I often get criticisms from laymen and unlettered ministers for using a modern translation of the Bible as a source of preaching resurrection.

Christmas is an Incarnation. It is the meeting of two worlds.

Outline of a Christmas sermon

---

Three Levels of Fellowship

[28 May 1950]
[Atlanta, Ga.]

Following his second year at Crozer, King returned to Ebenezer for the summer, where he preached a sermon that may have been based on the following handwritten outline:

Subject: Three Levels of Fellowship

Text: 1 Corinthians 1:2, 9

1. Gasterism — lower level — the thing that holds this level together is sensuality.
2. Communism — middle level — the thing that holds this level together is economics.
3. Spirit — Higher level — the thing that holds this level together is love.

---

2. 1 Corinthians 1:2 “Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours,” 1 Corinthians 1:9 “God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord”
3. Gaster is the Greek word for “stomach”.

---

Three Essays on Religion

In the following three essays, King wrestles with the role of religion in modern society. In the first assignment, he calls science and religion “different though converging truths” that both “spring from the same seeds of vital human needs.” King emphasizes an awareness of God’s presence in the second document, noting that religion’s purpose “is not to perpetuate a dogma or a theology, but to produce living witnesses and...”
testimonies to the power of God in human experience. In the final handwritten essay King acknowledges the life-affirming nature of Christianity, observing that its adherents have consistently "looked forward for a time to come when the law of love becomes the law of life."

"Science and Religion"

[September 1948–May 1951]
[Chester, Pa.]

There is widespread belief in the minds of many that there is a conflict between science and religion. But there is no fundamental issue between the two. While the conflict has been waged long and furiously, it has been on issues utterly unrelated either to religion or to science. The conflict has been largely one of trespassing, and as soon as religion and science discover their legitimate spheres the conflict ceases.

Religion, of course, has been very slow and loath to surrender its claim to sovereignty in all departments of human life, and science overjoyed with recent victories, has been quick to lay claim to a similar sovereignty. Hence the conflict.

But there was never a conflict between religion and science as such. There cannot be. Their respective worlds are different. Their methods are dissimilar and their immediate objectives are not the same. The method of science is observation, that of religion contemplation. Science investigates. Religion interprets. One seeks causes, the other ends. Science thinks in terms of history, religion in terms of theology. One is a survey, the other an outlook.

The conflict was always between superstition disguised as religion and materialism disguised as science, between pseudo-science and pseudo-religion.

Religion and science are two hemispheres of human thought. They are different though converging truths. Both science and religion spring from the same seeds of vital human needs.

Science is the response to the human need of knowledge and power. Religion is the response to the human need for hope and certitude. One is an outreaching for mastery, the other for perfection. Both are man-made, and like man himself, are hedged about with limitations. Neither science nor religion, by itself, is sufficient for man. Science is not civilization. Science is organized knowledge, but civilization which is the art of noble and progressive communal living requires much more than knowledge. It needs beauty which is art, and faith and moral aspiration which are religion. It needs artistic and spiritual values along with the intellectual.

Man cannot live by facts alone. What we know is little enough. What we are likely to know will always be little in comparison with what there is to know. But man has a wish-life which must build inverted pyramids upon the apexes of known facts. This is not logical. It is, however, psychological.

Science and religion are not rivals. It is only when one attempts to be the oracle at the others’ shrine that confusion arises. When the scientist from his laboratory, on the basis of alleged scientific knowledge presumes to issue pronouncements on God, on the origin and destiny of life, and on man’s place in the scheme of things he is [passing?] out worthless checks. When the religious delivers ultimatums to the scientist on the basis of certain cosmologies embedded in the sacred text then he is a sorry spectacle indeed.