authority for us only when it actually becomes the self expression of our higher nature.[2]

Stressing the immanence of God, and the divine in each man, liberalism holds that the need of propositional authority is obviated. Finding God in the whole of life, and not just in a special revelation, is sufficient for man, they contend.

Experience is the crux of authority. Only in experience does external authority come to bear upon man. The roots of this go back to Schleiermacher, who found the source of religion in a "kind of primal and immediate awareness, a unique element in human experience which is really more basic than either ordinary knowing or acting."[3] A furtherance of this philosophy of experience came from the liberals acceptance of comparative religions. The history in the Bible, from Hebrew life forward, was viewed

---

[1]George Albert Coe, Education in Religion and Morals (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1911), p. 78.

[2]Ibid., Pp. 78-79.

[3]Nathaniel F. Forsyth, ed. The Minister and Christian Nurture (New York: Abingdon Press, 1957), p. 143.

as continuous with man's search for God, as found in other cultures, instead of a unique revelation of the living God of Israel.[1]

The Bible is not ruled out as having no authority. Actually the Bible retains a unique place in the curriculum of religious education. The difference is, the Bible is only a primary resource. It cannot be a norm for Christian living, as other resources were often considered of equal value.[2]

Logically, it must follow that man is the final court of appeal. If his own personal experience determines what has authority over him, then experience becomes the determiner of authority.

Aims and Purposes.

Aims and purposes are resultant from the total view of theology. Beliefs held concerning man, sin and evil, and the logical concern for salvation, determine the course of religious education.

Accepting the evolutionary view of man and progress, liberalism denies original sin and natural depravity in the individual. The obvious fact that persons grow up to express predominately evil tendencies is acknowledged by liberals. There are varied reasons for this, such as the failure of homes, schools and churches to recognize their important duties to the child. Basically, the liberal takes the view that there is no inbred evil in the child.

How, then, does one account for the evil in human personality. In the case of the child, Coe has written that there are two sets of

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 144.

impulses in the individual.

> One set relates the child to the lower animals, the other to distinctly human life. The law of evolution has for the first time enabled us to see such facts in their true perspective. The unlovely impulses are traces of lower orders of life out of which man has evolved, and out of which each individual child develops. The individual begins life on the animal plane, somewhat as the human race did, and has to attain through development the distinctly human traits. But it is natural that he should attain them.[1]

Sin is not moral rebellion inherent in the heart of man. Sin might rather be spoken of as imperfection which exists in man due to ignorance and imperfections in human personality. The heart of the child must not be considered depraved. There are seeds of the higher order in the heart of the child which are waiting for food and murture. Horace Bushnell's assumption that "a child should grow up as a Christian and never know himself as being otherwise," represents the common liberal view.

Salvation was not a conversion experience where the child changed worlds. Ideas, such as many orthodox Christians held, were invalid to liberals. The child was never to be aware of being anything other than Christian. The Christian home and community took on added significance for liberals, for it was essential that the child receive spiritual food early in life.

The work of education, for the liberal church is two fold. First, to furnish mutriment for the higher tendencies in the person. Second, the church must give direction and guidance to lower tendencies which relate him to the animal world.

---

[1]Coe, op. cit., p. 59.

B. SUMMARY OF LIBERAL PROTESTANTISM

Modern liberalism had its roots in the fundamentalist - scientific encounter of about one hundred years ago. Liberalism was a reaction to the rigid position of fundamentalists. When the impact of science hit the theological world, liberalism accepted science and scientific findings as true. Man's reason and intuitions were accepted as the valid approaches to God.

Modern liberalism has a history that goes back to the first of the seventeenth century. Socinius was forced to flee Iraly for his radical views on the Trinity and the diety of Jesus. He was followed by Schleiermacher who felt the Reformation foundations were no longer tenable or defensible. With science apparently destroying the historic foundations of the Christian faith, Schleiermacher took the position that what was vital to religious experience could not be destroyed by scientific findings. Schleiermacher made "feeling" the central fact of religion. This feeling he called "absolute dependence upon God."

Now that the core of religion had been saved by Schleiermacher's "feeling" concept, neither science nor philosophy could endanger it. The scientific approach and method could be used now on the objective parts of historical Christianity without endangering the central fact of the Christian faith - that of religious experience.

The mood of Schleiermacher's day was to cast aside all religion as unreasonable and irrational. Schleiermacher's contribution was in salvaging religion by making religious experience real and vital.

Ritschl and Harnack followed in the nineteenth century. These men again reemphasized the need for objective fact in Christianity and sought

out the historical Jesus. They felt that theology needed to turn men again to Jesus and to tell what following Him means.

Ritschl divided science and religion. Science was to provide facts, and religion was to make value-judgments upon them.

Harnack made Christianity simple to understand. His great purpose was to rescue Jesus from the myth and teachings that actually obscured Him.

Both Schleiermacher and Ritschl had a great influence on American liberalism. However, since their time, three developments have given direction to American liberalism. (1) The theory of organic evolution, (2) Higher criticism of the Bible, and (3) The comparative study of religion.

Darwin's book, Origin of Species, had tremendous effects on liberal theology. Liberals accepted the natural origin of man. This removed man from a special creation category to an ancestor of anthropoid apes. Accomodating theology to this concept of man required adjustment of profound importance.

Arising out of the evolutionary theory, came higher criticism of the Bible. In so doing, the inspiration and special revelation of the Bible was denied. The Bible was placed on the same level as other good literature and treated in the same manner. For liberals, the Bible became a quest of man's progressive understanding of God.

Liberals were no longer convinced that they possessed the only true religion. They did not know for certain but that some other religion might be equal to, or even surpass Christianity. Since all men have equal access to God within, no one could assume he had the final answer. Scien-

tific investigation of all religions with compilation of facts, would determine what is tenable or untenable in all religions.

Liberalism saw God in the whole of life. Therefore His breaking into life in a special way was not needed. God does His work in the evolutionary process wholly. God becomes somewhat impersonal and His immanence was stressed. Thus to the liberal God became a humanized God.

Jesus' divinity is denied by liberals. While they respect Him as the supreme creation in the evolutionary process, yet His equality with God as being incarnate God is rejected. Consequently the Virgin Birth, miracles, etc., are unnecessary. Jesus is supreme man because He attained and fulfilled the potentialities of all men more completely than any other.

Sin, as well as guilt, is dismissed by declaring them to be a holdover from lower forms in the evolutionary process. Imperfection and ignorance rather than sin would better describe what is evil in the world. Education and direction are able to bring out the best and highest in man. Hence education is the supreme need of man.

Ethics, concern for behavior and action, became of paramount value for liberals. Salvation for mankind was to be found by correcting the evils of society. Improvement in the political, economic and social structure was the goal of liberalism. When this was cared for, the individual would be improved. As a result of Bushnell's teaching, Christian nurture became the heart of liberal religious education.

III. NEO-ORTHODOX PROTESTANTISM

How can something be both new and old at the same time? Terminology here seems to contradict itself. "Neo" refers to the new and different: "orthodox" refers to that which is old, established, and traditional. What, then, gave rise to this group which attempts to be both modern and old? The roots of present day neo-orthodoxy can be traced back to Soren Kierkegaard (1813-1855).

Kierkegaard was a Danish philosopher-theologian. Nominal Christianity in the state church in Denmark disturbed him. In his mind, being a nominal Christian actually was responsible for keeping one from becoming a true Christian.

Both the orthodox and the liberal was responsible for this in Kierkegaard's thinking. The orthodox was engrossed with a set content in religion. This content was divinely given and proven in Scripture. Intellectual assent to the validity of these truths had become equated with Christianity.

Likewise liberalism had failed. While the liberal denied the propositional, divinely given truth of orthodoxy, he believed that man was capable of finding the highest truths unaided. Man, being the measure and judge of truth, was bound by himself. Kierkegaard opposed both by asking, not what is the content of Christianity, but what does it mean to be a Christian?[1]

For him, salvation from the orthodox-liberal morass lay outside the realm of both these groups. To answer his own question of what it means

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., p. 122.

to be a Christian, he says that one does not become a Christian in a completed sense, rather he strives to become one. He may begin the journey but he cannot reach the goal.

Using Hordern's words:

> Kierkegaard believed that one could only become a Christian by a leap of faith, a radical commitment of one's whole life. That is because man's reason comes up against a boundry beyond which it cannot penetrate. The reason which can prove things in science is incapable of using the same methods to understand God, for God can never be just an object whose existence can be proved or disproved. When God is known he appears paradoxical to our reason.[1]

An important doctrine to present day neo-orthodoxy is the transcendence of God. Man is now completely separated from God by sin and guilt. This condition makes God unapproachable by man. Kierkegaard was not proposing an antithetical doctrine to the immanent God of liberals. His view was simply that the great gulf between man steeped in sin as opposed to a holy God could not be bridged by reason. If God is to have contact with man, it must be of God's initiation.

Reference has previously been made to the optimism of liberalism. Acceptance of the evolutionary theory gave assurance of inevitable progress and advancement. Denial of original sin, and the belief that education concerning the ideals of Jesus would prove able to make a better world were the tenets of the liberal.

Then the roof caved in for many of that school of thought. The First World War seemed to indicate that their optimism was not adequately grounded. Man in optimistic progress had decidedly a bent toward destruction. If the First World War seemed cruel, the coming of World War II

---

[1] Ibid., p. 123.

was doubly so. Unheard atrocities by civilized peoples were common. In our time the overwhelming power of the Communist world, which feeds on hate, is another stinging setback for those who had predicted inevitable progress.

Now let us consider some of the outstanding leaders in neo-orthodoxy in order to gain a perspective historically. Three men come immediately to mind, Karl Barth and Emil Brunner representing European thought, and Reinhold Niebuhr representing American thought.

Karl Barth.

While Hitler was rising to power in Germany, an unknown minister was doing some independent thinking. This was Karl Barth. If Kierkegaard is considered the greatest founding father of neo-orthodoxy, then Barth must be called its greatest apostle.

Barth was not to stay in Germany long. Hitler was demanding loyalty oaths to his regime, so Barth fled to Switzerland.

Here he began his career as a liberal theologian with a hope that the Kingdom of God would soon be achieved through the building of a socialist society.[1] But the First World War destroyed the hope of this realization. Others shared Barth's shaken confidence in liberalism. They could not retreat farther into radical liberalism for that offered less than what they already had. On the other hand, this new group roundly repudiated orthodoxy. They were not about to accept the old traditional view of Scripture and inspiration, for Biblical criticism was accepted in its

---

[1] Ibid., p. 126.

most radical forms. Obvious dissimilarity can be seen between neo-orthodoxy and liberals in noting that neo-orthodox theologians abhor the use of reason and natural theology.

Without accepting the existing tenents of either liberalism or orthodoxy, this new group stood somewhere between. They used some aspects of both and added much distincly their own.

Barth defends their uncompromising transcendentalism.[1] God is entirely separated from and discontinuous with human thought and experience. We can respond to the Word, and our lives thereby become changed, but we cannot by human thought explain God.[2]

God in transcendence has made neo-orthodoxy distinct. Not to know God in any way except as he breaks in upon man's experience makes a formal theology impossible. Barth would hold that any attempt to do so would prove inadequate if not presumptious. The best attempts to describe Him (God) today will inevitably betray their futility by the logical contradictions and paradoxes which in the nature of the case they will reveal.[3] If this be so, no man is qualified to speak of God except as God has spoken directly to him. God is beyond human powers of thought and cannot be described in man's experimental terms.

Emil Brunner.

More than one writer has found it difficult, if not impossible, to pin a neo-orthodox to one point. Change of thought or position in the-

---

[1]Burtt, op. cit., p. 377.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid., Pp. 377-78.

ology can be considered as characteristic of these men.

Brunner is a native of Switzerland. For many years he was a professor of theology at the University of Zurich. In his early career he and Barth were of one mind, Brunner being the leading disciple of Barth. However, a break came in their theological relationship in the thirties. Hordern tells us:

> ...the break came from Barth when Brunner published an article criticising Barth. The issues involved were those of natural theology. Brunner denied that the image of God in which man was created had been completely lost through sin, as Barth said. He believed that there was some revelation outside the Bible. He also charged that Barth leaves no room for the new nature of the redeemed man to grow out of the old nature.[1]

Care must be taken that one does not attribute liberalism to Brunner at this point. Brunner does not have the confidence in natural theology that will lead him to God. Sin has so blinded man and distorted him so irreparably that he can do nothing to save himself. Barth and Brunner both adhere to the Reformation concept of the primacy of Scripture. However, they interpret this in different ways. Barth believes that the Bible is the only source of knowledge about God. Brunner holds this to mean that the Bible is the only criterion by which we can judge the truth or adequacy of the knowledge of God that arises elsewhere.[2]

Martin Buber's famous concept of the "I-Thou" relationship with God, has been given impetus by Brunner. What Brunner attempted to do was to resolve the objective-subjective chasm between God and man. The real

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., p. 136.

[2]Ibid.

concept being sought was how can man and God know each other. Information about God makes him an "it." Only a personal relationship with God makes God a "thou." He reveals to us, not some information about Him, but Himself. He gives something of Himself and we give of ourselves in return. Making God and man equal in this personal relationship is not a part of Brunner's thinking. God always is to be the Soverign Lord.

Reinhold Niebuhr.

In all probability, America has been influenced more by Niebuhr than any contemporary theologian.

Niebuhr is a professor at Union Theological Seminary. Yet his theology has not been formed in quiet academic atmospheres. Rather it grew out of a life filled with live efforts to apply Christianity to social, political and economic realms. Niebuhr's thinking always begins with the human, the material and the social.[1]

According to Hordern

> Niebuhr graduated from a seminary in 1915 filled with the convictions of liberal theology. He believed in the goodness of God and man, in the desirability of applying the Sermon on the Mount to the whole of life, and in the optimistic hope that the Kingdom of God could be built upon earth in the relatively near future.[2]

He chose a small working-class church in Detroit for his charge. Here his acquaintance with labor problems led him to a realistic awareness of the injustice in economic and political realms. He became

---

[1]Ibid., p. 146.

[2]Ibid.

convinced that the shallow optimism among religious liberals did not give adequate place to the doctrine of original sin.

Neibuhr made a distinct break with liberalism in his conviction that there is something outside of man which needed rediscovery. He was not referring to fundamental orthodoxy, but to a rediscovery of what he considered true Christian orthodoxy.

What man needs is a reorientation in his relationship to God. E. A. Burtt has noted how this rediscovery

> ...replaces this man-centered orientation by the conviction that human nature can only adequately be understood through its relation to God, before whose judgment man is a sinful creature and whose redeeming love alone can save him from sin and despair.[1]

The relation of man to God cannot, says Niebuhr, be expressed with purely rational or logical terms. It can be expressed in myths such as the Genesis story of the creation and the fall.[2] Because God transcends the world of man, man's thought forms are inadequate to comprehend what God has to say. There is a depth in God which finite man is not able to comprehend. Because of this God has made himself available in symbols which speak to man. Theology is an attempt to express these symbols and dimensions beyond man. By myth, Niebuhr means that which, although it deceives, none the less points to a truth that cannot be adequately expressed in any other form.[3]

According to Niebuhr's fundamental analysis, man can only be fully

---

[1]Burtt, op. cit., p. 381.

[2]Hordern, op. cit., p. 147.

[3]Ibid.

understood in terms of two dimensions of his nature and their essential relationships.[1] The two dimensions are the "horizontal" and the "vertical." The "horizontal" dimension refers to that part of man which involves him in nature and all her processes. Man's body and mind are included. His desire, emotion, will and purpose bind him to the natural changes going on within and without.[2] Niebuhr includes man's reason under their influence when affected by them. The second or "vertical" dimension relates him to God as the transcendent source of his being. Religion traditionally refers to this as man's "spirit." This quality gives man the capacity for free transcendence. In this relationship man has the capacity for freedom from causual involvement in nature and reveals potentialities which can only be satisfied by a relation of obedient harmony with God.[2]

Strange as it may seem, this higher capacity, which places man above the animal world, is also the cause of tension and anxiety. He is torn between two masters, God and nature. Sin has its entrance at this juncture. The tension is ever conscious. Should man chose to serve God and admit his obvious weakness and finitude? Whatever man ought to do, the facts are that he always takes the way of sin by claiming independence and sufficiency for himself. This issues in the root, sin of pride.

Now let us examine briefly their conception of God, Jesus, sin and salvation. First, we must consider their view of the Scriptures,

---

[1]Burtt, op. cit., p. 382.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid.

however for it bears directly on each of the other points.

The Bible.

The Bible is not a propositional, once-for-all thing. The written word is not unchangably true to all persons in all times and places. Neo-orthodoxy never tires of warning against identifying the Word of God with the words of the Bible. They are not one and the same thing in the strict sense. The words of the Bible and the man Jesus are simply tokens.[1] Revelation must not be confused with the Bible. The Bible is a witness to revelation, but revelation is not knowledge about God, it is God himself acting in man.

For Barth the Word of God takes three forms. The first form is preaching, in which God stands over man using their free speech. The Word is the Commission under which preaching is done.[2] In this proclamation God, when and where He will, takes this and constitutes man's word the very Word of God.

Secondly, the Word of God is written. This will be our primary interest here. The Canonical Scriptures are witnesses to the revelation of Jesus Christ. The Bible is not the witness in propositional form, but a witness to revelation. The Bible is God's Word only in so far as He chooses to speak through it.

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., p. 129.

[2]Macintosh, op. cit., p. 288.

> This He does--for the thing always is His act--when a portion of it lays hold of us in God's name and by the working of His Spirit. In that concrete happening it becomes God's Word to us, and He makes it so to men over and again. The Bible <u>becomes</u> God's Word in this event.[1]

In the third place, God's Word is revealed speaking to us and heard by us as God's Word, the Bible attests past revelation; to attest is to point to something else, in a definite direction and beyond ourselves.[2] The point being made by Barth seems to be that he is determined to keep distinct the written words of the Bible with the One behind the Bible. The Revealed Word is Jesus Christ.

The reason for neo-orthodoxies adamant position of a distinct separation of the Bible and the Word of God lies in their view of theology. God is unapproachable in His transcendent reality. Man is finite and his product is human. This presupposes error and the continual liability to error. The Bible being a human attestation to God must likewise contain error. It cannot be a final and completed book.

Burtt has pointed out:

> The standard to which it always appeals in its interpretative work is, of course, none other than the living, compelling Word of God itself; and since the latter stands in mysterious discontinuity with all human reflections above it, it may at any moment require the responsive theologian to revise any previous interpretation that has been proposed.[3]

Burtt has made reference here to theology proper. Theology cannot be divorced from what is accepted as the Word of God, no matter what form. Neo-orthodox theologians, it is concluded, accept the validity of

---

[1]<u>Ibid</u>., Pp. 289-90.

[2]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 290.

[3]Burtt, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 378.

the higher criticism of the Bible. They are ready to accept any conclusion by scholarship concerning the Bible in its historical setting. Consequently the affirmation is given that the Bible has limitations in that it must be held as tentative and incomplete.

Mention was made earlier of the different interpretations that Brunner and Barth placed on the Bible. For Barth, the Bible, even with its limitations, is the only source of Knowledge about God. Brunner contends there is truth outside of the Bible, but that the Bible sets in judgment upon all truth and knowledge of God.

Niebuhr accepts the Bible on the basis that the hypothesis that the Biblical revelation is the most adequate to explain and redeem human life.[1]

Whatever else is said concerning the Bible, it cannot be considered identical with God's Word.

God.

God is "Wholly Other." He cannot be known by any analogy or anything in man's possession. God will not permit Himself to become the object of man's thought. The transcendence of God entirely separates Him and causes Him to be discontinuous with human thought and experience. God is Supreme Soverign of the world and in making revelation of Himself, does so by His own experiencing of men. God must take the initiative, for He cannot be known by man's intelligent search for Him.

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., p. 151.

Jesus.

How does one explain Jesus Christ? This is no easy question. Neo-orthodox theologians voice no unanimous answer. Some have contended for the divinity of Christ. Others claim that He is, at most, a very unusual man who had more completely divested Himself of sinful self-centeredness than anyone else. To others, Jesus was in some sense both divine and human. Since no single, "mean" view is practical, our method will be to present only the most representative views of the leaders of neo-orthodoxy.

Barth and Brunner insist on a divine Christ. Both of these men refuse to reduce the consciousness of Jesus to human limits.[1]

Earlier it was noted that neo-orthodoxy invited whole-heartedly the scientific method and the use of higher criticism on the Bible. Yet Brunner scorns the use of this method when the search for Jesus is undertaken. Dr. Henry quoted Brunner when he said:

> Few notes are struck with more vigor in Brunner's The Mediator, than the indictment of the "scientific 'research into the life and the self-consciousness of Jesus,'" which, by its broad humanistic assumption that what is true of us must be true of Him in just the same way, disclosed also the deeper assumption that Jesus Christ is "of no importance" for Christianity.[2]

Barth has struggled with the Trinitarian concept and the Christological problem. Barth holds to the Trinitarian approach to the whole of dogmatics.[3] His purpose appears to be an effort to avoid a tritheism on

---

[1]Carl F. H. Henry, The Protestant Dilemma (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949), p. 194.

[2]Ibid., Pp. 194-5.

[3]Ibid.

one hand and a pure Unitarianism on the other. Carl F. H. Henry in this reference believes that

> Karl Barth's statement of the divine tri-unity (with which Emil Brunner disclosed his essential agreement during his last American tour) has gone to such extremes in the legitimate effort to avoid tritheism, that it has encouraged at the same time the suspician of modalism.[1]

Avoiding either extreme requires one to be circumspect in his thinking. The fact that the term "personality" suggests an individual center of self-consciousness has resulted in Barth's contending

> that the concept of tri-personality necessarily suggests three distinct centers of divine consciousness, three self-conscious personal brings, in such a way as to require tritheism; therefore Barth prefers to speak of three "modes of being" in the Godhead.[2]

These three "modes of being" are not temporary manifestations for Barth, but are eternal distinctions, and are not foreign to the Godness of God...Barth suggests, it would be more proper to speak of God as one person than three.[3]

History, as such, does not lend itself to a logical explanation of Jesus Christ for neo-orthodox theologians. Barth and Brunner insist on the supra-historical as well as the historical. The incarnation was an occasion for God's breaking into history to the point that the occasion is essentially above and beyond history. Therefore the occasion cannot be adequately handled in the confines of history. The contrast of the infinite and the finite, the unconditioned and the conditioned, in the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 208.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 209.

person of Jesus Christ present a paradox that is basic in neo-orthodoxy.

Mystery is always present when an attempt is made to explain how Jesus Christ could be both truly human and truly divine. Barth has emphasized the divine aspect in Jesus when he insists that the personality of the Logos is divine; in common with Reformation thought, Jesus is granted a human nature, but no human person, in the incarnation of the Logos.[1] Both Brunner and Barth agree that the Logos constitutes the personality of the God-man. Jesus, then, while being a man was really no human person.

Here in America, Niebuhr maintains a different position on Jesus Christ. According to Niebuhr, if Jesus Christ were divine He would have no message for us; if He transcends finiteness, we, who are finite, are prone to be complacent rather than contrite in His presence.[2]

Niebuhr insists that Christ is to be the norm of living.

> The interpretations which define the sinlessness and perfection of Christ in either metaphysical or legalistic terms can have no real illumination for human conduct. If only a God-man, who transcends the conditions of finiteness absolutely, can define and delineate the norm of human existence, the contrition which contemplation of such a norm may prompt is quickly transmuted into complacency. For we must live our life under the conditions of finiteness; and may therefore dismiss any ideal or norm as irrelevant which does not have met our conditions.[3]

It is absolutely essential that Jesus Christ be less than perfect for Niebuhr. Sinlessness and perfection in Him would disqualify Jesus

---

[1] Ibid., p. 196.

[2] Ibid., p. 193.

[3] Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), II, p. 74.

as saviour for mankind. Jesus, being only human, has implications in that it involves Him in sinful acts.

A dual nature is, for Niebuhr, impossible. He says:

> All definitions of Christ which affirm both His divinity and humanity in the sense that they ascribe both finite and historically conditioned and eternal and unconditional qualities to his nature must verge on logical nonsense...it is not possible for any person to be historical and unconditioned at the same time.[1]

Carl F. H. Henry refers to Georgia Harkness in his footnote,[2] in which she appears to be in agreement with both Barth and Brunner as well as Niebuhr. She writes:

> "If one believes...he will affirm belief in Christ as the Son of God. This does not mean that Jesus was God. It means that His life was so filled with the character and power of God that when men have seen Him, they have seen the Father."

Henry's footnote continues:

> Miss Harkness tells us that the death of Christ discloses what God is always doing for us. On such an approach, the cross loses its essential uniqueness for another uniqueness which is not truly unique. The doctrine of the Trinity is reduced to God expressing Himself "in three ways."[3]

Sin.

Sin has made God unapproachable and transcendent. The gulf between God and man is not God's doing. The responsibility lies with man. Man's sin has not only corrupted his relationship with God but also with his fellow man. Because of sin God cannot be found in history because history is the story of man's defiance of God. Neither can God be found

---

[1] Ibid., p. 61.

[2] Henry, op. cit., p. 176.

[3] Ibid.

in nature, for sin blinds man's eyes so that he does not recognize the work of God.[1]

Just what is sin? We have just said that it is man's defiance of God. But in what way? For a clearer understanding we go back to Niebuhr's "two-dimension" concept.

Man, exists in two dimensions. The first dimension is the natural world. The second is supernatural. Here he finds himself related to God as the transcendent source of his being. This dimension involves what is called his "spirit."

By virtue of his existing in this two dimensional aspect of his nature, man is conscious of inevitable tension and intolerable anxiety.[2] Living in such a world puts inevitable tension on man for he is torn between God and nature. As Burtt has said:

> On the one hand, he knows that as a part of nature he is a finite and dependent creature, subject to all the contingencies to which other creatures have to submit. On the other hand, he is conscious that his capacity of self-transcendence opens infinite possibilities before him...He desperately needs a way of relief from the anxiety aroused by this intolerable dilemma, and the way universally chosen by men is the way of sin--more specifically, the sin of pride which is the root of all sin.[3]

Pride is the key word. Instead of recognizing that God is the true center of his true being, man puts himself in God's place. In so doing he is saying that he is independently able to suffice for himself. This self-assertion of man, proudly affirming an ego-centric world, is

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., p. 130.

[2]Burtt, op. cit., p. 383.

[3]Ibid.

the root and essence of sin.

Such pride invades every area of man's being. According to Niebuhr this pride appears in four main forms. First there is the pride of power. All men seek security in life. Gaining power makes a man feel secure and above the common man. In time, power, or the lust of power, leads a man to misuse his power to his shame and to the degradation of his fellow man. Second, there is the pride of intellect. Man, in reality, aware of his finite mind and limited knowledge, refuses to recognize these facts. Consequently he asserts his own knowledge to be final and absolute. Third, there is the pride of virtue. This is best typified by the Pharisee who is convinced of his own righteousness. He refuses to believe that he is anything less than perfect and ruthlessly judges all others by his own standards. He is a man without mercy who uses his religion to exalt himself over his fellowmen. Fourth, there is spiritual pride. This is closely related to the pride of virtue and together they may be called moral pride. Spiritual pride is best evidenced in religious bodies who assert that their particular form and doctrine has absolute Divine sanction and is therefore able to give perfect guidance and judgment in all matters.

Is sin all bad? One cannot be sure from the neo-orthodox position. Man's sin originates from the same source as man's nobility. It does not detract from man's dignity to recognize that he is essentially a sinner, for sin is only possible in a creature who, in part, transcends a purely animal existence.[1] At least this appears to be Niebuhr's viewpoint.

---

[1]Hordern, op. cit., Pp. 152-153.

Sin is such that we recognize its full power only after we have been delivered from it.[1] While man lives in sin unenlightened he is not aware of its consequences. Hordern points out that it is one of Barth's paradoxes that sin can only be overcome when we confess our sin, but we cannot confess our sin until it is overcome.[2]

Salvation.

Can a man be delivered from this two-dimensional tension? Is there any way he can live above the resultant pressure?

For all his emphasis upon sin, Barth has warned us that we must never make sin more important than grace. Sin has already been overcome and defeated by Christ.[3] Since Christ has defeated sin the Christian no longer needs to fear sin. Yet Barth makes little mention of a new life in which the Holy Spirit provides the moral strength which enables the Christian to live above sin. The victory spoken of by Barth is primarily the victory of God's forgiveness.

The cure for sin(at least for Niebuhr) lies in the Christian doctrine of salvation by grace.[4] Sin is not a substance. Sin is not a result of man's animal nature, nor does it arise out of bodily process. It arises from man's attempt to escape anxiety.[5] Only by abandoning the effort to resolve his tension through trust in his own power and wisdom,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 130.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 154.

[5] Ibid.

and by turning toward God in humble faith so that the Divine can and will do for him what he is unable to do for himself,[1] will man find a resolve. This resolve requires a repentant awareness of his sin. Repentance constitutes for him (Niebuhr) the heart of redemption, and the content of repentance is the acknowledgment that man is a permanent victim of his predicament in sin.[2]

Man, in humbling himself before God and admitting that he has no resource for Salvation except in dependence on the divine mercy,[3] is then made aware that God has already revealed himself in the form of a merciful Saviour as well as in that of Lawgiver and Judge.[4] Burtt well sums it up when he says:

> The train of events recorded in the Bible, culminating in the death of Christ on the cross, constitute a unique disclosure of God to man--a disclosing of his forgiving love. In virtue of this love, as revealed in the suffering Christ, he takes man's sin and sorrow into himself, inducing thus the contrition and willingness on man's part to give himself to God which could not otherwise have been aroused. Through the transforming experience thus initiated man's old sinful nature is crucified with Christ, and is replaced by a new self whose center is no longer itself but God.[5]

---

[1]Burtt, op. cit., p. 385.

[2]Carl F. H. Henry, Christian Personal Ethics (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957), p. 462.

[3]Burtt, op. cit., p. 385.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid., Pp. 385-386.

A. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Of the three Protestant positions handled in this study, neo-orthodoxy was the most difficult to state. There are two main reasons for this as the writer sees it. First, many neo-orthodox theologians were at one time liberals. In coming to this new theological position which roundly repudiated much in liberalism, these theologians, at the same time, retained liberal views at some points. The second reason came from the neo-orthodox use of the terminology familiar to orthodoxy. Old terms and concepts have been used but with new meanings being given to them. This made it exceedingly difficult to place a man positively in this theological thought. Also, Barth, and some who ascribe to his thinking, do not want to be confined to one final position. There is constant theological movement.

Due to this, only general statements could be made to show the educational implication of neo-orthodoxy.

Authority.

The chief difference between orthodoxy and neo-orthodoxy lays in their view of the Bible. Neo-orthodoxy aligned itself with the liberal school of Biblical criticism.

Because God is transcendent and unapproachable in reality, and man is finite and human, there can be no continuous contact between the two. The Bible was written by men. This simple fact makes the Bible liable to human finiteness and must, therefore, contain error. On this basis, neo-orthodoxy accepts the conclusions of liberal scholarship concerning the Bible in its historical setting. Affirmation is given, at least tacitly, that the Bible is always tentative and incomplete.

Is the Bible authoritative then for education? As a propositional, final authority, no. The Bible as such is not once and for all God's Word. How, then, does neo-orthodoxy use the Bible? They use it in an existential way. The Bible itself is not the Word of God, but it may become so. Ryrie quotes Barth as saying:

> There is no quality in the Bible itself that can be used to prove that it is the Word of God....That certainly means that it cannot be the Word of God but can only become so when it overpowers us and gains the mastery over us.[1]

From this it must follow that authority which the Bible has, is subjective to each person in a unique way. God, when He takes the Bible, is using a human tool and using it for His own words.

Barth does not hold the orthodox view, as is evident, concerning inspiration. Ryrie states:

> In explaining the meaning of II Timothy 3:14-17 and II Peter 1:21, Barth says that the important thing in both passages is that neither is there any occasion to think that the authors had special experiences. Inspiration he says, is to be understood as "the act of revelation in which the prophets and apostles in their humanity become what they were, and in which alone they in their humanity can also become for us what they are." This of course means that the text is a human product full of errors, but that when God uses it to overpower us, it becomes His Word.[2]

If the Bible is human and errant, can it have authority? Yes, says neo-orthodoxy. Its authority is the encounter of faith with the Christ of Scripture. Christ is the true authority. The Bible points to Him and is a record of God's revelation through Christ. The Bible is an instrument which points to Christ and thus has instrumental, not

---

[1]Charles Caldwell Ryrie, Neo-Orthodoxy (Chicago: Moody Press, 1956), p. 46.

[2]Ibid., p. 47.

inherent, authority. Some points are more authoritative than others because they are better pointers to Christ.[1]

God is "Wholly Other." He is entirely transcendent and man cannot have thoughts about God. How then does neo-orthodoxy teach about God? God has chosen to reveal Himself through Jesus Christ. The Scriptures attest to Christ, therefore the Bible is the intermediary in which man may encounter God. For this reason Christ becomes absolute authority. Scriptures become secondary authority and only when a person has a personal encounter of faith through them.

History is unimportant for the neo-orthodox. Historical events are interpreted symbolically. Ryrie states that:

> Barth's concept of history is that it is divided into two kinds - history which is histiographical, and history which is not. Historiographical means that it may be understood from a creaturely context. The account of creation, for instance, is not histiographical because it was the act of God by which the creature became a creature. Therefore, the account of creation cannot be expressed in creaturely terms and is unhistiographical history. Brunner uses the term primal history to describe all history that is on the plane of faith - creation, the fall, salvation, and glorification. This term denotes a real occurrence which is related to our world of time and space but which does not lie within it.[2]

Niebuhr, and other writers, speak of myth in relationship to history. The implication is that these things, such as the creation and fall, did not actually happen within our world of time and space. This means that although the Genesis account of the creation and fall are not actually history as we understand history, it is nevertheless true to experience. The fall of two real people living in a garden did not really

---

[1] Ibid., p. 48.

[2] Ibid., p. 50.

happen as history, but it does represent and express sin. Every man is actually, himself, Adam in this sense.

Aims and Purposes.

As was mentioned earlier, it was difficult to assign writers to this position. Neo-orthodox writers usually do not clearly label themselves. From inference, however, their aims and purposes are quite evident.

God and man are separated by a great gulf; something must be done to resolve this. The responsibility of any theology is to help man find God. The purpose of the church is to help man to see that he is a finite creature who is seriously limited, yet in possession of infinite possibilities. Man's real problem is sin. Barth, and many others, view sin as man making the mistake of making himself the center of things in his own universe rather than God. Sin is recognized as truly terrible and needing treatment. No man is able to do this, only God.

God's work is Salvation. He bridges the gulf between Himself and man. The purpose of the church is to cause man to see his despair. When this comes about, contrition and sorrow are born in the heart. Out of this, faith is conceived in the individuals heart and he receives new life from God. Salvation is the shattering or breaking of self, and this may come in a single crisis experience or in repeated ones.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 39.

B. SUMMARY

This section began by tracing present-day neo-orthodoxy back to Soren Kierkegaard. Kierkegaard was disturbed by the dead orthodoxy in the Danish State Church. Both orthodoxy and liberalism were responsbile for this. Orthodoxy was content that it had the content of Christianity, while liberalism was confident that it could by unaided reason attain the highest truths.

One never becomes a completed Christian in this life, said Kierkegaard, rather he always strives to be one. The leap of faith became the means whereby man became Christian. In his despair, man leans on God to help him.

The transcendence of God and His unapproachableness by man was a primary doctrine of Kierkegaard and neo-orthodoxy.

Present day neo-orthodoxy grew out of the shaken optimism of some liberal scholars during the First World War. Karl Barth has established neo-orthodoxy as a major influence in theology. Neo-orthodoxy is distinguished by its repudiation of the major tenents of both liberalism and orthodoxy. Neo-orthodoxy accepted some of both and added much peculiar to itself.

God, being transcendent, made any formal theology impossible. Only as God spoke directly to men could God be known. Consequently God cannot be spoken of in man's experiential terms.

Brunner is considered to rank next to Barth in neo-orthodox theology. He primarily was in accord with Barth except at one point. Barth believed that the image of God was completely lost by sin. Brunner denied this and went farther to say there was revelation outside the Bible, or

in natural theology. Brunner also gave Buber's "I-Thou" concept impetus. His purpose was to resolve the objective-subjective chasm between God and man. The question Brunner was trying to answer was how could man know God. Only by a personal relationship, said Brunner, whereby God reveals not something about Himself, but Himself.

Reinhold Neibuhr has greatly influenced American theological thought. His early convictions were with liberal theology but he came to the discovery that man needed a reorientation to God. God, being transcendent, cannot be comprehended by finite man's thought concepts. Consequently, God speaks to him by means of myths, or symbols which portray a truth beyond man. Theology, for Neibuhr, is to attempt to express these symbols to man.

At the bottom of man's trouble is his being a possessor of a two-dimensional nature. A tension is developed by man's having to choose between two masters, God and nature. Man ultimately and inevitably chooses the wrong way and this issues in sin.

The Bible is not God's Word as such. It is not once and for all truth. The Word of God is contained in Scripture by virtue of giving witness and attesting to Christ who was God's Word.

There is no unified voice concerning the person of Jesus. Some hold to His divinity but stress His divine aspect till his personality is purely divine. Others are of a different opinion. These deny His divinity and maintain Jesus was only human. His uniqueness being that His life was so filled by the power and character of God that in seeing Him, men have seen God. Christ discloses what God is always doing for man.

Sin is defiance toward God. Pride is the root sin, for thereby man sets himself as the center of life which is God's place. This sin invades all of life and corrupts man's relationship both to God and his fellow man.

Salvation from sin comes by God's grace. Already sin has been defeated in Christ. By turning to God in humble faith and recognizing that he has no other recourse for Salvation except by divine mercy, man discovers that Christ is his saviour. He then has a new self which places God at the center, not himself.

IV. EVANGELICAL PROTESTANTISM

Evangelical is a term that is derived from the Greek word evaggelion meaning "gospel" or "good news." That which pertains to the gospel is evangelical. The Reformation considered itself a return to the Bible as the source of religious authority. This same emphasis upon the Bible as religious authority typifies the evangelical movement today.

Present day evangelical Protestantism is in the main stream of historical Christianity. Luther, Calvin, and John Wesley were the great leaders of this movement. Many Protestant denominations may be traced back to the work of these three men.

Martin Luther, in 1517, posted his ninety-five theses on the church door in Wittenburg. His purpose was to denounce certain prevalent abuses of the Catholic sacramental system. These theses were written in Latin and meant for the attention of Luther's colleagues. Luther's desire was to have a discussion and debate on the points which he had tacked on the church door. Soon all of Germany knew what Luther had done. The politi-

cal, social and religious conditions were conducive for a receptance by great numbers of Germans. From this event onward, history changed its course.

Luther had searched for freedom from the weight of sin burdening his heart. The Roman Catholic system could not provide this for him. Reading and studying the Scriptures, he came to realize that salvation was through faith and trust in God, through Christ. Obedience and fidelity to God were required rather than a slavish subservience to man-made ecclesiastical systems.

Such a realization resulted in a profound religious experience for Luther. At its heart was an exuberant sense of release from the tension of sin, and from the overwhelming fear of divine condemnation under which he had been quaking.[1] Out of this experience came Luther's doctrine of Christian freedom. He no longer felt under bondage and the control of the Catholic Church. Luther felt free from the intellectual authority and penitential discipline imposed by the Catholic Church. This same experience and priviledge ought to be the right of every man, he believed. Burtt credits Luther's fervent and enthusiastic preaching of this doctrine of Christian freedom as being the

> ...major factor in breaking the social power of Catholicism, convincing thousands of men and women in nothern Europe that they could attain eternal salvation apart from the sacramental system and priestly authority of the church.[2]

Five salient aspects stand out as results of the Lutheran Reformation. (1) The Bible was declared to be the Word of God. The Roman

---

[1]Burtt, op. cit., p. 146.

[2]Ibid., Pp. 146-147.

Catholic Church had made tradition and Scripture as equal authority. Only the hierarchy of the Church were permitted power of interpretation. Luther placed the Bible in the position of final and ultimate authority. (2) The Priesthood of all believers. No longer were individuals required to have a mediator between God and themselves. Under Luther's emphasis each person had the privilede of acting as his own priest. Each believer now had the right to approach God through Jesus Christ. (3) Salvation was by faith alone. Works of merit and pennance were no longer valid to gain salvation. The sole means of acceptance by God was faith in Christ. (4) Assurance and certainty of salvation was possible. Through faith in Christ one could know for certain that he was a child of God. Persons no longer needed to live in fear and dependence upon the sacraments of the Church. (5) The Holy Spirit was again given prominence. Christ sent His Spirit to be His representative in the world. He would lead, guide and direct the Christian. The Spirit would reveal God's Word, the Bible, to His people.

These five points of the Lutheran Reformation are still the emphases of modern evangelical Protestants.

A younger contemporary of Luther was John Calvin. He published the first edition of his Institutes of the Christian Religion in 1536. This work shared with Luther the platform of justification by faith, and it has stood through subsequent history as the outstanding systematic formulation of Protestant theology.[1] Luther had rejected the Catholic conception of natural theology. In its place Luther felt the need to

---

[1]Ibid., p. 147.

keep to revelation. Calvin built his doctrines on the assumption of man's complete dependence upon God as absolute soverign Will. In this sense Luther and Calvin were agreed. Yet Calvin, under the influence of Zwingli, his older contemporary, assigned an important place to natural theology as one of the two main ways in which God is known by man.[1]

Evangelicals follow here, believing that God is disclosed in nature and history as well as the biblical revelation. Nevertheless, while God may be disclosed in nature and history, as well as in direct appeal to conscience, Biblical revelation only can reveal God's will and plan of salvation.

The spreading of the Protestant message throughout the world gradually brought with it religious tolerance. This was not always so. Actually each group in the Reformation movement was noted for its intolerance. Time and circumstance brought religious toleration to be one of the central Protestant principles. While there were many differences among evangelical groups on less important matters, there came to be a basic agreement on fundamental doctrines. On these fundamental doctrines great care was exercised to guard against error. Yet a latitude was allowed on the less important matters in which error could exist without endangering either the individual soul or the evangelical faith. Within the limits set by the fundamental doctrines, evangelicals insist that every individual must be allowed to study the Bible for himself. He must be allowed to preach in accordance with this study, as he may be directed by his conscience and the Holy Spirit.

---

[1]Ibid.

The difference between fundamental doctrines and less important matters may be illustrated by the case of baptism. Those of the Baptist denomination hold that the word in the Bible which is translated "baptize" means the same as "immerse." Consequently they firmly believe that this mode has the sanction of the Bible. Yet the Baptists do not hold that one of another denomination baptized in another way does not have salvation. Fellowship exists on the fundamental doctrine. However, if one were to deny the virgin birth or the sinlessness of Christ this one would be denounced as un-Christian by all evangelicals. All doctrines clearly taught in Scripture, and especially in the Gospels, are unanimously supported.

It is at this point where evangelicals differ most distinctly with liberals. Liberalism denied explicitly, or by implication, traditional Biblical doctrines which to evangelicals were absolutely essential to Christian faith. Of these doctrines, the inspiration and special revelation of Scripture, the virgin birth of Christ, His bodily resurrection from the dead, the special creation of man as a spiritual being, and the reality of hell as the reward of unbelievers are most tenaciously affirmed by evangelicals and just as firmly denied by liberals.

John Wesley was important to the evangelical movement. Wesley was a preacher in the Anglican Church. He preached and believed the orthodox Protestant faith. Yet Wesley, in his early ministry, did not possess genuine religious peace. Even serving as a missionary in Georgia only served to point out his religious need. In defeat and despair, Wesley returned to England.

Fortunately, for Wesley's disturbed mind, he was invited to join

a "society" sponsored by Moravians. The Moravians taught a complete self-surrendering faith, an instantaneous conversion, and a joy in believing. On Wednesday, May 24, 1738, John Wesley experienced what he calls his "conversion." That evening, Wesley states, he went unwillingly to an Anglican "society" in Aldersgate Street, London. Luther's preface to the Commentary on Romans was read. Wesley testified that

> ...about a quarter before nine, while he (Luther) was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given to me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death.[1]

This experience for Wesley was to play an important role in the evangelical movement. The emphasis on a warm heart and a fervent spirit, which Wesley made, characterizes present day evangelicals. Wesley stood theologically on the common ground of evangelical doctrine and tradition. He did, however, take exception to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination. This did not keep Wesley from fellowship with Calvinists, however George Whitfield, a fellow evangelical and close friend of Wesley's was a Calvinist.

Wesley's religious experience was warm and vital. Coupled with the powerful preaching of Whitfield, Wesley lead a revival of "heart" religion in England.

North America was largely founded upon the convictions of the historical evangelical movement. Luther's work, while started in Germany, spread over almost all of Europe and eventually to America. Calvin's

---

[1]Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952), p. 513.

greatest influence was exerted in Switzerland. Yet it too spread widely and had its message carried to this country by the first settlers in New England. The Wesleyan influence, in the evangelical movement, was carried to the colonies by lay preachers who preached their message to all who would listen. The Methodist circuit rider became famous in American tradition.

This brief resume accounts for evangelicals in the United States. We have chosen to use the term evangelical because it most nearly meets the "mean" group in Protestant orthodoxy. While evangelicals are orthodox, they are orthodox with a spirit. They believe it is possible to be orthodox in all of belief and yet be giving merely intellectual assent. This is not adequate for the evangelical. There must be the spirit of the Reformation faith which grips and moves the heart. Evangelicals are conservative without being defensive. Their purpose is greater than simply defending a Christian doctrine from liberal threats. Evangelicals firmly adhere to the fundamentals of the historic Christian faith, yet they cannot be called fundamentalists. The fundamentalist may be obscurantistic and willfully ignorant of theological involvements and complexities. Evangelicals cannot be accused of this.

Dr. Mildred B. Wynkoop has said the evangelical position is both a spirit and an affirmation. It has both vitality and form.[1] Dr. Wynkoop succinctly states the aims and the purpose of the responsible leadership in the evangelical movement.

---

[1]Mildred Bangs Wynkoop, Th.D., "An Existential Interpretation of the Doctrine of Holiness," an unpublished manuscript. Western Evangelical Seminary, Portland, Oregon, 1958, p. 11.

1. It is self-critical and has, by the grace of God, a new humility. Spiritual and intellectual arrogance appalls it. Bragging embarrasses and grieves it. This kind of conservatism feels a profound obligation to truth but it would speak truth in love. It does not glory in its own self-righteousness and claim special favors from God, it moves forward rather on its knees asking God to keep it teachable and useful. Its criticism is of itself not others principally, though it has intellectual self-consciousness in the light of the norms of Christian truth.

2. It accepts the Scriptures as the final authority for Christians. It believes in Special Revelation. Its first responsibility to the Word of God which is its judge and light. Its confidence is in the eternal truth of Scripture and in the presence of the living Christ. It would be found faithful to the letter and to the spirit of the Word of God. It considers the Bible to be, not an end in itself but a means to the end, namely that men may know God, and His will for them.

3. It affirms the traditional doctrines of the Church--its Christology and Doctrine of God, its teaching on sin and atonement in Christ. But it holds all human formulations to be in some measure less than divinely inspired. Theology must be always under the scrutiny of the Bible and must be interpreted anew to every generation in its own language and experience.

4. It accepts critical scholarship critically, not with a blind acceptance of all the "assured findings of science." It is discriminating. It recognizes problems. It wants a "pure text" of Scripture. It thinks history is important.

5. It has a social sensitivity and an awareness of interpersonal responsibility. It lives intelligently in this world, with an ear open to its cry and its hands busy in its needs, yet with its eye measuring values against eternity and God's will.

6. It recognizes the need for personal interdependence, not isolationism. Individuals find enlargement and enrichment in the Christian community. It does not raise false barriers to fellowship but realizes that to the point where Christians can communicate in love and faith the world will believe in Christ and God (John 17).[1]

---

[1] Ibid., Pp. 11-13.

In light of the fact that Evangelicals today are commonly acknowledged as in line with historical Christianity as well as inheritors of the Reformation emphasis, brief statements concerning their views of the Bible, God, Jesus, sin and salvation will be adequate.

The Bible.

The evangelical carefully guards the Scriptures. This is a primary task. By so doing he preserves the historic foundation for the Christian faith. In contrast to the liberal and neo-orthodox the evangelical believes the Bible to be true history as well as true religion. While recognizing the purpose of the Bible as religious, evangelicals believe God worked in true historical situations.

Evangelicals believe the Bible to be the inspired, the only infallible word of God. Consequently it possesses final authority for Christians. The Bible is not a record of man's search for God, nor is it a compilation of his religious experiences. The opposite is true. God has revealed to man, in the Bible, by special revelation what man could not know unaided. The Bible not only contains God's Word, it is God's Word. The Bible is a live book to the Christian for in it and through its words, the Holy Spirit speaks to the person. Apart from the Holy Spirit is the Author of the Holy Scriptures. The writers of Scripture were moved by the Holy Spirit to record what has been written. Out of this comes the confidence that God has adequately revealed Himself in Scripture for Salvation. Nothing more need be written. Also, the evangelical is certain that the Holy Spirit does not reveal anything to any man contrary to or beyond what has already been recorded in Scripture.

God.

Evangelicals affirm the traditional, historical doctrine of God. God is the Creator and Sustainer of the universe.

Dr. S. J. Gamertsfelder has set forward the Christian idea of God which is likewise the evangelical view.

> a) God is conceived as the ultimate reality of all phenomena. b) God is conceived as the absolute power on which all finite beings are dependent. c) He is the absolute reason in which all mental processes are grounded. d) He is the absolute perfection and final cause which imposes law on moral beings. e) He is the absolute personality revealed in Christ that invites all mankind to walk in fellowship with Himself in Holy love.[1]

Evangelicals accept God as personal and vitally concerned with individual persons. While God is transcendent from His creation, yet He is everywhere filling the universe with Himself. This attribute makes God available to all who would listen to Him. God is not, however, to be confused with His creation. He is not material, but pure spirit. Nature is not God, only an expression of His working. Evangelicals recognize God as Father in a personal relationship. In general, God is Father to all of mankind. But by personal faith in Christ, God becomes vitally related to man in such a way that man can have personal access to God.

Jesus.

Evangelicals believe in the diety of Jesus as the Christ, in His Virgin birth, in His sinless life, in His miracles, in His vicarious and atoning death through the shedding of His blood. They also believe in His bodily resurrection, His assension to the right hand of the Father,

---

[1]S. J. Gamertsfelder, Systematic Theology (Harrisburg, Pa.: Evangelical Publishing House, 1952), p. 153.

and His personal return in power and glory.

The full diety and the full humanity of Jesus Christ are difficult, if not impossible for theologians to explain. Recognizing the peril in over-emphasizing either the diety or the humanity of Jesus, the evangelical accepts the settlement of the problem as stated by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D.

Jesus was God in the flesh. He was God incarnate. Jesus presented to the world what God was like because, in a real sense, He was God. He was more than a man. Jesus was more than the height of the evolutionary process. When Jesus died on the cross more than man suffered there, for God, Himself, was taking upon Himself the penalty of man's sin.

Sin.

Sin is a moral problem. Sin is a moral evil which cannot be solved philosophically or by social adjustment. The evangelical view of sin is fundamentally derived from the word of God.

Dr. Wynkoop quotes F. R. Tennant in The Concept of Sin in making a statement concerning the evangelical view of sin. To be constituted a moral evil or sin there must be:

> ...a moral law to be transgressed; knowledge thereof, by an agent, sufficient to render him a moral subject with regard to it; opposition between impulse and reason; and lastly, intentional volition as an indispensable factor in all conduct that is rightly to be called moral.[1]

Sin is moral because it is personal. There is a breach of faith between man and God. Man is responsible for this. To be moral, some device was needed whereby man could choose, something that would demand

---

[1]Wynkoop, op. cit., p. 219.

a personal, therefore moral choice.

According to the Biblical account God made one law in the moral universe which would test man's first parents. This law was simply the command; "Thou shalt not..." The consequences of disobedience were stated. The manner in which man responded to this law determined his relationship to God. By breaking that single law as Dr. Wynkoop has written:

> ...man challenged God's veracity, integrity and authority. He no longer stood in the relationship of truth to Him, hence his holiness was lost. He doubted God's integrity and blocked the one avenue of fellowship between man and God, faith. He rejected His authority and set himself up in God's place and became a moral rebel in an orderly universe.[1]

The moral consequences are all the more serious in view of the fact that man had warning as to the results of such action. These results were two-fold. First, there were natural results, and second, there were divine penal sanctions. Wynkoop is quoted again:

> The natural results were depravation in every area of his being due to deprivation of the Holy Spirit, the source of holiness and spiritual life. His intellect was darkened because he no longer was in contact with truth. His will was perverted because believing a lie he persisted in pursuing error. His affections were degraded because loving himself his whole life was perverted. He had sinned and became a sinner. But beyond the natural was the divine sanction, "Thou shalt surely die." Justly, the wrath of God turned upon the rebel. It was not an impulsive, ungoverned anger, but the just and solemn sentence of a righteous judge made in full accordance with a pre-arranged contract. Condemnation and the curse of death fell as a black shadow upon man from God's righteousness shinning behind a violated law.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 220.

[2] Ibid., Pp. 220-221.

Evangelicals hold to the biblical teaching that man, even though fallen, stands morally responsible to God for his actions. Sin is not attributed to the flesh of man. Nor is it considered substance inherent in the body. The body, or the members of the body, are not of themselves sinful, but sin consists in yielding the members to unrighteousness.[1]

On the biblical premise that sin is a moral and personal matter between God and man, Dr. Wynkoop makes three observations:

> ...(1) sin is basically estrangement from God which has consequences in all areas of natural life. (2) This estrangement is two-fold; God's withdrawal from us and our attitude of rebellion against Him. (3) The acts of moral beings committed in this atmosphere of rebellion are sinful and it is the moral atmosphere out of which they spring that makes them sinful regardless of how proper or noble they may appear on the surface.[2]

When the Bible talks of men being dead in their trespasses and sins, evangelicals accept the fact at face value. Man is spiritually dead. He does not know his way. He has cut himself off from the Source of life.

Salvation.

In contrast to the liberal, who believes that man ought to grow into a right relationship with God, the evangelical believes that man is spiritually dead and needs a spiritual rebirth before he can begin to grow. The Bible does not state that man must sin, but it does affirm that all men do sin and consequently are spiritually dead. The neo-orthodox admits that man is in sin but offers no escape except by confessing the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 240.

[2] Ibid., p. 254.

fact before God. In so doing, God's grace then covers the sinner. Neo-orthodoxy consummates in universal salvation for all since Christ died for all.

Just how do evangelicals teach salvation? Of what does salvation consist?

Salvation is gained by way of the same route it was lost. Sin constituted a breach in faith, a disrupted relationship. Salvation, then, has to do with this broken and disrupted relationship. Reestablishing a proper relationship, correcting the disruption between God and the heart of man is the core of the evangelical force. But sinful man is in darkness and in no way able to affect a restoration. God only can end the alienation. He did this in sending His Son, Jesus Christ into the world to reconcile sinful man to Himself.

The Holy Spirit acts upon the heart of man to call him back to God. Man has the responsibility of responding to God's voice. If he responds positively, this is faith. This is the point where man broke fellowship with God. By disobedience, man evidenced that he no longer was accepting God's authority. He was rebelling against God's moral law. The reversal of this constitutes salvation. Being ready to once again trust God to stop rebellion, and allow God to rule one's life is salvation. This relationship can be affected only by what Jesus called the new-birth. Allowing God's Holy Spirit to direct the heart, to stop moral rebellion against God, and to seek His will for one's life is the evangelical view of salvation.

A. EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Authority.

Authority for the evangelical is in the Word of God, the written and Living Word. In what sense is the Bible the written word of God? Dr. Lois E. LeBar answers this:

> Those who accept the continuity of New Testament and Reformation theology hold the scriptures to be the special divine revelation of our soverign Creator-Redeemer. This self-revealing God gave mankind accurate ideas about Himself and His grace in words as the logical symbol of communication, words describing both concepts and experiences. Concepts or doctrines alone would be difficult for man to understand. Experiences alone would be difficult for man to interpret. But doctrines and experiences together teach man as he is able to comprehend - not all, but some of God's infinite character. We would be God if we could understand all of God's counsel.[1]

The Word of God is the message of God to man written in man's language. Evangelicals recognize that every generation needs theology again related to it in a language that has meaning. The major problem in relation to authoritative revelation is to get it accepted by each new generation. Clear teaching, and lives that exemplify the truth of the Bible, are necessary if the younger generation is to accept and respond to this authority.

Biblical authority is stressed by evangelicals because of their confidence in what the Scriptures can do. Written in old language and unstudied, the Bible is insignificant. But the Bible contains life-giving

---

[1]Lois E. LeBar, Education That is Christian (Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1958), Pp. 169-170.

potential to those who get inside. When that hard outer shell is broken by soft, warm, receptive surroundings, the enormous potential is released to produce all kinds of fruit.[1]

Scripture not only commands but it provides. From it comes spiritual food, water and light - essentials for daily nurture, training and discipline; or the "instruction in righteousness" as Paul described it in II Timothy 3:16.[2]

The Word of God serves both as a guide for those who accept it, and as an instrument in God's hand to bring rebellious man to Himself. Dr. LeBar well describes this function.

> For the reproof and correction of II Timothy 3:16, God provides a mirror to reflect our true state, to reveal how far we fall short of what we might be in Christ so that we will feel the need of cleansing in the laver where "the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanses from all sin" (I John 1:7). But it's not easy for the human soul, born in sin, to see himself as God sees him. The Word must often be a sharp two-edged sword cutting deep even to hidden motives and intentions that are never consciously countenanced, but which nevertheless are the determinants of action.[3]

Evangelicals believe the Bible is ever fresh, and when brought to bear upon current needs, it produces action as it is meant to do, not always positive, but it changes things.[4]

God's written Word is always authoritative. The neo-orthodox says that the Bible may become God's authoritative Word when it over-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 122.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., Pp. 122-123.

[4] Ibid., p. 170.

powers man. In contrast to this, the evangelical holds this revelation of God as valid whether or not men read it, heed it, accept it or reject it. It records actual historical events though the context indicates that some of it is figurative and symbolic.[1]

The Bible is truth in its entirety. But this truth has been spoken in many different ways. Truth has been revealed, say evangelicals, in at least eight different ways. (1) Historical truth. History is not all on the same level of revelation. All parts of Scripture were not meant to serve the same purpose. (2) Poetical truth. (3) Phenominal truth. God spoke to men in their circumstances. From where a speaker was standing he would describe a thing from that vantage point. (4) Symbolic truth. Prophetic visions well point this out. (5) Proverbial truth. Solomon's recorded proverbs attest to this use of truth. (6) Cultural truth. What was useful in a particular culture was used to convey universal truth and principle. (7) Spiritual truth. Here insight is given into the deeper meaning of the Bible. (8) Theological truth. Out of this comes the material which is profitable and useful for doctrine.

Curriculum is built around the Bible. The evangelical believes the supernatural character and characteristic of Scripture merits this central position. The Bible is not an ordinary book. Therefore it cannot be treated as other books. Evangelicals believe the Bible can be the center of curriculum and maintain a dynamic curriculum. Actually this is the only means to have a dynamic curriculum. This is so, for

---

[1] Ibid., p. 170.

no other book is comparable to God's revelation. God means His words to be more than facts, even eternal facts.[1]

The Bible is more than words, it is action. God, as a person, cannot be separated from God, His Word. God never intended that the written Word be separated from the Living Word. Evangelicals believe that contact with the Living Word is made only in the Written Word. In this sense the Bible-centered curriculum is Christ-centered.

Experience becomes meaningful only in relationship to Christ. With Christ and the written Word central, experience becomes essential, although of secondary importance.

There is no magical power in the Bible as paper and ink. Evangelical acceptance of the authority of Scripture involves their view on inspiration. The Holy Spirit gave guidance to what was written in the Bible. The Bible is His voice speaking for God. When the Bible speaks it is the Spirit who illumines the page, which becomes God's voice speaking to the individual. Life is brought to the written Word by the activity of the Spirit.

Aims and Purposes.

Bringing the message of God for salvation is the primary task of evangelical education. A new-birth from God is the need of every person. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Sin has brought deprivation of spiritual life. Evangelicals do not believe education will accomplish a spiritual rebirth. Education is used to bring man to

---

[1]Ibid., p. 205.

his realization of need for a positive acceptance of Christ. This must be a personal, complete commitment. Only after the new-birth can a person be nurtured and fed spiritual food. Because of this the winning of men to Christ is of paramount importance for evangelicals. However, the task of nurturing, feeding, and providing the elements of growth is the natural counter-part of conversion. Following the winning of souls to Jesus Christ, the aim of Christian education is maturity in Christ to the glory of God.[1]

B. SUMMARY

Evangelicals are the recipients of historical Christianity and Reformation theology. Luther, Calvin, and John Wesley are the great names in the evangelical movement.

Luther was forced to break with the Roman Catholic Church on his insistence that salvation was by faith alone. His doctrine of Christian liberty freed men all over northern Europe from the authority of the Roman Church.

Results of the reformation may be summed up in five brief points: (1) The Authority of the Bible as the Word of God; (2) The Priesthood of believers; (3) Salvation by faith alone; (4) Assurance of salvation and (5) The prominence of the Holy Spirit.

John Calvin made his outstanding contribution to the Reformation in the writing of his Institutes of the Christian Religion.

Evangelicals are united on the fundamental doctrines of historical

---

[1] Ibid., p. 206.

Christianity. Great care is exercised so that none may be subjected to error. On minor issues, considerable latitude is allowed between evangelicals, personally and denominationally.

John Wesley and the evangelical preachers in England brought back much of the "heart" and warmth to the evangelical movement.

Those who took the name of Lutherans, Calvinists and Wesleyans all were destined to come to the shores of North America.

Evangelicals are the "mean" group within orthodoxy. They are conservative in theology, and hold to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. Dr. Wynkoop has suggested six affirmations of responsible evangelicals. (1) The evangelical movement is self-critical and has, by the grace of God a new humility. (2) It accepts the Scriptures as the final authority for Christians. (3) It affirms the traditional doctrines of the church. (4) It accepts critical scholarship critically, not with a blind acceptance of all the "assured findings of science." (5) It has a social sensitivity and an awareness of interpersonal responsibility. (6) It recognizes the need for personal interdependence, not isolationism.

The evangelical accepts the Bible as final authority. Scripture is accepted as true history and true religion. God is revealed in Scripture adequately that man may know His will and purpose.

God is known as a Person vitally interested in man. He is conceived as ultimate Reality, absolute Power, absolute Reason, absolute Perfection and absolute Personality. God is both transcendent and immanent. The universe is an expression of God's work in nature.

Jesus Christ is truly God and truly man. Evangelicals believe in His Virgin Birth, His Holy Life free from sin, and vicarious suf-

fering on the cross.

Sin is real, a moral evil. Basically it is rebellion against God, a broken trust. Every man is personally responsible for his relationship to God. The consequences are two-fold. Man is living in depravity apart from the Holy Spirit and under the wrath of God.

Salvation from sin is gained by the same route in which it was lost. By coming back to God through the leadership of His Spirit, and by putting his trust and faith in God, man receives salvation. New life, spiritually, is given him through Christ. Relationship between God and man is restored. Man stops his moral rebellion and seeks God's will for his life.

CHAPTER V

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION COMPARED

CHAPTER V

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION COMPARED

What are the comparisons between progressive education and present-day religious education? What are the basic agreements or disagreements between these two fields in education?

The theory of evolution had far reaching effects in religion as well as in science. The impact of this theory demanded a decision from all theologies. In the main, one of three alternatives was taken. (1) Evolution, and what it stood for, was rejected. These attempted to discredit and deny all aspects of the theory. (2) A reconciliation was sought, whereby the facts of evolution could be accepted, and yet ways found to maintain truths of religion. (3) Or, they might accept, quite frankly, the theory of evolution, think of the world and life and religion in terms of evolution, and make whatever intellectual adjustments seemed necessary.[1]

I. LIBERALISM COMPARED WITH PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

This third course was taken by liberals. Secular progressive educators had accepted evolution and applied the theory to education. Liberal religious leaders did the same. Religion was conceived as an evolutionary product, and man is religious because he lives in a universe that calls forth this religious response.[2]

John Dewey made a great contribution to "progressive" liberal

---

[1] Titus, op. cit., p. 89.

[2] Ibid.

education, as it came to be called. The empirical method, which, as used by Dewey, firmly condemned any philosophy or theory that concerned itself with absolutes and finalities. Dewey's attitude at this point is definitely shared by a good many progressive religious educators.[1]

Relativity of values in progressive education corresponds with evolving religious truth of liberalism. Dr. Theodore Munger, one of the earliest to preach liberal theology, made a statement concerning the evolutionary impact on the Bible. He writes:

> It is a mistake to regard the truths of the Christian faith, even those that are called leading and fundamental, as having a fixed form. Were they revelations from God, they might perhaps be so regarded; but being revelations of God, they imply a process of unfolding.[2]

A statement such as this represents much liberal thinking today. The Bible is not a supernatural book, being a revelation of God, not from God, which if from God would imply supernaturalism.

Scripture, being a natural book, must be rejected as having any absolute and final authority. If authority cannot be supernaturally grounded, it must be grounded in man himself. This fact brings us to the second major point of comparison. Progressive secular education and liberal religious education both ground authority in human experience and reason.

American liberalism accepted John Dewey's solution to the problem of authority more readily than the answer given in historic Christian tradition. Lewis Grimes asks what Dewey bequeathed to religious educa-

---

[1]Arnold S. Nash, Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century, Whence and Whither? (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951), p. 277.

[2]Ibid., p. 228.

tion with respect to the nature of authority? Grimes briefly states:

> ...for Dewey there is no such thing as truth per se either in propositional statements, "ideal forms," or personal encounter. Rather, there are truths, and these are found in and through experience - not just the learner's, to be sure, because of the ages, various sources from the present and the past, are to be utilized in the learner's search for meanings. Authority, then, lies in experience, socially acquired and socially shared.[1]

Liberal's who have followed since Schleiermacher have accepted this philosophy of authority.

Dewey and progressive education maintain that human experience cannot be transcended. The world has ends within itself, not beyond. While Dewey speaks from a naturalistic point of view, yet the liberal religious educator says nearly the same thing, except that he posits an immanent God. What Dewey left to natural causes, liberals, such as Coe, credited to God.

The evolutionary view of religion demands an immanent God in liberalism. Evolution is God's plan and work. A unity is created by God's immanence. On this premise of an immanent God, Coe writes as follows:

> This means, among other things, that material atoms are forms of divine activity; that the laws of nature are simply the orderly methods of his rational will, which is in complete control of itself; that evolution does not suffer any break with man, a self-conscious and moral being, appears, because the whole of evolution is, in reality, a process of realizing a moral purpose; that the correlation of mind and brain is just the phenomenal aspect of the real correlation of our mind with the divine power which sustains us; that the development, physiological and mental, that

---

[1]Forsyth, op. cit., p. 143.

> man receives through nature is part of an all-inclusive educational plan, and that, in our work as educators, God is working through our reason and will carry forward the universal plan.[1]

It is therefore concluded that God, being so entwined within man, makes all men, in some sense, divine.

Christian nurture, growing up to a fuller development in God, is a natural consequence. Providing the child with proper experiences for growth, becomes the goal of progressive education and liberal religious education alike. Externally applied authority was not to be used, but, surroundings and conditions in which inherent qualities may evidence themselves, were to be elicited. Because God works through man's reason, and human experience provides the ground for learning, human reason and experience become authority for liberal religious education. Progressive education, while not concerned with the ultimate cause underlying this basis, likewise grounds authority upon human reason and experience.

These two points, evolution and authority, are the salient features for comparison.

II. NEO-ORTHODOXY COMPARED WITH PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

Noting comparisons between secular progressive education and neo-orthodoxy vividly demonstrates why neo-orthodoxy has been called dialectic theology. Dialectic used in connection with neo-orthodoxy has a different shade of meaning than when used in the normal sense.

---

[1]Coe, op. cit., p. 43.

Dialectic refers to opposites or concepts that are in opposition to each other. Karl Barth asserted that dialectic, as he used it, was the main feature of the conception of man and history. A dialectic opposition was, for him, the fundamental principle of Christian faith. The great opposite being God and man. Other opposites, such as that of heaven and earth, of the Infinite and the finite, of the Eternal and the temporal, of the Holy and the profane, of the Creator and the creature, all demonstrate the dialectic principle. Neo-orthodoxy differs from other philosophical systems which hold that the oppositions are to be conceived and unified by logical means and by means of reality as well. The dialectic of neo-orthodoxy meaintains that these opposites cannot be treated in a logical way. They can only be revealed by God. God alone, not man's reasoning, can overcome the gulf between them.

We have explained this in hope that one may better understand how neo-orthodoxy both agrees and violently disagrees with progressive education.

Neo-orthodoxy adamantly rejects the epistemology of progressive education. Progressives contend that knowledge can be gained primarily by actual experience. Reasoning from universal truths or principles to deductions is held in disrepute. There is more to experience, for the progressivist, than pure sense-perception, but sense-perception must provide the frame of reference for knowing. Reason alone cannot come to a knowledge of the truth.

Even though neo-orthodoxy rejects this system of epistemology, there seems to be a relationship. Neo-orthodoxy, too, says that knowledge of God cannot be reasoned, for God will not allow man thoughts

about Himself. Progressives say that one is only able to "know" any object when a person becomes engaged in active, live experience. Neo-orthodoxy's existential experience, by which man knows God, corresponds to the experience concept of progressive education.

Also, neo-orthodoxy rejects the progressivist concept of metaphysics. Dewey questions any possibility of absolute reality. Human experience cannot be transcended. Experience is the only means that man possesses to penetrate secrets in the natural realm.

At this point neo-orthodoxy does not agree with progressive education. The dialectic of reality is here evidenced. God, in transcendence, possesses reality, but His reality is "Wholly Other." God is not available to man by reason or thoughts. Only as God breaks through to man can man know Him.

We are now led to the place where progressives and the neo-orthodox are in agreement. Experience is both the means and the method of knowing, and of experiencing reality for progressive education. On the other hand, the neo-orthodox, while disagreeing with progressives on some aspect of epistemology and metaphysics, logically comes to the same emphasis. This is the place and importance of experience. Since God is completely transcendent, and known only as He existentially (in neo-orthodox usage) reveals Himself to individual persons, the individuals experience becomes the only way of knowing. In light of this, authority for the neo-orthodox becomes subjective and personal. Subjective experience does not adequately explain the scope of the implication. For both progressives and the neo-orthodox, experience has a greater source than one man's personal and private encounter.

The dialectic aspect of neo-orthodoxy is evidenced in its acceptance of the evolutionary view of Scripture. Neo-orthodox scholars gladly welcome the historical-critical results when applied to the Bible. Yet they vehemently reject, as did Brunner, like treatment to Jesus, of whom Scripture is about. For this reason, curriculum cannot be Bible-centered. Accepting the evolutionary view of Scripture admits to its human origin, and hence, its errency.

Nor does the neo-orthodox go over completely to experience centered curriculum of liberal religious education, which is a consequence of accepting evolution. Consequently, a balance is sought for. This is found by building a curriculum that is both God-centered and experience centered. This view is not logical in its outcome, which reminds one again of the fundamental dialectic principle. Getting back of the Bible to God, is the desire of neo-orthodoxy. Yet this is possible only through human encounter, personally experienced, which ultimately places curriculum on the experience-centered basis. At least this is the logical conclusion of a non-dialectic.

Progressives and the neo-orthodox are one in their insistence of unimportance of history. Inevitable change and flux, leading to ever different and advanced stages make the past relatively unimportant for progressive educators. Another reason is given for neo-orthodoxy. The reality of God and His message to man cannot be contained in the thought molds of men. History is but a record of man's rebellion and sin against God. Consequently, God cannot speak in history, making a reliable historical account. To break in upon man required God to do so from outside of, or beyond history itself. For this reason the supra-historical

emphasis is made.

The Bible cannot serve as historical authority. What is written therein, must of necessity, be only a human recording of man's encounter with God. God spoke to man in the supra-historical context. The content is, then, spoken in myth and symbolism. In themselves, they are not historical truth, but, they represent truth beyond and above history.

Anyone acquainted with the field of religious education is aware of the many books published, and being published by scholars of the neo-orthodox persuassion. Because of this, they may wonder why more reference was not made to specific authors.

There were several reasons for this omission. After having read many authors of this school of thought, there still remained a hesitancy to quote them. A fear persisted that what may appear to mean one thing to him, may have meant something else to the author quoted. Many statements by these authors, clearly evidenced neo-orthodoxy beliefs. But, since their association was, in the main, only implied, it seemed wise to omit most quotations from such sources and adhere quite closely to the recognized sources in neo-orthodoxy.

In closing this section, mention should be made that in the last ten years, scholars of the neo-orthodox persuassion have made a large contribution to the field of religious education. Their example ought to serve as a stimulus to scholars of the other areas as well.

III. EVANGELICALS COMPARED WITH PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

Dedicated to diametrically opposed principles, progressive education and evangelicals have little in common.

Progressive education was structured on pragmatic philosophy which accepted the evolutionary hypothesis in its entirety. We have seen how this related man to all of nature in purely natural terms. Humanity differs from animals only by virtue of a more complex development. Not being able to transcend himself, man became the basis of authority in the world. His experience was the only avenue by which he could gain knowledge. Human improvement was inevitable. A dedication to evolution produced a fair degree of confidence in man.

A supernatural world did not exist for progressives. Dewey rejected orthodox religious values totally. Any existent spiritual values would be relative. The origin of any such values would be created solely out of the slowly evolving experience of the human race. These can have no absolute value because any such value at a given time is not the highest, but merely the highest value yet.

Evangelicals take a different stand on each of these points.

Evolution is rejected by evangelicals to the extent that it is able to account for the appearance of man. Evangelicals do not deny that in God's creation He may use the facts of evolution such as survival of best adapted forms and change, but naturalistic evolution was ruled out as far as accounting for man. But, whatever else may be so, evangelicals are convinced that man is a special creation of God, at least to the extent that he is distinguished from lower animals by virtue of possessing an eternal living soul. Man is distinguished by virtue of

his creation in the likeness of God. His possession of mind and spirit gave to man the ability and quality whereby he was able to transcend his physical body and natural limitations. The attribute of transcendence makes man vitally related to God. Being created by God, for the glory of God, man's responsibility and authority is grounded above and beyond himself. God, according to evangelicals, did not shut Himself off from man, but was always in communication with him. Consequently, man's authority did not reside in himself, but in God, who made His will known to man.

The Bible is accepted by evangelicals as the instrument given and empowered by the Holy Spirit wherein objective, propositional authority may be found. God remains unchanged. The Scripture, which claims that God is the same yesterday, today and forever, is interpreted to mean that values are grounded in an eternal Being, unchangeable, and hence, always relevant. The fact that man does not always accept this eternal authority merely attests to man's weakness, not to the relativity of any value.

Evangelicals accept the Bible as absolute and final authority, because it is a revelation of God's will and purpose given in real historical situations. Experience is not denied as lending support to authority. However, final authority is confidently placed in Scripture, even though Scripture is often above man's ability to comprehend. Scripture may, at times, be above human reason but it is never contrary to human experience.

In contrast to progressive education, evangelicals consider the pupil to be more than biological. While he is a biological being, the pupil is a spiritual being as well. Being a spiritual being gives him

eternal value as well. Considered in this way, there are definite objectives toward which the pupil must strive. His existence is grounded in God, therefore, it is vitally important that the pupil align himself with the will of God, as the source of his life. Being grounded in God makes concern for the basic underlying truths of God worthy of study by human beings. Evangelicals accept St. Paul's expression in stating their view of the relationship of God and man. "For in Him (God) we live, and move and have our being."[1]

IV. SUMMARY

This chapter has been devoted to a comparison of progressive education and the three considered streams of Protestant thought. Evolution and naturalism in science affected the field of religion to a large extent. No group was allowed the priviledge of neutrality in the ensueing controversy.

Religious liberals chose to accept evolution as fact, in all its implications. Religion, in this framework, was conceived as an evolutionary product. The use, by Dewey, of the empirical method was accepted by liberals. Absolutes and finalities came to be rejected by religious education as they had been rejected in secular progressive education.

Evolution required that religious values be regarded as relative and ever changing.

The major consequence in liberalism was the rejecting of the fact that the Bible was supernaturally given, and that it contained absolute and final authority. Authority was, then, grounded in human experience.

---

[1] Acts 17:28a.

An immanent view of God, as advocated by Coe, served to account for the presence of the Divine in man within the evolutionary framework.

God, being immanent in man, produced confidence in the inherent qualities of man. Consequently emphasis upon Christian nurture became the vogue.

Liberal theology and religious education had much in common with secular progressive education.

Neo-orthodoxy compared with progressive education involved paradoxes. The dialectic nature of neo-orthodox theology accounted for this since a fundamental principle of neo-orthodoxy was the dialectic premise that opposites exist which cannot be brought together by logical human reason. Only God is able to bridge this gap.

While neo-orthodoxy claims to reject the epistemology and metaphysics of progressive education, yet like progressive education, experience receives the paramount emphasis. As a consequence, authority becomes subjective for both neo-orthodox and progressive educators.

The historical-critical method of studying Scripture was accepted, yet a rejectance came of the same method, when applied to the life of Jesus.

Progressives and the neo-orthodox are of like mind on the unimportance of history. Their reasons are different, however. Progressives, holding to evolution, contend that constant change, flux and progress make the past of very minor importance. Neo-orthodoxy says that since the elements of God and divine come from outside of history, history can contribute little to their position.

Many scholars from the neo-orthodox school have contributed much

to the field of religious education in the past ten years.

Evangelicals are distinguished for their contrast to the principles of progressive education. Progressive education is structured upon the naturalistic, evolutionary hypothesis. Evangelicals are dedicated to the supernatural position. God is the creator of man. He (God) has given everlasting values and unchanging principles existence in the universe. Therefore, the Bible, accepted as God's written Word, has been received as absolute and final authority. His revelation has been given within history and is ever relevant to life.

Pupils are considered and treated as spiritual beings. Their responsibility is to God; existence is in Him. Apart from God, man is incomplete.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A brief history has been presented showing the rise of what is known as progressive education.[1] Contributors have been noted beginning with the ancient Greek, Heraclitus, to John Dewey and his twentieth century collegues.

Pragmatism, the philosophy which structures progressive education, has been treated.[2] Pragmatism has been shown to be unique in that it is both a philosophy and an educational theory. Implications to education, as an outgrowth of pragmatism, were presented.[3]

Contemporary Protestantism's three main emphases were presented giving their basic tenents. Consequent educational implications were then considered.[4]

Liberal Protestantism was traced from the seventeenth century to the present day. Neo-orthodoxy, its acknowledged leaders and theological implications to education, have been treated. Evangelical Protestantism, presented as the inheritor of orthodox Christianity and Reformation theology was considered as the third major force in present-day Protestantism.

A chapter was presented which compared the salient aspects of

---

[1] Cf. ante. Pp. 7-29

[2] Cf. ante. Pp. 30-61

[3] Cf. ante. Pp. 62-80

[4] Cf. ante. Pp. 81-152

progressive secular education and contemporary religious education.[1]

This survey was limited to a study of the underlying structure of progressive secular education and contemporary religious education, and the consequent implications. Any consideration of specific curriculum, particular methods, and administration, of necessity, was excluded. As stated in the introductory chapter, any reference to progressive education was made in regard to the philosophical structure, not to method and procedure. Evangelicals were compared with progressive secular education and found to be in contrast on all major philosophical issues. However, evangelicals have no desire to be labeled as necessarily antagonistic to many, so-called, progressive methods. In fact, evangelicals concede that progressive method has been of service in making natural forces prominent in education.

At the same time, the evangelical will contend that many of the basic methods and procedures of education credited to progressive education actually were practiced by the Hebrews and Judiastic schools. In light of this, evangelicals do not concede the origination methods and procedures now known as "progressive" to secular progressive education.

An objective, impartial investigation by this writer has been attempted. No specific conclusions have been stated. Only the underlying structures of the several areas of education and their consequent implications have been presented. Specific conclusions have been left with the reader. No specific evaluation of relative merit or demerit in any case, has been intended. However, such considerations would be useful for

---

[1] Cf. ante. Pp. 154-166.

further study.

Several general statements concerning this survey may be valuable to a future investigator.

Progressive education discarded supernaturalism in all its forms in favor of naturalistic sciences and philosophies. This being the case, man himself was the apex of the naturalistic, evolutionary cycle. Man possessed within himself the ability to meet all his needs that are evidenced in the exegencies of modern life. Experience was considered the final proving ground of all things. There being no person or thing above nature made absolutes externally grounded values impossible. Truth and values were necessarily relative. Being dedicated to the evolutionary hypothesis required that the pupil be likewise considered. He is a biological, physiological and sociological animal without an immortal, spiritual existence.

Liberal Protestantism also accepted the natural, evolutionary origin of man. Man was not held to be a special creation of God. Rather, he was considered to be a natural descendant of the anthropoid apes.

Liberalism applied the evolutionary hypothesis to the Bible. Being the natural product of natural means, the Bible was treated like any other book. Consequently, the absolute and final authority aspect was denied to the Scriptures.

God was viewed in the whole life. His transcendent, personal attributes were de-emphasized in favor of an impersonal, immanent stress.

Divinity in any supernatural manner was denied to Jesus Christ. He was the Son of God only to the extent that all men are the Sons of God. Christ is accorded a special position only in that he was the

supreme creation in the evolutionary process.

Having accepted the evolutionary hypothesis, sin and guilt in persons came to be considered only as holdovers in the evolutionary process. Salvation from these drags on society can be corrected by education and a correcting of social evils.

Neo-orthodoxy, in contrast, to liberalism, stressed the complete transcendence of God. God was "Wholly Other," unapproachable. God could not be spoken of in the experiential terms of man.

The Bible was accepted by much of neo-orthodoxy as a natural product, subject to the tests of historical criticism. These tests were conducted on the premise that the Bible was an evolutionary product of man's strivings after God. Consequently the contents of it would be open for revision.

Theology could not be formal nor could ultimate authority be ascribed to the Bible. Experience became the testing ground for truth, not the propositional authority of Scripture.

Evangelical Protestantism is distinctive in its position. Evangelicals believe in a supernatural religion. God is both transcendent, by virtue of His being Creator, and immanent in the world. Nature is not God but rather an expression of His working. Whatever else man may be, evangelicals insist he is a special creation by virtue of his possession of an eternal soul. Man is spiritual - he transcends the purely natural world.

The Bible is a supernaturally revealed book. In it is found ultimate and final authority. The Scriptures are God's striving after man. In the pages of the Bible is found revelation which man could know in no

other way except by supernatural revelation.

Sin is a personal, moral breach of faith between two moral persons, viz., God and man. Man was not able in his own strength to effect a reconciliation. God only was able, and He did. He sent His only Son to man to bear the penalty for sin and thereby effect a reconciliation between God and sinful man. Jesus Christ is accepted as real God and real man in the same Person. His divinity and humanity were complete.

Salvation was provided to man by again putting trust and faith in God through Jesus Christ. This faith is the only means of restoration from sin to holiness.

Suggestions for further study.

While the purpose of this paper has been to make a comparative study of progressive education and contemporary religious education, much more has suggested itself.

A study comparing each of the three main emphases in Protestantism to each other would be valuable. Since the evangelical position is generally conceded to be in the main line historically, liberalism and neo-orthodoxy could profitably be compared to it in several ways. Following a study of each respective theology, a consideration of curriculum content would be useful.

Also, a study dealing with the moral and spiritual involvements of progressive education would be of service. What has been gained or lost? Has progressive education been a positive force in human progress? Such questions might be asked which would evaluate progressive education in the light of its resultant product.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brameld, Theodore. Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective. New York: The Dryden Press, 1955. 446 pp.

Brubacher, John S. A History of the Problems of Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1947. 688 pp.

_____ (ed.). Eclectic Philosophy of Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958. 520 pp.

Burtt, Edwin A. Types of Religious Philosophy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951. 468 pp.

Butts, R. Freeman. A Cultural History of Western Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1947. 645 pp.

_____, and Laurence A. Cremin. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953. 628 pp.

Coe, George Albert. Education in Religion and Morals. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1911. 434 pp.

Coulter, Charles W., and Richard S. Rimanoczy. A Layman's Guide to Educational Theory. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1955. 159 pp.

Ferm, Vergilius (ed.). A History of Philosophical Systems. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1950. 642 pp.

Forsyth, Nathaniel F. (ed.). The Minister and Christian Nurture. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957. 250 pp.

Gamertsfelder, S. J. Systematic Theology. Harrisburg, Pa: Evangelical Publishing House, 1952. 619 pp.

Henry, Carl F. H. Christian Personal Ethics. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957. 615 pp.

_____. The Protestant Dilemma. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949. 248 pp.

Hordern, William. A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology. New York: The Macmillian Co., 1955. 222 pp.

LeBar, Lois E. Education That is Christian. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1958. 242 pp.

Lotz, Philip Henry (ed.). Orientation in Religious Education. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, MCML. 618 pp.

Macintosh, Hugh Ross. Types of Modern Theology. London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1947. 333 pp.

Meyer, Adolphe E. An Educational History of the American People. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957. 444 pp.

Nash, Arnold S. (ed.). Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century, Whence and Whither? New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. 296 pp.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. The Nature and Destiny of Man. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948. 329 pp.

Ryrie, Charles Caldwell. Neo-Orthodoxy. Chicago: Moody Press, 1956. 62 pp.

Titus, Harold H. Living Issues in Philosophy. New York: American Book Company, 1946. 436 pp.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. 624 pp.

Windelband, W. History of Ancient Philosophy, quoted in J. Donald Butler. Four Philosophies and Their Practice in Education and Religion. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951. 551 pp.

Encyclopaedias

"Pragmatism," Encyclopaedia Britannica (1955 ed.), XVIII, 413-414

Unpublished Materials

Wynkoop, Mildred Bangs, Th.D., "An Existential Interpretation of the Doctrine of Holiness." Unpublished Manuscript, Western Evangelical Seminary, Portland, Oregon, 1958. 307 pp.