We have before us an invitation to attend the next annual meeting of the Religious Education Association (Cincinnati, May 2-4). The letterhead of the association lists the officers and board of directors: 26 Protestants (we recognize many modernists in the list, but no fundamentalists, though there may be some); 5 Jews (3 of them are Reformed rabbis); and 3 Catholic laymen.

President John H. Finley, in his letter urging attendance, states: "Conditions have so greatly changed that a careful rethinking of the functions and program of our religious and educational agencies is necessary. Some seventeen groups of leaders in education have been working for months in the effort to discover and define the issue of our contemporaneous life with which religious and moral education ought most to be concerned."

A Report of Progress which accompanies the invitation indicates three problems:

1. What can the churches do to create a "newer and finer social order" and to meet personality problems?
2. How can duplication of effort be avoided in the character-training work of the churches and allied agencies, and how should men be trained for this work?
3. What can moral and religious education do to prevent the disintegration of home life and what is the contribution of religion and of religious education?

* We wish these men all the luck in the world in their work, but we can see no point to a common discussion of these problems. Why not? We have no common ground of discussion.

We don't find the name of God in the three pages before us. If God must be left out, why not call it Humanitarian Education Association? If a personal God is left in, of course, a few names will have to come off the letterhead; but if He is left out, we can't go along.

Supposing we leave God in. Either He has spoken to us or He hasn't. If He has told us something about Himself and ourselves, He has probably given us the solution of the three problems proposed (we insist that He has), and all that remains for us to do is to study what He has said. If we leave in Revelation, of course, we lose most of our names from the letterhead; but if it is left out, we cannot go along.

Suppose we leave in Revelation - by which we mean an authentic and infallible message from God to man - and begin to study what God has said about the three problems proposed. Either God wanted us to know the meaning of that message or He didn't. If He did, then He must have established some authentic and infallible agency on earth to settle the matter of its meaning whenever this was questioned. (If He gave a message, of course, it is senseless to suppose that He didn't want us to know its meaning.) If we insist that such an agency exists, we have left on the letterhead only Col. Callahan, Edward Fitzpatrick, and Michael Williams - and since the four of us are already agreed on the solution to the three problems, all that remains for us to do is to say the beads for the grace to apply the remedy.

This criticism is offered in no deprecatory spirit. We recognize and admire the sincere spirit and tireless energy of those men, who see the evils that afflict us and are striving themselves to correct them. Our only desire is to point out to them that the root of the problem, as we see it, lies totally elsewhere than in the field of their quest, and that we can discuss these matters profitably with them only when they not only understand the terms we use, but accept them in their full meaning.

**PRAYERS:**

- John Maloney’s grandfather (operation); a friend (appendectomy). 3 sp. int.

**Anniversaries:**

- Lincoln Wurzer’s father; Tom Gately’s uncle.