

and winning families and communities. They sought the transformation of individuals. We must work also for the transformation of the social order. They marked the main tracks along which heretofore we have run our race in China. We are marking out another track, social and community rebuilding. They strove to enter an unknown terrain and civilization. Ours it is to Christianize an unknown economic area of life, something they do not seem to have mentioned or planned to do. Their difficulties and ours are different. To face our challenges calls for a courage equal to their's. They could not foresee how far we would have travelled by this time. Of our future advance we have no time to attempt a forecast. They dug into an unopened country. We are digging into openings as yet no better understood than those they confronted.

Christianity is in China to stay! It now has its own leadership. Gutzlaff tried to force such a leadership and was badly hoodwinked. In June 1867 the Editor of *The Missionary Recorder*, felt that the "call for missionaries is practically boundless". Then in terms we have discarded he wrote, "Practically. . . this notion of employing a native ministry (he was discussing "A Native Agency") to supply the lack of foreign missionaries is not worth consideration, because that ministry does not exist". Sixty years of Protestant planning had not, in this Editor's mind, registered any progress in the building up of a Chinese Christian leadership. Yet exactly sixty years later (1927) events were to bring forward a Chinese leadership that had long been in the making under cover. The "poor hundred (of missionaries) actually sent, "to which the Editor referred in 1867, had in 1927 become what he would have deemed a veritable multitude; and during the same period there had emerged a Chinese Christian leadership which has actually taken the lead in many respects.

Yet as we look into the future our main problem is still that of leadership. This is partly a question of numbers, but much more of a type of training that will enable Christian leaders to stand up to the modern challenge of life in China. This need for modern training, not foreseen by our missionary ancestors, affects the missionaries also. At the very time that a campaign is getting under way to study the problem of the modern training of Chinese leaders the same question is being opened up anent missionaries both in China and at the home base. Both Chinese Christians and missionaries need a new type of training. They are the two aspects of the one outstanding need of Christianity in China—modern leadership. Each aspect has features of its own. Yet for both the main need is the same—training that will fit them for making Christianity a dynamic factor in every nook and corner of China's life. The early training fitted them to draw Chinese into a Christian nook and corner; the new training must fit them to make every nook and corner in China Christian. We are moving towards the development of the one and real leadership of Christian service to China. The early missionaries thought of a task that was their's primarily. We think in terms of a task in the doing of which Chinese Christian workers and missionaries are equally essential and cooperating parts. This is the new starting point into our future.

## The Church—A Cooperative

R. O. HALL

**I**F we could turn the sun into a patent medicine God Himself would be powerless to save the world. But that is what again and again we have tried to do with the Sun of Righteousness. For some strange reason Man, though made in the image of God, loves to hand out bottles of Redemption, small doses to be taken every morning before breakfast, and two large doses<sup>1</sup>—sometimes three large doses—every Sunday. Strange that we should be so like that, when God is so other. Strange we should love tidiness and rules of three, when the three which is God have made so untidy a world; in which life perishes when it is imprisoned in regulations.

Is this not exactly what happens? A great act of God takes place in a certain time in a certain way. Like Wesley's preaching, or the sacramental teaching of a slum parson, or the sharing of a hated sin with a Grouper—and at once one tends to say; "Ah, this is the way. Let us patent it;" and not, as one should say, "Ah, this is God. Let us adore Him." Even Our Lord Himself is preached as a way to the mastery of sex or self, rather than as the Way to the Heart of God.

And this tendency of Man to bottle experience, to take out patents in ways of redemption, is menacing one of God's newest gifts to men: the increasing recognition of the cooperative principle as the only way for the common life of men. This is most dangerous; for the cooperative movement is of all ways of common living the least amenable to standardization and mass production. Like marriage and friendship it demands so much of human personality that it cannot be governed by rules: it cannot be standardized, patented, bottled, and sold by hucksters in the market place.

So when cooperatives are proposed my first answer is always "Don't." But then at once I say, "Yes: do," if haply this suggestion may be of God. I say "Yes: do" because I am convinced that only as cooperative living grows can we live the Christian life. But I have no great plan for it, and no one method. There is so much of God in this that it can only come His way.

And that is the artist's way. The artist paints a picture. He cannot help it. And then perhaps something in that picture, some things in many others and many other messages from life itself move another artist to paint another picture. It is his own picture. It is not copied. The first artist has no intention of promoting pictures. But the second artist has caught something from the first that has helped the former to paint his own picture.

There is a cooperative in Nanking. It has six rickshas. It charges standard rates—but keeps all profits after a fixed interest to

1. My erring pen wanted to write "dczes"—but was reproved.

help the cooperative to get more rickshas and the puller to get a fuller life. There is a cooperative in Kwantung that has bought up a bankrupt village of eighty souls and means to make them into a contented, solvent, useful cooperative Christian village. There is a group of young men in Central China who have made an egg cooperative. There are many more. The picture gallery is growing. Spend an afternoon every now and then in that gallery and one day you will be moved to paint your own picture. *But it must be your own picture.* It must meet your needs, spring out of your real life.

But there are canons of art; good pictures must obey some universal rules of truth and beauty. So are there principles of cooperation which are vital. Below are some of them.

(1) Some measure of personal freedom must be surrendered and this freedom become the common property of the whole. Note, for instance, clerical pension in England. Every Anglican clergyman pays a fixed proportion of his income but the man who pays £30 a year gets the same pension at seventy as the man who pays £15. Notice the difference between this and ordinary insurance.

(2) The motive must not be individual profit, but the cooperative must make sense out of life. It must make for a *better common life* for all who share.

(3) The cooperative must never limit its membership for reasons of profit: only for reasons of efficiency. As for instance a cooperative of one hundred members might find they could draw 10% on their capital by remaining a closed corporation. This is not cooperation; it is cooperate profit-making.

(4) The cooperative must not run at a loss. The world is good after all. It does make sense. God means our mutual service of one another in business to be real mutual service. The world is in a sense a profit-making world. God has made it like that in order that our family life together may be full of good things for mind and body.

(5) A cooperative must be run by Christians as part of their life with God and one another: but membership and service should only be limited to Christians when some limit is necessary for efficiency.

It is no coincidence that the cooperative movement and most modern theology descend from the work of Frederick Denison Maurice. Maurice rescued Christian theology from its Latin pattern; from the stamp of Augustine's personal experience translated into terms of a pagan philosophy; a theology which was revived by the fathers of the Reformation.

Nor is it a coincidence that individualistic capitalism flourished in the Reformation countries, where there was little suggestion of the cost of life in the Christian family, and "charity" often took the

place of brotherhood. This Christian charity is, by the way, the foundation of modern missions. I don't despise it. It was a necessary stage. So is a middle school a necessary stage; only *not* permanent!

Maurice re-introduced the Greek way of thinking. The Greeks tended to unify; the Latins to divide. Though strange and yet natural, the Greeks had small cities constantly at war and the Latins united by war—one great Empire, with the motto "*divide et impera.*" The Greek method is nearer the artist's way. The Latin method suits the man of affairs. One good city is worth more than a great Empire without good cities. The Greek way of thinking of the world provided a philosophy of Incarnation; the Latin way a philosophy of Redemption.

Maurice began the emphasis on the Incarnation which has so revolutionised the preaching and practise of the Church. His own basis was Greek philosophy: but he began the emancipation of theologians from that philosophy. The early Fathers of the Church accepted a semi-Greek-semi-Jewish view of God and fitted Jesus on to it. Maurice by his emphasis on the Incarnation provided the approach from Jesus to God so that to-day we would rather say "God is like Christ" than "Christ is like God."

And this man—this theologian-philosopher—spent all his energy and his means with Kingsley and others in starting cooperative industries—as though they would say "The Church a cooperative",—which is the logical issue of the Incarnation. The Incarnation is the perfect picture of God in individual life. A cooperative, which is a church covering every activity of life and worship, is the perfect picture of God in social life. The family is not this perfect picture; nor is the state; one is too small, the other too big. And the relationship—a blood relationship in the family, geographical in the state—are fortuitous and not fully voluntary.

For China this is of first importance. The family has been the foundation of common life, providing at once an objective for loyalty and a basis for security. But the old family life is being steadily worn away under the double pressure of western industries, and the Christian Church. The Church provides an alternative, and deeper, object of loyalty; but no alternative basis for security. The young married man is thrown, therefore, on his own resources and inevitably makes his salary the standard for the job of work he does: striving by insurance, investment, and perhaps speculation, to carve out some security for himself and his family. Sunday by Sunday he listens to the preaching of a way of life which from Monday to Saturday he must disobey if he is to keep his foothold on life.

For all sorts of ways, in all sorts of places, in different ways in different places where immediate needs are different, the Church *must* become a cooperative or it will find itself unwittingly and unwillingly dependent on the present economic order for its continued existence.