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Cerebral Crash Program

In the days of Ike the Well-Loved, the tribes of Earth learned the use of the bow and arrow.

Now it happened that the Tribe of the Red Bear devised a monstrous great bow with which they were able to shoot their arrows great distances, even into the land of Usa. And the people of Usa were afraid for "lo," said they, "our bowmakers are not able to make great bows like unto those of the Men of the Red Bear and we shall all die because the Men of the Red Bear are evil men and they seek the destruction of the righteous."

Then up rose Ike the Well-Loved and his councilors and spake to the people and said, "Fear not the great bows of the Men of the Red Bear for behold, we have greater trees than they wherewith to make bows. But bring ye your gold and silver ornaments, your chrome and your fine jewelry that we may purchase the best of the trees of the forest and bribe young men of cunning to fashion from them bows larger than the bows of the Men of the Red Bear."

And it was done. And throughout the land of Usa young men of cunning were paid to do nothing else but to fashion great bows. Moreover these young men were given great honor and they were consulted on all things so that no one exceeded them in power, not the mighty men of valor, nor the priests, nor the elders of the tribe. And they took wives from among the fairest of the daughters of Usa and they rode the best horses and their workshops were equipped with every tool that the hand of man could fashion. And before long they had fashioned bows as great as those possessed by the Men of the Red Bear.

But one young man there was, Ichabod the Potty, who scorned the bowmakers and refused to labor in their workshops. And day by day he amused himself in his cave, seeking to make the greatest noise ever heard by man. Using the crude materials of the earth, he ground them up and heated them with fire and at first he made small noises like the clapping of hands and then greater noises like the sound of wood hitting against wood and at last a very great noise such as man had never heard before. And so great was the noise that the neighbors complained, asserting moreover that not only was the noise not to be borne but that so great was the force of the noise that it caused the solid rock to dislodge and to close up the openings of their caves. Whereupon Ichabod the Potty was put in prison where, shortly thereafter, he died, content that he had made the greatest noise ever devised by man.

And it came to pass in the days of Kennedy the Uncombed, when Usa lacked bread because its whole wealth had gone into the making of monstrous great bows, that men recalled how Ichabod the Potty had loosened the solid rock with his great noise and skilled workmen who had no love of noise labored to do what Ichabod had done. And when they had succeeded in doing so the mighty men of valor were glad and said, "Behold, here is a weapon greater than the monstrous great bow. Too dreadful is it for use, but let us make huge quantities of it so that if we should need to use it we will have it."

And the great bows were stacked neatly into piles and they were consumed with fire. And Ichabod the Potty's body was dug up out of the prison graveyard and buried with full military honors in the Temple of the Prince of Peace, the god of the people of Usa.

The President and the Presidency

Last year the President recommended, and the Congress declined to consider, legislation to clarify the question of when a president is disabled and how his powers pass to the vice-president. In the light of Mr. Eisenhower's most recent illness, it should not be too much to expect that the Congress will do its obvious duty this year and arrange some procedure for the orderly transferral of the president's powers to the vice-president.

Meanwhile, it may still be some time before such legislation can go into effect and we shall have to get along as well as we can with the fact that President
Eisenhower is an elderly man, subject to the afflictions that go with aging. Some of these afflictions are temporarily disabling. The suggestion that he should resign because of a temporary disability is an indecent one, particularly when it comes from some of the members of his own party who are still riding on his coat-tails. So long as the President remains sound in mind and judgment he ought to retain the high office which, inevitably, will lose some of its dignity when the 170-year-old tradition that a president does not resign is broken.

The sickness or health of the President would not be so crucially important if it were not for the anachronistic structure which has developed in the executive branch of the federal government — a structure which still requires the president to carry responsibilities which, in any well-run corporation, would long ago have been delegated to some subordinate official. It is high time some sort of streamlining of the executive branch were undertaken — the more thoroughgoing the better. At a minimum, the cabinet ought to be reconstituted as a kind of executive committee, its members drawing salaries appropriate to the quality of men who ought to staff such a committee. The rights of the vice-president to participate in policy-making and to be fully informed, already enjoyed by Mr. Nixon as a matter of personal privilege, ought to be confirmed by law. Perhaps it would be desirable to limit the president to one six-year term, thus relieving him of the necessity of trying to run the country and his own party simultaneously. And certainly the constant carping about how the president spends his time ought to stop. One has to be pretty asinine or pretty dishonest to suggest that the president is working only when he is at his desk.

Given a decent structure, an elderly man can take his light strokes, his ileitis operations, and even an occasional heart attack without leaving the nation leaderless. But the kind of structure we actually have would make a young man old before his time. And the chief difference between a worn-out old man and a worn-out young man is that the worn-out old man at least has the benefit of a few more years of experience and whatever extra wisdom he has derived from that experience.

**Beginnings**

Something there is in us that does not like beginnings. The still-clean page in the typewriter, the first class day of the semester, the hour after one has been sworn into office, the first day of the new year, these irritate us. The moment of realization is always a let-down from the months or days of anticipation, and not until the new thing has become commonplace do we feel altogether at home with it.

Some have suggested that this irritation is the product of man's fear of the unknown. We do not fear the past because it no longer holds any secrets for us. We know its shape, we know its power, and we know that we have outlived it. But the future is quite another matter. How can one ever be sure what he will write on the virgin page? How can one ever be sure that he will be able to defend his sovereignty over the procession of days and seasons that marshalls to carry him into the grey mist of the future?

We would suggest that it is not so much our fear of the unknown as of the known that makes us dislike beginnings. We may not know what words the clean page in the typewriter will bear when we have finished with it but we do know that the words will be our words and, therefore, something less than the page might have borne if it had come under the hand of a C. S. Lewis or a J. B. Phillips. And so also with the year. The one thing that we know about 1958 is that, in the living of it, we shall leave our finger marks all over it, moment by moment converting bright hopes into dull regret, trading expectation for memory.

There is nothing wrong with January 2. By then, already, the die has been cast, the new year has lost its shine and we know how to handle it. It is January 1 that gives us the trouble. Something compels us, in spite of all previous experience, to have one more try at doing things right. We won't dirty this year, as we have every other year, with angry words, with lazy procrastination, with faithless fears, with egotistical shouting and pushing.

But, of course, we do. By mid-afternoon on New Year's Day one of two things will have happened. Either the lid will have blown sky-high or we will be so exhausted from our efforts to keep the lid on that we will fall into a chair and sleep. Waking or sleeping, we rub off the shine and the new year is no longer new.

And this is the sort of thing, repeated over and over, that constitutes the *lachrymae rerum*, the tears of things. For in our fallen state we can not build without first destroying, we can not create without first killing. The child dies in becoming a man, the virgin loses her innocence in becoming a wife, the critic sacrifices his freedom in becoming an administrator. Life forces us either to dirty the clean page or to leave it forever unused, and blessed be Martin Luther for having offered us the comforting advice to "sin courageously."

By the time these pages are in print, we will have spoiled the new year. But, please God, we will have used it, also. And under the cover of God's forgiveness we shall find 1958 a good year, in spite of everything.
In this morning’s mail I received a brochure along with a letter from a travel agency inviting me to take a Mediterranean tour this winter. The brochure was attractive, with many photographs and many references to warmth and sunshine. This was ideally timed since several inches of snow lay on the ground and a cold wind was blowing. However, I don’t know how I got on anyone’s list as a likely prospect for a cruise anywhere.

I had been admiring the photographs, particularly those of places I had been, and I was feeling quite disappointed in my inability to take the cruise. Just then a visitor came to the office and in the course of our conversation he noticed the picture on my calendar which, this month, showed a most beautiful shot of Oregon with Mt. Hood in the background. “I wonder how the photographer got that picture,” the visitor said. “I just spent two weeks in Oregon and it rained so much I never did see Mt. Hood. It’s strange what photographs don’t show.”

Yes, it is strange what photographs don’t show. When the visitor left I picked up the brochure again and took another look to see what the photographer of these interesting pictures didn’t, couldn’t, or wouldn’t show.

One of the ports of call on this cruise is going to be Marseilles. One of the two scenes of this city is of the main street, the Rue de la Republique. The photograph is clear, unretouched, and everything is correct. There is the round building at the end of the street which houses a bar and outside cafe; there are the six story buildings lining the street for blocks; there in the lower corner is a familiar monument. But what the photograph couldn’t show is the wind when it’s blowing or the odor when it’s not.

Those six story buildings act as a funnel and any wind blowing at all sweeps along the street picking up dust. When a mistral is blowing this famous street is impossible. And this street ends at the inner harbor. Centuries of oil and refuse dumping by ships have given a peculiar odor to this area when there is no wind.

From the number of photographs in the brochure, the cruise takes in quite a bit of Italy. One of the photographs shows the monument to Victor Emanuel II. It is not a clear shot, in fact it is rather arty and hazy, as if a cloth were held over the lens. Well, one does get an idea of what the monument looks like, a huge white marble affair with many steps and statues. What the filter keeps the viewer from recognizing is that this is probably one of the most overdone, unimaginative, and cluttered up pieces of phony architecture ever perpetrated as a memorial to anyone.

And then there is a picture of Pompeii. I congratulate the photographer on the angle he chose for this shot, for it is one I didn’t realize existed. From this picture one gets the idea that Pompeii is completely restored; the roofs are on, flowers and grass are growing, in fact, the place appears to be a teeming city. Nowhere in this scene do you see the lava dust that covers everything; none of the reconstruction that is no more than a foot or two off the ground is visible; gone too are the loose rocks and the barren ground.

Next to this photograph is a group on Naples, which includes one of the waterfront street, the via Partenope, with a part of the harbor visible. The street is almost deserted but the apartment buildings look familiar and very attractive. But where are all the street urchins who frequent this street begging for money? Where are the bum boats in the harbor with their cargoes of garishly painted religious relics (many made in Japan) which they try to sell to passengers on incoming boats? Where are the flies around that quaint little open food store showing in the corner of the picture?

The cruise takes off for North Africa, and in this sequence of photographs there is one highly romantic scene of an Arab in full robe in the middle foreground with a mosque in the background. The location isn’t given but it could be anywhere in North Africa where bullets aren’t flying at the present moment. The picture isn’t faked, but fortunately for the total effect the photographer was trying to get, the Arab is close enough for one to see his quaint costume but not close enough to see it clearly. His robe appears to be clean and snowy white and it may be, but if it is, it is the first clean robe on a native of these streets I’ve ever seen. The robe ends six inches from the ground and what this photograph does not show is that between the end of the robe and the sandals are six inches of unromantic dirty leg.

When I put the brochure down the second time, my interest in the cruise had waned, the snow outside looked clean and attractive, and the wind seemed more refreshing than cold.
Religious Public Relations Is Different

By Harold E. Hammond

Executive Secretary
Division of Public Relations
National Lutheran Council

In his recent book, The Golden Kazoo, John Schneider, through one of his characters, hoped future generations of public relations men would find lower and lower levels of communication so they could reach greater and greater numbers of people. Though humorously offered, there is point indeed to this analysis. I introduce my presentation on “Some of the Public Relations Problems the Church Faces in Championing the Christian Message in the Community, the Nation and the World” with this reference because it points up, in my opinion, a difference between communicating religion and doing a “build-up job” on a product or a different kind of institution than a Church body.

Here then, is our first “problem” as Church public relations people. We must confine our activities to “high level” methods of communication, and we cannot, by the nature of our religious ideologies, do a “build-up job.” As a matter of fact, we can rarely avoid such danger zones as we know perfectly well will create poor public relations, or which will result in the heaping of positive abuse upon the heads of the individuals and organizations we serve. I offer as examples of this subjects like integration, birth control, McCarthyism, economic exploitation, and other topics in which a Church body may invite abuse because it feels compelled to take a position on these subjects.

Unlike public relations men in industry, we cannot develop “formula opinions” or “party lines” which our people will follow. For example, General Motors may take a stand on a political or social question because this stand will help sell more of its products. Right down the line, GM personnel will adhere to this stand, even though the motivation may be purely to increase sales. Now let us examine what would happen if the PR department of a Church body recommended and adopted a particular position on this same question.

Even in matters of faith and morals, the pronouncement of dogma by a Church body invites discussion, and often criticism, among the members of the Church body. It is virtually impossible to obtain unanimity of opinion from churchmen within a given Church body on a subject like integration. There are pastors and priests and rabbis in the South who will scorn a position taken by their Church favoring integration, and stormy debate can be expected at a church convention into which an integration resolution is introduced. Because, by its very nature, Christianity allows freedom of belief and conscience in many matters not concerned with basic doctrine, there can be no blanket opinion or position to which everyone in the Church adheres, and except in matters of basic doctrine, there is no discipline comparable to that which a corporation can invoke to compel churchmen to accept the pronouncement of the majority.

The Differences

In drawing together our comparison with commercial public relations, we can say that religious public relations has, among others, the following distinctions:

1) The organization can rarely take a unanimous position in which there is total concurrence. Individuals and factions within the Church group will take exception, and a “united front” can rarely be achieved.

2) The opposition will be heard, since the “debate” is generally open and news coverage is given to the conference or convention. Most church public relations departments frankly give equal news coverage to the opinions of the opposition. Any attempt to suppress a minority opinion normally leads to greater publicity for the the minority views, making suppression ill-advised.

3) Any attempt to impose a position or an issue, or to glorify anything at all beyond true proportion (as is often done with a commercial product) will be resisted strongly within a Church body. The greatest criticism comes from within, and exaggeration is dangerous, if not impossible.

4) After the Church body has announced its position, the debate on the merits of the position is carried on by the membership — the lay members as well as the clergy. All negative aspects are therefore given the limelight treatment, and there is absolutely nothing a public relations department can do about this.

Now all this is the nature of religious publicity and promotion. Whereas corporations and commercial organizations would consider pointing up the weaknesses of a product or situation ridiculous, church groups must accept this public relations problem and learn to live with it. Since the search for truth is basic, it cannot even be thought of as a “problem,” and we have grown more accustomed to thinking of it as a responsibility.

Rather than avoiding controversial issues, then, churches regard such issues as a responsibility, and it becomes the job of public relations people working on behalf of the churches to see that various positions on controversial issues which their bodies discuss are
widely known. All matters of faith and morals, and political, economic, social, diplomatic, and philosophical questions with which their people must be concerned in daily life come within the jurisdiction of the churches. Even though not all churches consider themselves under obligation to prescribe attitudes or positions to their constituent members or the world at large, almost all churches do recognize an obligation to arrive at an interpretation of issues and let their constituent members know what these interpretations are.

In itself an example of public relations masochism was the recent controversy over “who speaks for the Churches and who has the right to speak” set off by J. Howard Pew in a letter dated December 15, 1955, that prefaced a report to the National Lay Committee of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America (reprinted in U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 3, 1956, pp. 47-48). In his report, Mr. Pew challenged the clergy’s right to participate in controversial matters:

Throughout our Committee’s term of life, it repeatedly brought to the Council’s attention the seriousness of the problems involved in its issuance of controversial statements and studies in the fields of sociology, economics and politics; and the danger inherent in speaking to official Washington and the United Nations General Assembly in behalf of Protestantism on matters outside their field and for which they possess no mandate.

Mr. Pew made additional provocative statements along the same lines, and I doubt if he could have said anything which would have inspired more of the same than what he did say. Although his attack was against ministers taking positions on public issues, he had no objection to Christian laymen voicing such opinions.

In the rebuttal, it was pointed out that the clergy represent leadership in Christian thought and teaching, and that it is their Christian responsibility to speak out boldly in matters concerning the welfare of God’s creatures — even when there are sharp disagreements on the issues between churches and individuals and groups within particular churches. There is no attempt on the part of the churches to “control” the thinking of the people, as Mr. Pew suggested. There is an attempt on the part of the clergy to fulfill a Christian responsibility by pointing out the Christian implications involved with political, social and economic issues, however much of a public relations problem this may create for the church.

Protestant, Catholic and Jewish clergy and lay people have spoken out recently on such subjects as congressional investigations, the 5th Amendment, the Communist Party in America and elsewhere, strengthening the U.N., rehabilitation of Korea, collective security, reduction or armaments, technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, refugees, and a score of other highly explosive issues. In each of these there are special implications and responsibilities for Christians and Jews, and if the clergy does not speak out on them, who will represent the spiritual thinking? Religion today cannot live in a vacuum from antiquity, and it must be dynamic and progressive if it is to be a real and vital force in this modern age. What meaning would it have otherwise in our lives?

Now can you imagine any corporation or business making a point of becoming involved with such controversial issues where their business was not directly concerned? Essential to “good public relations” in the commercial sense is the avoidance of anything “hot” or controversial. Another essential is only to put the best foot forward, to present only the favorable side of the company or product, and to paint the rosiest kind of picture. This the churches cannot do, by their very nature and purpose, and this is why the public relations situation is of necessity very different from the commercial and infinitely more complicated.

The Religious PR Job

What is the product that we are selling, and how are we going about doing it? We are all — Protestants, Catholics, Jews — trying to present the witness of God in people’s lives and in our lives, and the things which God inspires those who love Him to do towards their fellow men on behalf of His Kingdom on earth.

When we publicize, promote, or feature the work we perform as churches, we are not, through this, hoping to do a “build-up job” on God. We don’t feel this is either necessary or appropriate. We are trying to do two things, however: (1) Make evident to those not of our faith a general understanding of its nature and motivation, and an account of what our faith moves us to perform on behalf of God and His creatures, and (2) Inform those who are participating in this work what is being done with the dollars or foodstuffs or clothing or medicines they are contributing, or about anything else they are doing en masse. In large group activity, communication becomes vital for the continuation of such work.

If I may indulge in an example, last summer I toured Lutheran World Action projects in Europe — some of which were behind the Iron Curtain. The vast and wonderful work in the area of relieving the misery of human beings regardless of race, color, creed, motivated by the spirit of Christianity, requires telling, retelling, and repetition of the telling ad infinitum. It is important that the people who support Lutheran World Action and Lutheran World Relief know where their dollars and other contributions are going — not so that they can take a personal pride in this, but so that they may be further inspired to do more and more of this work. If I were to make a criticism of the public
relations of the churches, it would be that the story of their work is not being told often enough or forcefully enough.

The highly conservative nature of churches and church organizations causes them to wait for new media of communications to become widely accepted before they will go into them, and further, there is the need in religious public relations of dignity in communicating the message so that the subject is not belittled. On the first point, it has been said that religious organizations waited so long for radio to be accepted that they “missed the boat” entirely on it. Although this is somewhat of an exaggeration, there is no question that religious groups did not exploit this medium sufficiently, and that the public mind has veered to television just as religious groups have come to recognize their responsibility to utilize radio for the communication of the Gospel.

Whether or not religious denominations will take full advantage of television for communicating the Word and Work of God remains to be seen. Certainly a lot more is being done a lot sooner than was the case with radio. It is my private opinion that the experimentation and presentation of religious television programs must be speeded up to a great extent over the next decade if the religious organizations are to hold their own on television. Both quantitatively and qualitatively, a great deal of work has to be done on both the local television and the national TV hookup levels, or religious groups will be forced to settle for Sunday morning programs and other second- or third-rate times and spots.

Just as church conservatism with new media of communications becomes a problem of the religious public relations man, so does the matter of dignity of presentation. Until recently, for example, religious organizations considered paid advertisements in newspapers and magazines undignified, and many denominations still regard this as on the same level as painting “Jesus Saves” on rocks along the highway. In defense of this compulsion for dignity, I must say that there is no subject or “product,” if you will, that requires or deserves greater reverence and dignity of treatment than God and His Kingdom on earth. Anything said or done which would offend anyone who might otherwise be won to the Lord is in direct conflict with the objectives of the church. Rightly, therefore, do churches shy away from methods of communicating the Word which might bring ridicule to God or His Church.

The religious public relations technician has a definite responsibility towards keeping the presentation through mass media of communication on a high level. He has an equal responsibility to the media to see that this level does not require sacrifice of their standards or the interest of their public. Therefore he has the two-sided job of interpreting the requirements of the subject to the media and of educating the officials of the church in those ways of presenting their subject which meet the entertainment, educational, informative, and technical standards of the media.

Because church organizations have tended in the past to train pastors in the ways of public relations, the criticism of newspaper men and others in the various avenues of public relations that church PR men are too biased in favor of the church and insufficiently aware or sympathetic towards the problems of the media professionals is a legitimate complaint. More and more, however, church organizations are calling upon lay professionals to do their public relations, and this trend is hopeful of closer cooperation between the churches and the media. My personal conviction is that it is easier to induct a PR man into the requirements and sensitivities of the church organization with which he must work intimately every day, than it is to make a professional PR man out of a churchman who continues to move in church circles almost exclusively.

But even the professional PR man entering church public relations is not without problems in his efforts to overcome natural barriers to presenting the case for religion. His is a task of perpetual education of his own church colleagues. John Milton’s dilemma about whether he was explaining the ways of God to man or the ways of man to God is no more complicated than the dilemma of the church PR man. I think we devote more time to explaining the ways of public relations to the church than of explaining the ways of the church to public relations people, and this may be a mistake. But unless we can make our own people understand the requirements of the trade, there is no point in our obtaining radio or television time, no opportunities for feature treatment in the press and popular magazines.

We deal here with things quite intangible, but I see a motivation difference in promoting an ordinary charity and a Christian charity; of treating secular education and Christian education (and I’ve done public relations for secular colleges and universities also); and of interpreting the qualities of a soap and the significance of a Christian act. In the case of charity, the “plus” factor is the difference in motive of responding to an emotional appeal to help someone in need, and the positive responsibility of the Christian towards one of God’s creatures; in the case of education, the “plus” factor is learning for the sake of fulfilling a Christian mission in life – that of serving the interests of God and one’s fellow-creatures to a fuller extent; in the case of promoting a product or Christianity, the “plus” factor is presenting the case in the best possible manner in order to witness for one’s God, regardless of measurable results.
All of us have probably heard someone say at one time or another that it is inexplicable, indeed entirely unfathomable, that some pious, godfearing man has been permitted by God to be the victim of an overwhelming misfortune, ill health or long suffering, while hundreds of godless people and even hardened criminals are permitted to go serenely through life untouched by any of these woes. The latter would seem to lead a charmed life, so to speak. Unwittingly, the most devout Christian may sometimes in a weak moment express some doubt concerning the wisdom or the omniscient justice of the Divinity in such individual cases. The Bible tells us however in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:45) that “He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust”. The ways of Heaven are mysterious and wonderful and beyond human comprehension. Christian theology teaches moreover that Christians are to regard suffering and adversity as a test inflicted upon them by the Divine Will of God to prove their faith pure gold, not a worthless alloy. Christians must therefore bear their cross (as did Jesus himself!) patiently in preparation and in anticipation of the greater joys of heaven.

There is indeed a very old proverb which tells us that Gold is proven through the test of fire, which is found recorded as early as the Proverbs of Solomon, 17:3, Jesus Sirach, 2:5, 1 Peter 1:8, Revelations 3:18, and in Pindar, Nemaei, hymn 4; Rursum in Pythiis, hymn 10; Cicero, Epistulae ad Familiares, 9; Ovid, Tristia, 1, 5, 25; Cassiodorus, historia ecclesiastica, 4, 29; and Isidorus Hispalensis, Synonym, 1, 28. Variations in the form of corollaries and applications to the realities of life are: Gold is proven in the fire, bravery in a calamity, Gold and loyalty are proven in the fire, the same fire purifies gold and consumes straw, and Time proves friends as fire proves gold; more directly significant and applicable to the theme of this our paper are the following later projected forms with a simile added: Gold is proven in the fire, a good man in suffering, God proves men’s hearts as fire proves gold, and the Christian’s faith is proven in adversity as the purity of gold is proven in the fire. The germ of this idea is to be found in the old pagan form per aspera (ardua) ad astra which, according to Otto, has its origin in Virgil’s Aeneid, 9,641, and which the monks humorously paraphrased as follows during the Middle Ages:

Non per dormire poteris ad alta venire!  
Sed per studere poteris ad alta sedere!

In these forms we have not only the theological explanation for the Christian acceptance of suffering as the just test instituted by Divine Providence, but it has also become the symbol for the continual, never-ceasing, restless onward-urge and upward-striving which have led men to conquer what seemed to be insurmountable obstacles and unknown dangers. In this light it has become the central theme of great literary works: Wolfram von Eschenbach’s Parzival, Goethe’s Faust, Part II, and Henrik Ibsen’s Peer Gynt. In these renowned works the great lesson is that he who continually strives upward and onward despite hardship and adversity of every kind can be redeemed in the end. Conversely, the punishment inflicted as a just nemesis upon those who cannot or will not willingly bear the adversity or the misfortune placed upon them by Divine Providence is clearly shown in literary works such as Marlowe’s Faustus, the end of Don Juan, and in Buerger’s well known poem Lenore, which Sir Walter Scott has translated into English verse. Sometimes, moreover, the words per ardua ad astra have come to symbolize high adventure and the fathoming of the strange and the unknown, as they do when used as the official motto of England’s Royal Air Force and in Walter Hogg’s fine poem Sirens.

We have noted above that great literary works have this broad, general theme as their basis. It is the underlying theme in all of them, but it is not definitely stated as such in plain words. That the theological concept guilt and the Gods has long specifically occupied the thoughts of men of high intellect is abundantly clear. This theme has been dealt with directly by various renowned writers in world literature, who have definitely stated the problem and considered it from variant points of view, seeking to give an adequate explanation to the perplexing difficulties it poses.

Why should the good and the pious not be spared suffering and adversity, and why should evil, godless men not be made to suffer as punishment and atonement for their wrongdoing? Oriental ascetics believe that physical hardships, suffering and privation grant them atonement for their naturally sinful (not criminal!) lives. Here the punishment is self-inflicted upon the mortal by the Heavenly Powers; nor is the reason for inflicting such punishment upon one's self criminal guilt but rather original sin.

One of the best known instances of our theme in European literature is to be found in Goethe’s two Harper’s Songs, written in 1783 and included in chapter 13 of the second book of his Wilhelm Meister’s Apprenticeship. Without knowing it, the Harper has married his own sister, the theme of the famous Greek tragedy OEdipus Rex by Sophocles, where King OEdipus unwittingly marries his mother Jocasta, and also of
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Schiller’s *Bride of Messina*, where the twin brothers Don Cesar and Don Manuel unknowingly fall in love with their sister Beatrice, and in the ensuing rivalry Don Cesar in a fit of anger stabs his brother dead and then commits suicide. Too late does the Harper come to know of this incestuous union, of which Mignon, a fascinating and a strangely precocious child with deep longing and intense feeling, is the offspring. It is in these two songs that the aged Harper pours forth his despair and the torments of his conscience from a heart sorrow-laden in the depths of bitterest human wretchedness. The intensity of his despair is shown in his first song in his longing for solitude, in his abandonment by people to his torment, and in his final penitent words:

> So ueberschleicht bei Tag und Nacht  
> Mich Einsamen die Pein,  
> Mich Einsamen die Qual.  
> Ach wert ich erst einmal  
> Einsam im Grabe sein,  
> Da laest sie mich allein.  

(“Thus by day and by night the pain steals over me, over me, lonely man, and torment creeps over me, over me, lonely man. Alas, when once I am lonely in my grave, then, then, will it leave me alone.”)

It is in the second of the two *Harper’s Songs* that our theme is even more directly dealt with. Based on Ezekiel 4: 16-17: “Son of man, behold, I will break the staff of bread in Jerusalem: and they shall eat bread by weight, and with care: and they shall drink water by measure, and with astonishment: that they may want bread and water . . . and consume away for their iniquity,” the Harper here directly upbraids cruel Destiny which drives man unwittingly into sin, abandons him, and then punishes him ruthlessly. According to the Harper, it would seem that the Heavenly Powers whimsically lead a poor human wretch into life only to permit him to become guilt-laden and overwhelmed with torment. Alleviation of guilt or forgiveness is not, however, according to him, the will of these dread deities who in their whim abandon him and permit him to go on suffering alone with his guilt weighing heavily on his stricken conscience. And why? All guilt is avenged on earth.

> Wer nie sein Brot mit Thraenen ass,  
> Wer nie die kummervollen Naechte  
> Auf seinem Bette weinend sass,  
> Der kennt euch nicht, ihr himmlischen Maechte!  

Ihr fuehrt ihn in sein Leben uns hinein,  
Ihr lasst den Armen schuldig werden,  
Dann uberlasst ihr ihn der Pein;  
Denn alle Schuld raecht sich auf Erden.  

(“Who ne’er his bread has eaten in tears, who ne’er through sorrow-laden nights weeping has sat upon his bed, he knows you not, ye heavenly powers!”

> Ye lead us mortals into life, ye let a poor mortal become guilt-laden, then ye abandon him to torment; for all guilt is avenged here on earth.”)

If the Harper here arraigns Providence overseverely the reason lies in the immensity of the misfortune that has befallen him. Yet his assertion at the end, while usually true, nonetheless shows a distinct opposition to Christian doctrine. Guilt is frequently avenged on earth, to be sure. However, the true Christian does not despair utterly as does the Harper for a sin unwittingly committed. He finds solace and comfort in the ever saving grace of Jesus Christ; for even if our sins be blood-red, true repentance will wash them away and make us white as snow. What great comfort and solace! Perhaps the best consolation and antidote to the Harper’s despair is to be found in Psalm 127:2: “It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows: for so he giveth his beloved sleep.”

Both Julius Schneider, *Goethe-Jahrbuch XII*, and Von Klenze call attention to a remarkable similarity between the thought content of Goethe’s second *Harper’s Song* above and the following passage in Jean Racine’s *Thebaide*, Act III, Scene 2:

> Voila de ces grands dieux la supreme justice;  
> Jusques au bord du crime ils conduisent nos pas.  
> Ils nous le font commettre et ne l’excusent pas.  

(“Such is the supreme justice of those great Gods; to the brink of crime they guide our steps. They make us commit it and do not excuse it.”)

It should perhaps be added here that the unfortunate and beautiful Queen Louise of Prussia, who at the time of Napoleon’s crushing defeat of Prussia was compelled to flee to Koenigsberg in exile, gained melancholy consolation from the sad and significant lines of Goethe’s *Harper’s Song*, a fact that caused Goethe to feel gratified at having provided at least a little comfort for this fine lady in her hour of humiliation. Napoleon’s defeat at Waterloo and his exile to St. Helena spelled his doom and somewhat justified the thought in the last line of the Harper’s song. Goethe has again voiced the same thought in his *Sprueche in Prosa*, 426 when he states that “wir leiden alle am Leben” (“we all suffer in living”), and in his *Iphigenie auf Taurus*, Act IV, Scene 5, where the omnipotence of the gods and their whimsical use of their power over mortals is clearly and powerfully depicted in the well known Song of the Parcae.

The great Schiller has also woven the same problem into his fine drama *The Maid of Orleans* (Joan of Arc), and has in fact made it the central theme of the tragic guilt upon which his heroine’s downfall depends. In Joan’s fate we are to experience the tragic differentiation between the rights of the wholly free human being, of which every natural impulse is a part, and the divine command. This is the situation into which Joan is placed and it is because of her choice that she is doomed in the end. It is the Virgin Mary, who, resting her
claim on the fact that she has given birth to the Saviour and is thereby now divine in her own right, demands of her that no human passion may stir her heart with the sinful flames of vain earthly love, — for only a pure virgin can accomplish a glorious deed on earth. Mindful of her destiny when she has been smitten with love for Lionel, she herself arraigns her hard fate, when she exclaims: "Und bin ich strafbar, weil ich menschlich war?" ("And am I culpable because I was human?") If a superhuman deed is to be accomplished, then Heaven must choose other more perfect instruments than she...

Die Unsterblichen, die Reinen,

Die nicht fucheln, die nicht weinen ...

("The immortal ones, the pure ones, They who feel not, they who weep not ...")

She however is a human being! She may say:—

Konnt' ich dieses Herz verhaerten,

Das der Himmel fuetend schuf?

("Could I harden this heart of mine Which Heaven endowed with feeling?")

And she is logically permitted to raise her bitter complaint to this same Heaven:—

Musstest Du ihn auf mich laden

Diesen furchtbaren Beruf?

("Did you have to load upon me This dread and awful mission?")

And in precisely the same strain as Goethe’s Harper she concludes:—

Doch Du rissest mich ins Leben,

In den stolzen Fuerstensaal,

Mich der Schuld dahinzugeben,

Ach, es war nicht meine Wahl!

("You, however, brought me into life, Into the proud royal hall, Only to succumb to guilt, Alas, it was no choice of mine!")

Thus Schiller's Maid of Orleans at the climax of its action is likewise a tragedy in which a gigantic Fate crushes the heroine. Indeed already the first message to the god-inspired maiden had contained a final dictum, an interpretation of her mission. Twice Joan had hesitated to carry out this mission; then wrathfully the goddess appeared to her a third time and angrily spoke these words:—

Gehorsam ist des Weibes Pflicht auf Erden,

Das harte Dulden ist ihr schweres Los;

Durch strengen Dienst muss sie gelaeutert werden;

Die hier gedient, ist dort oben gross.

("Obedience is Woman’s duty here on earth, Long-suffering endurance is her hard destiny; Through unswerving service must she be purified; She who has served well here, is great in heaven above.")

Obedience is also demanded by the Grand Masters of their knightly subordinates in Schiller’s Maltese Knights and in his poem The Fight with the Dragon. The concept “obedience” is undoubtedly very important in the demands of the mature Schiller, and this is indeed at first most difficult to comprehend, when his old demands of individual freedom and self-determination are placed beside it. We have here a tangible evidence of the importance of his Kant studies, for obedience to duty in preference to inclination is simply the application of the categorical imperative in Kant’s Critique of Judgement to situations in Schiller’s dramatic tragedies or dramatic poems, just as Kleist later applied the same principle, duty over inclination, in his Prinz von Homburg. In the case of the Maid of Orleans the concept of duty to which Joan has subscribed is in the form of a mystic, divine mission not to be tainted by earthly love. Her resultant guilt when she falls in love with Lionel is a guilt which she feels should not be held against her since she, a weak, human girl, is too frail to fight and did not wish to accept this “duty” in the first place. It is in this situation that she arraigns her cruel Destiny, which she feels is wholly unjust in the superhuman duty it has imposed upon her.

In Schwere Stunde (Difficult Hour) Thomas Mann has treated the same theme with Schiller the leading character struggling with himself over his past conduct and his present wretched condition. It is he who is experiencing a difficult hour when he thinks back over his life of hardship and struggle in comparison with the life of Goethe, “that other one, that one in Weimar whom he loves with a longing jealousy. He (Goethe) is wise. He knows how to live, how to create; he is full of consideration for his health and welfare.” And his own life in contrasts to Goethe’s life: “How loudly his conscience cried out! He had sinned against himself during all those years, against the tender instrument of his body. The deviations of his youthful moods, the nights passed in sleepless revels, the days spent in rooms filled with tobacco-saturated air, high spirited and unmindful of his physical health and wellbeing, the drugs with which he had goaded himself on to work,—all that was now seeking revenge.” But if it was now seeking revenge, then “wollte er den Goetttern trotzen, die Schuld schickten und dann Strafe verhaengten”, (i.e. “He would resist the Gods, who sent down guilt and then metered out punishment”). Schiller is made to conclude that “he had lived as he had to live, he had had no time to be wise, no time to be careful.”

Thomas Mann shows here that he, too, had been thinking of the problem involved in human guilt and the role played therein by the gods. He makes Schiller solve this problem by a heroic self-sacrifice in which the great dramatist shows no regrets for his former behavior, correct or incorrect, by dedicating his energies to his dramas. He has lived as it was necessary for him to live, and faces the future whatever it may bring with courage and hope, challenging the gods by completing his greatest works in spite of them when already slowly dying an agonizing death.
In a very different strain, AEschylus in his *Agamemnon*, 1. 187, asserts “the grace of those dread deities” and lauds the “gain of pain” as follows:

- Adversity is grave instruction’s school.
- In the calm hour of sleep
  Conscience, the sad remembrancer, will creep
  To the inmost heart, and there enforce
  On the reluctant spirit the wisdom of remorse.
  Mighty the grace of those dread deities,
  Throned on their judgement bench, high in the empyrean skies!

(Milman’s translation)

Here AEschylus states the same theory of purification through adversity as does our proverb at the beginning of this paper that The Christian’s faith is proven in adversity as gold is proven in the fire. AEschylus’s “gain through pain” concept comes much closer to the Christian concept of bearing one’s cross courageously and cheerfully as a test than do the given examples above by Goethe, Schiller and Racine. In *Schwere Stunde* it is Thomas Mann who is speaking rather than Schiller when the latter is made to “defy the gods” in his dogged determination to work harder than ever before while literally dying on his feet. Unless this be meant merely as a figure of speech, Schiller certainly never entertained any heroic ideas of “defying the gods.” However this may be, the Christian in such a situation will not go to pieces; rather he will confidently turn to his Christian faith and to his Bible and take comfort from promises such as the following:

Isaiah 1: 16-18: Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow: though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.

1 Peter 5: 6-7: Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time; casting all your care upon him: for he careth for you.

Isaiah 30: 20-21: Though the Lord give you the bread of adversity, and the water of affliction, yet shall not thy teachers be removed in a corner any more, but thine eyes shall see thy teachers: and thine ears shall hear a word behind thee, saying, This is the way, walk ye in it.

**FOR K.**

Could I but tuck my Self’s totality into a crystal pebble lying
smooth in my cool hand

Would I not, aiming true
my david-sling with steady eye
fling it at the sun shouting:

Jump your orbit
and gallop with me, my heavenly steed
wheeling through milleniums of azure silence.

Let us surge together through white whirling constellations
while I pluck a violet fire from the heavy cluster
hanging to our left
and gather up the flying songs of endless space

And carefully cradle the moon in my arm
for its safe return to my earth-twin’s hand.

DIANE DORR-DORYNEK
The first few months of this season showed an outburst of the poetic drama as if the Broadway atmosphere had been permeated by an urgency for the poet to conquer the stage. No doubt the entertainment-hungry masses who equate art with escape will continue to rush to the musicals despite the fact that, to their own dismay, they must have found out that with regard to dullness, lack of intelligence and finesse "Copper and Brass" tried to out-"Rumple" "Jamaica".

Apparently forced by the artistic and egghead pressure coming from off-Broadway for the last two seasons, there was an obvious trend toward the literary drama, and about some of its most noteworthy entries I will have to speak next month. Today I would rather dwell on those that have not quite succeeded in triumphing on stage but whose intrinsic value is a part of the powerful drive behind the poetic drama.

No season can begin better than in the sign of Dylan Thomas and Sean O'Casey. Paul Shyre's adaptation of O'Casey's autobiography I Knock At The Door was produced as a staged reading under Stuart Vaughan's sensitive direction. O'Casey's word contains so much drama, his mixture of biting humor with human insight, kindness and warmth has an electrifying intensity which needs neither costumes nor scenery. It is theatre in the best sense of the word because even in his novelistic writing O'Casey is above all a dramatist.

It is different with Dylan Thomas who was one of the great lyricists of our time. But he had a way of turning a phrase, of wielding the word like a sword, of saying sentences in a casual manner and making them sound anew, as a matter of fact, as if he had just invented the English language. Rebellious energy and a reckless vitality create the dramatic undercurrent in whatever he says. Emlyn Williams appeared in a one-man show reading -- no, reciting -- Thomas' prose and poetry under the title of "A Boy Growing UP". Alone, with some change in lighting, sitting or standing, Mr. Williams evoked the spirit of the poet better than any naturalistic staging could have done. He effected an "aliveness" of Thomas' world and the vigorous, blistering, blundering, pathetic and funny people he created. A one-man’s theatre became an artistic revelation.

Since Thomas' "Under Milk Wood" was originally conceived as a radio play, it naturally tries to appeal to our auditory rather than visual senses. A great deal of its innate power and the vibrant simplicity of its lines were lost when scattered over a realistic stage set. Although the actors tried to speak the pungent words as "literary" as possible, by also trying to give their characters stage reality they got into conflict with themselves and Dylan Thomas, who certainly would have rewritten the whole poem for theatrical use.

Another staged reading -- arranged by Banner Productions at the Carnegie Hall Playhouse -- of a play originally written for radio was Samuel Beckett's "All That Fall". He is the man who enriched the theatre with his "Waiting for Godot" two seasons ago. Again as in his greater opus he puzzles and tantalizes the listener who must search for the meaning when an old Irish woman makes her way to a railroad station to meet her blind husband whom she brings home. That is all there is to "All That Fall" on the surface. But as can be expected from such a probing mind as Beckett's, within this sparse scene he gives us to taste a great deal of life's bitterness and despair and the sardonic humor of it all. Pathos and irony are skillfully blended and he sends us home tongue-lashed and soul-scatathed.

Two plays with a strongly literary background failed. Nathaniel West's novel "Miss Lonelyhearts," certainly an excellent satire on our time, lacked the original lustre of Howard Teichmann's dramatization, and the gradual collapse of the idealistic reporter writing the Miss Lonelyhearts column -- an outstanding example of the struggle between idealism and realism -- did not come off on stage. And such a great writer as Carson McCullers whose prose passages can be of strong poetic allusions could not solve the problem of "The Square Root of Wonderful." In spite of the magic in the title little of it got into the frail play which remained another conventional routine job of someone who thinks he has to turn out a comedy of manners at great speed.

Lucille Lortel must be credited for having given Douglas Watson and his Kuriakos Theatre Production No. 2 the opportunity to present a strange but dramatically fascinating stage translation of Katherine Ann Porter's "Pale Horse, Pale Rider." Besides listening to the wonderful words of one of our greatest story tellers, we also became familiar with a story adaptation technique developed at Northwestern University. It is an experiment in which the actors play a certain part, but are, at the same time, separated from their roles.

In the course of it the most curious things may happen. A character would say his lines and then suddenly speak of himself in the third person as if he were completely detached from the character portrayed. This may be an interesting way of dramatizing any piece of prose if you are out to serve the novelist more than the theatre. This is then done in total deference to the purity of style and the flow of the original prose. But on stage it seems you must render to Caesar what is his.
Genuine or Counterfeit

By Luther P. Koepke
Professor of Religion and Dean of Student Affairs
Valparaiso University

But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.

(James 3:17)

Almost everything genuine has its counterfeit. Things go by doubles, substance and shadow, to warn the unwary and to check the thoughtless. In its simpler aspects this fact is familiar to all of us. We know the saint and his shadow, the hypocrite. We know the doctor and his shadow, the quack. Merchant and faker, truth and fallacy, illumination and illusion march together two and two everywhere. Most of us know these things because they are within our common observation.

In vaster, more sounding matters perhaps we aren’t always so observant. All great movements of humanity going toward what it believes are its higher and destined goals seem to be accompanied by counterfeit movements. The counterfeit marches alongside the genuine, not to resist or offer battle, but to draw away from the genuine.

A movement that frankly avows its intention to overthrow a principle or an institution, the home or religion, is only a fourth or fifth degree danger. First degree danger lies in the enemy that says he is friend to the desirable thing while his real purpose is to destroy.

So, for example, the Bible indicates that the anti-Christ does not announce his opposition to the real Christ. If he did, his capacity for doing harm would be less. The great danger of the anti-Christ is that he so closely counterfeits the real Christ, so skillfully impersonates His spirit, so exactly makes promises that seem Christ-like, that even those may be deceived who would not be taken in if the mask were not so life-like or if it were removed altogether. The anti-Christ offers lower objectives, on lower terms, by counterfeit methods. Through superficial similarities, profound deception is wrought.

In James 3:17 we read, “But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.” The text indicates the source from which the genuine in religious matters is to be ascertained. This is the wisdom that comes from above, God’s revelation. The source of genuine knowledge in religious matters, then, is not the work of men. This wisdom has not been gathered by painstaking research, nor is it the accumulated philosophies of the past. The genuine is the revelation of God to men.

If the source of genuine knowledge in religious matters is in God, we should expect that the working out of this knowledge in the lives of men should be genuine and not counterfeit. The text mentions that the wisdom that cometh down from above is pure; it is clean and wholesome and good for men.

As is the case in most areas, so also in religious matters the genuine should be able to stand the tests which prove its real worth and value. In our common experience we know that before a manufacturer places a product on the market he will give it various tests to prove its value. The most conclusive test, however, is the use of the product by the one who purchases it. There it meets the test or it fails.

Similarly, in religious matters, we should expect that the genuine would be able to meet all tests and to prove its value in active use. Christians will assume that Christianity has withstood the tests of counterfeit religion for some nineteen hundred years. The Christian faith has shown its real value, however, when it is actively embodied in the total life of an individual. It is finally only on the individual basis of a personal attachment of the individual to God through Christ that the genuineness of the Christian faith can be demonstrated.

According to the text the genuine nature of the Christian faith and the wisdom from on high works out in the life of the believer in the qualities of peacefulness, gentleness, mercy, and good fruits. The genuine nature of the wisdom from on high is shown by these genuine qualities in the life of the person attached to Christ through the pure wisdom from on high.

In the text we also find a mention of hypocrisy. This could be described as counterfeit Christianity and the hypocrite as a counterfeit Christian. Counterfeit Christianity does so much harm because it resembles the genuine so closely.

When the government tries to protect the value of
genuine money by combating counterfeit currency, it doesn’t have too much difficulty when the counterfeit money is crude. A crude method of counterfeiting is easily recognized by many. Much more difficulty is caused by the expert counterfeiter whose counterfeit money resembles the genuine so closely that only a trained expert can tell the difference.

So in Christianity and in the Christian life, it isn’t the open opposition that constitutes the real danger. It is the expert counterfeiting of real Christianity that poses a definite danger and leads many people astray. This may apply to a group or to an individual.

The counterfeiting of genuine Christianity is also found in what is termed as the true Christian church. Christ recognized that there would be hypocrites among his visible followers. On one occasion Christ referred to such as the tares among the wheat and he says that the counterfeiting so closely resembles the genuine that no human will be able to separate the counterfeit from the genuine. It is only on the final day of judgment that the counterfeit will be separated from the genuine by Him Who knows the innermost disposition of the heart.

At times it may even be possible that an individual is a counterfeit Christian and scarcely recognizes this himself. Just as people sometimes handle counterfeit money and never realize it, so a person might possibly counterfeit Christianity without being aware of it. This may happen when a person goes through the form of the Christian faith without recognizing the center of Christ’s teaching. When, for example, a person tries to attain heaven through his own efforts or in keeping a series of regulations, rather than depending completely on the grace of God in Christ, such an one may be a counterfeit Christian. Here also the best possible way to combat the counterfeit is to learn more about the genuine.

Almost everything genuine has its counterfeit. In matters of religion we find that this also is true. It is up to each of us to learn that the wisdom that is from above is pure and that because of this it will lead to the destined goals of life in Christ for time and eternity.

**BRIEF MILLENNIUM**

The feet of birds I watch below
Write hieroglyphs upon the snow.
How easy to toss out a crumb
And bring them brief millennium.

Lucia Trent

---

**Letter from Xanadu, Nebr.**

By G. G.

Dear Editor:

The Missus is out to a shower tonight and I’ve been sitting here by myself thinking about this and that and trying to figure out what it all means.

You know I’m usually a pretty optimistic sort of guy, maybe because I don’t spend a whole lot of time trying to dope things out. But I’ve got a good case of the jitters tonight. Somehow or other I got to thinking about this dead dog going round and round the world and it all seems kind of spooky.

Rev. Zeitgeist had a sermon last Sunday on what Sputnik ought to mean to the Christian. It was all about how we spend billions of dollars on science and then don’t even meet our congregational budget. (We were $375 short this year.) Usually I don’t go much for preachers talking about money from the pulpit but this time he had a point. Maybe if we Americans had done more for the church lately we wouldn’t have this thing hanging over our heads now. Of course, it’s kind of hard to figure why the Russians got it when they’re all atheists but maybe it’s like when the Philistines used to come in and clobber the Israelites.

I can’t help wondering what all of this worry about Sputnik will do to business in 1958. I suppose the tax cut they promised us is pretty much out of the picture now. But maybe defense spending will give the economy a little shot in the arm. There’s got to be a silver lining in this cloud somewhere but I can’t seem to find it. If we had any leadership back in the nineteen-forties we would have blasted the Russians to smithereens when we had the bombs to do it and they didn’t. But it’s too late now. I don’t expect to see a tax cut in my lifetime and I wouldn’t be surprised if we got a Democratic administration in 1960.

It’s sure some world we are leaving to our kids. No wonder they’re all turning delinquent. I’d be tempted to kick over the traces myself if I thought I could get away with it.

Regards,

G.G.

P.S. — I just found a fifth of Old Yokum in the kitchen. Maybe a drink or two will make me feel better.

P.P.S. — Hupy Nwe Yare!!!!!!?
The Fine Arts

The Years Belong To Christ

(Fragments from an English Psalter about 1290 A.D.)

As life goes on and the years pass by, we begin more and more to try to analyze its meaning. Always it has its deepest significance when Christ is central.

The little miniature in the Psalter shows the four ages of man in the four corners beginning at the lower left and running around the outside in clockwise fashion. The ten ages of man are shown in the circles of the pattern. The divisions all have a slightly different background to emphasize the way in which life changes. Once more the circle begins in the lower left with man as an infant on his mother’s knee. Man is shown in all his various phases until, at the last, in the center at the bottom, he is shown in his tomb.

The whole matter of a man’s life and thought and prayer is sanctified by Christ, the unchangeable one, set in the exact center. All life revolves around Him. He rules our reason as He rules the whole world. The wheel is here regarded as a radiating pattern, not as a kind of a wheel of fortune, turned whether we will or not, in whatever way a blind fate dictates. This is rather the form of the great Rose windows of the cathedrals with their Chrysto-centric figure. Everything radiates from Him. The entire pattern is fixed and firm as Christ is.

At the top, man appears as king. He has come to this position from the weakness of childhood through the vanities and chivalries of youth. From this position of highest potential and nearest likeness to Christ, the King of Kings, man moves downward to the grave.

It is interesting to see that men in every age have sought out the mystery of life and have found it in Christ as King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Life becomes rich and fascinating and full as He becomes the center. This view of life takes the center off self in man and puts the emphasis on the man in Christ. As soon as the study of art goes beyond the stage of finding some good forms to imitate and some good colors to copy, then its faith and philosophy begin to make their true contributions to the cultured soul.

The present movement toward production in the field of art rather than consecrated appreciation had better assess most carefully the potential losses to mankind once the appreciation has died.

The Four Cycles of Life and Ten Steps to Eternity
Hovhaness Both Original and Significant

By WALTER A. HANSEN

About two years ago I listened with patience and many gnashing of teeth to a young composer as he told me how wholeheartedly he detested the use of the word "original." Was it a defense mechanism that prompted this young man to indulge in such vapid talk? I wonder. At all events, his own music did not sound particularly original to me.

Those who evaluate music cannot get away from the adjective "original." Furthermore, there is no valid reason why they should shun the word as though it were a plague.

Consequently, I shall not hesitate to characterize the works of Alan Hovhaness, the forty-six-year-old American composer of Scotch-Armenian descent, as original in the true sense of the word. What is more, I shall state as emphatically as I can that the music written by Hovhaness is distinctively original to the highest degree. I know of no composer whose style of writing is even faintly similar to his.

But not every composer can be original and at the same time have a great deal to say that has actual significance. Consequently, I shall not hesitate to characterize the works of Alan Hovhaness, the forty-six-year-old American composer of Scotch-Armenian descent, as original in the true sense of the word. What is more, I shall state as emphatically as I can that the music written by Hovhaness is distinctively original to the highest degree. I know of no composer whose style of writing is even faintly similar to his.

Music by Alan Hovhaness is the title of a disc (M-G-M E3517) which has afforded me much pleasure and edification. Here is music abounding in distinctive originality and in what, to my thinking, is undeniable significance.

Armenian Rhapsody No. 2, Op. 51 is chockful of elemental power. It is played by the M-G-M String Orchestra under Carlos Surinach, the Spanish-born conductor who is breaking many a lance for modern composers who have something to say.

Celestial Fantasy, Op. 44, with its deftly contrived polyphonic writing, is equally beautiful - though in another way. Mountain Idylls, Op. 39, Nos. 1, 2, and 3 and Slumber Song and Sirius Dance, Op. 39, Nos. 4 and 5 are masterfully conceived miniatures for the piano. They are played by Marga Richter, who is both an unusually able pianist and a composer with much to say.

Macedonian Mountain Dance, Op 39, No. 6 is arranged for the Manhattan Piano Quartet by Hovhaness himself - is couched in Greek style and is full of excitement. Kirghiz Suite, Op. 73, No. 3 for violin and piano - played by Anahid and Mario Ajemian - is founded on themes developed from Tartar tunes. It is strikingly original. So is the Quartet No. 2, for Flute, Oboe, Cello, and Piano, Op. 112, performed by the M-G-M Chamber Orchestra under Surinach.

Sharagan and Fugue, Op. 61, No. 1, scored for brass choir, has a haunting beauty all its own. At the same time it exemplifies Hovhaness' outstanding skill in the field of polyphonic writing. "Sharagan" is an Armenian word for hymn.

If you are interested in becoming acquainted with one of the most distinctively original composers of our time, you will want to hear and rehear the works recorded on the disc titled Music by Alan Hovhaness.

Some Recent Recordings

SERGEI PROKOFIEFF. Concerto No. 3, in C Major, for Piano and Orchestra, Op. 26. Gary Graffman, pianist, with the San Francisco Symphony Orchestra under Enrique Jorda. An excellent performance of one of the finest piano concertos composed during the twentieth century. On the opposite side Jorda conducts Prokofieff's Classical Symphony, which has actually become a classic (RCA Victor).

GIACOMO PUCCINI. La Tosca. Rome Opera House Orchestra and Chorus under Erich Leinsdorf. Principals: Zinka Milanov, as Floria Tosca; Jussi Bjoerling, as Cavaradossi; Leonard Warren, as Scarpia; and other outstanding artists. Leinsdorf maintains the proper balance between sentimentality and intense dramatic power (RCA Victor).

RICHARD STRAUSS. Domestic Symphony. The Chicago Symphony Orchestra under Fritz Reiner. Reiner, one of the ablest exponents of Strauss's music, presents this autobiographical work in a manner which sets forth all the magic contained in the score (RCA Victor).

FRANZ SCHUBERT. Trout Quintet, for violin, viola, 'cello, double bass, and piano. Played by Szymon Goldberg, William Primrose, Nikolai Graudan, Stuart Stanky, and Victor Babin. The music is enchanting; the performance is completely truthful (RCA Victor).

LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN. Septet in E Flat, Op. 20, for violin, viola, clarinet, horn, bassoon, 'cello, and double bass. A beautiful work beautifully played by the Chamber Music Ensemble of the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra (Decca).

JEAN SIBELIUS. Tapiola, which Ernest Newman has called "one of the greatest works in the whole range of symphonic music": The Swan of Tuonela; Karelia Suite, Op. 11; Bolero (Festive). The Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra under Hans Rosbaud. Praiseworthy performances (Decce).
The method of this book is clear and simple. Our author goes through the Old Testament literature period by period, chooses what he regards as the significant Messianic prophecies in each of these periods, discusses the Rabbinic interpretation of these passages (when that is possible) and points to their use in the New Testament. His concern is to demonstrate that the Old Testament clearly and unmistakably refers to the coming Messiah and that the evangelists and apostles were justified in finding the picture of Christ in its prophecies. There is throughout the book a rather vigorous polemic against both Jewish and critical authors who attempt to see such prophecies only within the framework of the historical situation of the Old Testament period. A secondary interest of this book centers about the defense of the traditional theories about the date and authorship of various books of the Old Testament.

It is no secret that the point of view advocated in this book was under severe attack at the hands of Biblical scholars in the nineteenth century. They maintained that the Old Testament could be understood only against the historical situations out of which it grew. They discovered that the prophets spoke to their own age and were concerned for the most part only with the very near future. The "Messianic prophecies" could be explained as references to figures and events closely related to the life and times of the prophet himself. There was of course an immediate reaction to this critical spirit and many sought to vindicate the traditional view towards the Old Testament and its prophecies. The defenders of the tradition in many cases attempted to use scholarly tools sharpened by their opponents. They failed however to carry the bulk of the scholarly world with them. The gulf created between the two parties meant that neither side could benefit from the insight of the other. The same situation is still to be found in many circles today. But there have been notable attempts to bridge the gulf — to recognize the claims of the literary critic on the one hand and the spiritual insight of the Church on the other. Such an attempt has also been made in connection with the problem of "prophecy and fulfillment." I would suggest that H. H. Rowley, The Unity of the Bible (1953), pp. 90-121, be consulted as an example of the way in which this problem may be worked out. This and many other similar efforts show that the terms "critic" and "Christian" are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

Unfortunately A. J. Kligerman is unaware of all this. His attempts to prove the Messianic character of Old Testament passages result in a very arbitrary and uncritical use of evidence. In the first place, there is no apparent principle which he follows for the selection of Old Testament texts. Some of his selections appear in the New Testament; some do not. The inclusion of the latter may be defended on the ground that the Church has traditionally regarded at least some of them as Messianic. But how then is the exclusion of many other texts used Messianically in the New Testament to be justified? It would appear that those texts were chosen which are favorites of the author or which lend themselves most readily to homiletical treatment. A full and serious discussion of how Paul or Matthew used the Old Testament would have involved the author in a whole series of problems that would have forced him to alter his conclusions. It is symptomatic that he simply bids the reader "compare Matthew 2:15 with Hosea 11:1" (p. 53). Had he honestly compared them himself, noted the original meaning of Hosea 11:1 and the meaning that Matthew 2:15 finds in that passage, he may have seen that in this passage as well as in many others the Evangelist quite possibly had a much broader conception of the relationship between Christ and Israel's history than that assumed in this book.

The Rabbinic material is completely distorted by our author. When he speaks, for example, of Psalm 2, he simply states, "That this psalm is Messianic is proven by Jewish and Christian tradition" (p. 37); he then goes on to discuss the Psalm as he sees it. The impression that is left (not only here, but in many other places) is that the Jews knew well enough about the Messiah, but stupidly or perversely failed to recognize him when he came. Now Psalm 2 is indeed used Messianically by the Rabbis (beginning in about the year 150 A.D. as far as our records go; cf. Strack-Billerbeck I, 6ff.), but a study of their opinions soon shows that these passages in no way go beyond the typical Jewish picture of the Messiah. In the early period (the period of the Tannaim) the Messiah was viewed within purely human categories, usually as a political figure and never as a suffering Messiah. (Only later, in the period of the Amoraim, do we find the picture of the suffering Messiah — possibly under Christian influence.) Yet even within these limits the picture of the Jewish Messiah is extremely diversified. (The documentation for these assertions may be found in the pertinent chapters of the following trustworthy works: J. Klauser, The Messianic Idea in Israel; P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der Juedischen Gemeinde; G. F. Moore, Judaism.) What then can it mean to appeal to Rabbinic evidence for proof of the Messianic character of Old Testament passages? For (a) the Rabbis may also have been wrong in finding a Messiah in the Old Testament and (b) in any event their description of the Messiah may correspond more accurately to the Davideic king to which the Old Testament looked forward.

The unscholarly use of Jewish material is underscored by the author's use of relatively late and undatable Rabbinic pronouncements. He overlooks the apocalyptic works of inter-testamental Judaism and (though this book was published in 1957) does not mention the Dead Sea Scrolls which are full of Messianic expectation.

The most unfortunate thing about this book is that it is filled with a brand of argumentation familiar to us from that type of Biblical learning usually described as fundamentalistic. This argumentation operates on the surface with the discipline of the historical method, but profoundly distorts whatever it lays its hands upon. One example will suffice. In supporting the traditional date for the book of Daniel our author states (as one of his proofs) that "Josephus relates that the prophecies of Daniel were shown to Alexander the Great about 300 B.C. by the high priest Jaddua, and says that the Greek monarch was greatly pleased and encouraged by the prophecy concerning the overthrow of the Persian monarchy, which seemed so clearly to refer to himself" (p. 116). This is supposed to prove that Daniel must have been written 300 B.C. Only one who had not considered seriously the date of Josephus' writing and who had absolutely no idea of Josephus' method of writing history could bring out this passage as any indication of the date of the book of Daniel. Such absurd arguments fill the pages of this book. Unfortunately this sort of thing
sounds just impressive enough to convince the reader who knows nothing about the historical method and cannot recognize the tricks that are being played on him. It is lamentable that such incompetent authors continue to produce books on theology.

WILLIAM R. SCHROEDER

CHRISTIAN ETHICS

By Georgia Harkness (Abingdon, $3.75)

Dr. Georgia Harkness, America's leading lady-theologian, an ordained Methodist minister, and professor at the Pacific School of Religion, has added to "the plethora of books on Christian ethics... because I have not found anything which says just what I think needs to be said."

What needs to be said is neither "moralism" nor "fractionalism"; neither the delineation of the "single-track way to the discovery of the will of God for each concrete decision" nor the proclamation that the Bible no longer gives "dependable guidance for our own time."

"What, then, is Christian ethics? It is the systematic study of the way of life set forth by Jesus Christ (first half of the book), applied to the daily demands and decisions of our personal and social existence" (second half). "Christian ethics centers in the ethical insights of Jesus" (reviewer's italics). Christians are constantly "drawing from his insights," called to an Imitation of Christ, to "have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus."

Such a concern with Jesus, the ethical teacher, says Mr. C. S. Lewis rather sharply in a different context, is "patronising nonsense." In terms of Miss Harkness' own goal, this reviewer would say that she has not said "what needs to be said."

Although she wishes to operate with enlightened loyalty to the Bible ("we cannot take the record as it stands, and we cannot discard it"), she has not presented the problem of Christian ethics as it is seen biblically, and correspondingly has not (in this volume, at least) given the biblical solution.

Two points specifically point up the inadequacy of Miss Harkness' statement of the problem and its solution. One is the complete absence of a demonology. The other is the non-essential role of the church for her understanding of Christian ethics.

For her man's ethical problem is a species of the problem of knowledge—not knowing the highest good nor how to effect it, styling his life in line with insights of secondary and tertiary validity (Stoicism, Utilitarianism, duty ethics) or with such as are completely wrong (self-centered hedonism, the humanistic foundations of many ethics.) The advent of Jesus with his insights of primary validity and 100% truth corrects this sub-par knowledge of the good. Jesus himself, e.g., corrected the ethics of the Old Testament. He "put deeper meaning into the issues involved." In "the ethical teachings of Jesus" lies the solution to man's ethical problem.

But is this the problem at all? Is it not more in tune with biblical witness to say of everyman in every situation of life, ethical or non-ethical, "ye are not your own." You do not operate on the basis of your ethical insights, but your "ethical insights" operate you. Man is not the controller of his ethical action, but the controlled. The problem is not one of insight, but persists in spite of and perhaps even without regard to insight. To paraphrase St. Paul: "I know what is good, I know what is bad; nevertheless, I neglect the good and do the bad. Who will deliver me from such a 'satellite-existence?'" Here a demonology is necessary. For a statement of man's problem which ignores his bondage to the demonic is actually ignoring man's problem.

Because Miss Harkness has no place for the devil, she finds it a "serious omission" on the part of St. Paul that he gave no "theoretical basis" for his assumption "that Christians under grace still sinned." Certain other criticisms she makes of St. Paul also stem from this inadequate understanding of man's problem.

Similarly the author's understanding of the church is primarily notic. The church is "a divinely grounded fellowship" whose "moral insights" are "in agreement with the spirit of Jesus." Although for Miss Harkness St. Paul plays second fiddle to the writers of the Synoptic Gospels, it is only in his writings that the church takes on a much more significant role than that which she allot it. For already in the synoptics the church is not completely defined by describing its members, but rather by pointing up its connection with Him who calls it "my church" and by seeing it in opposition to the "gates of hell." The church seen in such a context is genuinely ecclesia militans. It has enemies who are live enemies; it has a Lord who is a living Lord. Its relation to both of these entities is not determined by "right inner attitudes," but by power mediated by Word and Sacrament from the living Lord for use against the living enemy.

The biblical understanding of the church points toward the solution of the problem of Christian ethics. But it is never satisfied with getting the insights of Jesus into the minds of men. It essays to do much more, viz., get Christ Himself into men. Not satisfied with information, it strives for incarnation, for repeated, continual incarnation—"Christ in you."

Given the choice to travel with the "insights" of Duncan Hines, i.e., his recommended lists, or with Mr. Hines himself, what'll you have?

EDWARD SCHROEDER

THE PSALMS FOR TODAY

By Thomas Coates (Concordia, $2.00)

In our world of outer distractions and inner distress men crave that which will collect and regroup the scattered forces of their inner life. This book of meditations provides the reader with just such guidance—words that draw him into communication with God and that help him receive the faith and life of which God is the source.

The book consists of 58 devotional meditations on selected passages from the Psalms. The major part of these brief meditations treat general topics, such as "Keeping God in First Place," "The Skipping Hills," "No More War," "A Bottle of Tears;" and the last eleven focus on festivals the Church honors. Each meditation situates man in his hopes and fears, joys and pains, disappointments, loneliness, and despair. Illuminating all these surface symptoms of our human predicament through the incisive perception of the psalmist, Dr. Coates leads the reader to confront God in them. And it is ever anew He extends the forgiveness of His Son to the man who recognizes his plight. The trembling perception of the psalmist is at the same time one of vibrant trust. And each meditation guides the reader unerringly to the source of such trust—the cross of Christ whose Spirit inspires the trembling but vibrant faith and life of the entire psalter.

Here is devotional writing with serenity and strength. As the fitting foreword by Dr. Richard R. Caemmerrer points out, leading the reader honestly to confront God, The Psalms for Today avoids the sentimentalism which enervates so much of devotional literature. Yet it is Biblical in the highest sense of the word: clean exegesis, clearly rooted in the message of the Cross. The warmth of word and phrase reveals the craftsmanship and concern of the author. It is a joy to think through each meditation, whose language is simple and precise, always maintaining its ancillary function of helping the reader to confront God.

Thus this reader eagerly recommends this little volume to all who feel a need for renewal, strength, comfort, growth in the inner man—and who today does not?

HANS SPALTENHOLZ

A NATURALIST IN PALESTINE

By Victor Howells (Philosophical Library, $6.00)

This is an interesting account of modern Palestine (before the mandate divided it into two countries) from the point of view of a naturalist. The author's observations on the flora and fauna of that country are strong together by an account of a journey extending from the Gaza strip in the south to Haifa and the Sea of Galilee in the north. The customs and folklore of
the Bedouins among whom the author and his companions moved are also described. The story is told in about 180 pages and the text is accompanied by thirteen drawings, twenty-nine photographs and one map (all in black and white).

The title of this book may suggest that it has something to do with the Bible. That is not so. Our author has no historical concern and apparently no interest in illuminating the Biblical account. Nor is the author's interest purely scientific. He seeks rather to write a popular account which will hold the interest of the layman. This he does with great success.

**WILLIAM R. SCHOEDEL**

**SERMONS ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN**

By F. L. Neebe (Published by the Author, $3.00)

**HEICHER FILING SYSTEM**

By M. K. W. Heicher (Baker Book House, $2.00)

These are two books of importance especially to our ministerial readers, but also of interest to church workers and active church members.

The first is a paper bound book of sermons on the precious Fourth Gospel, with a Preface by T. A. Weinhold, President of the Western District of The Lutheran Church -- Missouri Synod. The sermons were preached over a period of six months to the Town-and-Gown Trinity Congregation at Columbia, Missouri.

Most sermons treat an entire chapter. A few take half a chapter as the text. It does not seem that the sermons were fitted into the Christian Year. But some are intended for certain church festivals or seasons. Chapters 18 and 19 are divided into seven parts for a series of Lenten and Holy Week sermons.

As Pastor Weinhold says in the Preface, the preacher "has employed a style and diction that would arrest attention, without sacrificing anything from the old, but great fundamental truths of the Gospel." Professors and students from a university and two local colleges were no doubt employed a style and function of; motifs discussed in; and creative freedom, and tradition.

The second book of about one hundred pages is written by the Editor of Doran's Ministers Manual. It is intended especially for "Ministers, Missionaries, Church School Teachers and other Church Workers."

Mr. Heicher gives instructions in indexing and filing material which one wants to keep and find when needed on future occasions. He suggests almost a thousand topic heads under which quotations, references, clippings, illustrations, etc. may be filed for future reference. These are given in two lists, one alphabetical, the other numerical and topical. A third table suggests a Record of Sermons and Addresses.

All who do preaching, writing and delivering addresses and talks on many occasions know how elusive items are which one has read or heard, and which one wishes to use at a given time.

Those who want to become systematic in their work or to improve their system will find much that will guide them in this laudable endeavor. This should help diminish the number of sermons preached and addresses delivered which are in the main abstract dissertations with nary an illustration.

**CARL ALBERT GIESELER**

**SPIRITUAL PROBLEMS IN CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE**

Edited by Stanley Romaine Hopper (Harper Torchbook No. 21, $1.50)

Based essentially on lectures given at The Institute for Social and Religious Studies of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America during 1948-50, this collection of 18 essays might appear to be "slanted" or one-sided. Happily, instead, they are the fruit of a significant cooperation of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant scholars. Notable contributors are David Daiches, Irwin Edman, Theodore Spencer, Horace Gregory, Cleanth Brooks, and Kenneth Burke. Concise yet critical biographical sketches are given for all authors included.

A triple division forms the outline of this paperback edition ("57" of the 1952 anthology: part 1) Religion and the Artist's Situation; 2) Religion and the Artist's Means; 3) Religion and the Artist's Beliefs. The dilemma of possible complexity is rather well solved by means of an effective because thoroughly analytical index. E.g. under "Criticism" the following subtopics are listed with page references: Catholic; esthetic vs. scientific; metaphor, and function of; motifs discussed in; and myth; New Critics; religion, science, and; creative freedom, and tradition.

The very nature of the subject discussed is responsible for some of the big words used glibly throughout, namely technical jargon like theodicy, existentialism, and mutations; but some of the sweeping generalizations unfortunately imply easily without proof or documentation. However, the clarification of modern man's literary search for a soul, for enduring comradeship, for inner peace and a place in the cosmos, is herein achieved better than in any comparable, ambitious, inexpensive volume.

**GENERAL**

**THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE**

By George P. Schmidt (Rutgers University Press, $6.00)

This volume is a survey of the rise and growth of the liberal arts college in America. It is a story of change. Colleges today are something far different from the first American college brought forth in the wilderness in 1636 and the liberal arts themselves have undergone marked transformations: certain disciplines have sunk to near oblivion; others, once regarded as upstarts unworthy of academic notice, are now entrenched under a thick coat of moss and ivy resisting the encroachment of still newer kinds of knowledge.

To survey in a single volume a development embracing over three hundred years and more than a thousand colleges and to relate that development to broad cultural movements in our history is a task particularly vulnerable to criticism. There are bound to be omissions. Not all of the important institutions can even be mentioned, and the reader with a special interest, say, in the reform movements of the second quarter of the 19th century or the growth of fraternities or intercollegiate athletics may wish for additional treatment of these areas at the expense of something else. Some pages early in the book seem overly crammed with encyclopedic detail, and in some sections the illustrative examples crowd out important ideas.

But Professor Schmidt has not been unaware of the obvious dangers inherent in his survey. On the whole he has trimmed and controlled his diverse materials to illustrate broad general tendencies in higher education. He has not become bogged down in that curse of academicians these days — the infinite definition — and he has avoided the easy condescension toward our institutional ancestors — the feeling we get when we look at old yearbooks though his account is often enriched with humor.

The book ends with chapters on the liberal arts college today and on academic freedom. After summarizing the attacks from all quarters on the college, Professor Schmidt finds it in a healthier state today than in the 19th century, a part of its vitality being expressed in its restless experimentation in organization and content. Toward the end of his survey, with considerable diffidence, he sets down the meaning of a liberal education and con-
fesses its inadequacy by saying the whole conception is necessarily vague:
A liberal education means knowledge; verified and dependable information about the world of nature and its processes, and about human society both in its historic origins and in its ever-changing contemporary forms. It means training and abilities: to use one's own language effectively and one or more foreign languages adequately; to think critically — itself a cosmos of more specific skills; to judge intelligently among alternatives; to participate helpfully in social situations. It means appreciation of people; of the moral and spiritual quality of actions; of human imagination whether displayed in painting or music, in poetry or drama, or in mathematics, astronomy, or physics.

The future of the liberal arts college, he believes, is dependent upon open avenues to truth. The threat is not only the external one against the right to investigate controversial issues, but an internal resistance within institutions to new methods and questions according to the different kinds of evidence appropriate to each. Although this gives no new knowledge, it purportedly gives a new viewpoint leading to understanding and can elucidate and unify overall views within the bounds of meaningful experience. Although in clarifying beliefs it is limited in effects to occasional fragmentary glimpses of light, this at least keeps minds free of nonsense — something very valuable which only this kind of philosophy can give. Thus, it can distinguish an instrumental good as a means, which can be checked by factual evidence, from good as an end or supreme value judgment. How to justify judgments about supreme values, however, is regarded as an unsolved problem.

Pedagogical aspects of education are dealt with lightly, for these are questions of facts and techniques which can be verified empirically. Instead, the author concentrates on the educational questions of aims, values, and theories which are essentially philosophical. For facts, evidence, and patterns of explanation education must look to the social sciences. Because the latter are still not fully developed, educational theories are of three kinds: un demonstrable metaphysical statements, value judgments that are not self-evidently true, and empirical statements drawn from successful practical experience and insight in education. There is a wide gap between educational "theories" (which is merely a courtesy title) and the facts on which they rest. Nevertheless, all such "theories" have great influence on education.

The claims that religion can tell us the purpose of man and existence and that there is a connection between religion and morality are few who will rest content with these claims. Philosophical analysis, like prompting minds of philosophical analysts. But as a simple introduction to philosophical analysis it has much to commend it, especially if readers possess a broad and deep background with which to profit from its astute ness without losing perspective and balanced judgment. Few philosophies or philosophical methods hold the center stage for long. This is not the first to make such apparently modest but actually sweeping claims. Philosophical analysis, like prompts in a play, may usefully give cues and warn when dialogue is garbled, but there are few who will rest content with these alone. Man's questions, insights, convictions, need for peace of mind and soul, and the quest for certitude and a world-view which give purpose and meaning to life and to education persist.
TIBERIUS

By Gregorio Maranon (Duell, Sloan and Pearce, $3.75)

Tiberius, the second emperor of Rome, whose reign extended from A. D. 14 to 37, was a tall, intelligent man of strong physique. He was also a person of culture, a splendid military leader, and an efficient and conscientious administrator. But his principate was marred by more than one hundred recorded cases of prosecution for treason, and it is mainly upon these trials that the numerous characterizations of the emperor and his rule have been based.

The degree of Tiberius’ responsibility for the prosecutions and their many resulting executions is extremely difficult to fix. In the first place we are not able to determine with absolute certainty whether those convicted were severally guilty or not. However they were all men of high position, for the most part of senatorial rank, and some of them may have conspired against the emperor in an aim to restore the republic. Furthermore the great majority of the trials occurred either during the period of the powerful influence wielded over Tiberius by his praetorian prefect Sejanus (who was notwithstanding also ultimately executed for plotting to overthrow the prince and seize control of the government himself), or during the last years of Tiberius’ rule, which he passed in isolation on the lonely island of Capri, now virtually bereft of his mental faculties. Thus one may argue that it was very likely Sejanus who was directly responsible for whatever crimes were committed in the time of his ascendency, and that for any later criminal acts a sithile emperor who governed Rome by correspondence and with a mind almost unbalanced can hardly be held accountable. Still if Tiberius did not actually order any unjust executions while under the control of Sejanus, he surely must have known of their occurrence and for not prohibiting them must at the minimum assume a large share of the awful guilt that would be attached to these crimes.

Dr. Maranon, who is a psychologist as well as physician, has however adopted an inflexible position and flatly charges Tiberius with all political crimes committed during his reign, no matter in which years. His thesis is that through his inability to rise magnanimously above humiliations suffered at the hands of the imperial family before his principate in connection with his marital and domestic life and his selection by default as successor to his adoptive father, the emperor Augustus, Tiberius became a morbid misanthropist, and that upon his accession to the throne he gave vent to his deep-seated, smoldering resentment by resorting in sadistic fashion to the cruelties of despotism.

In the development of his highly interesting case the author argues with much cogency and skill, marshaling before us all the resources at his command, historical documents as well as his professional knowledge of the human mind and body. And in his often minutely detailed psychoanalysis of Tiberius, though the attempted reconstruction of the latter’s strictly private life must always remain purely speculative, Dr. Maranon has also come forward with an original and valuable approach for the study of his subject’s puzzling character. Yet there are two restricting factors that weigh against his condemnation of this Roman emperor. Despite the bitter experiences of his earlier years it does not follow, as Dr. Maranon would have us believe, that Tiberius was psychologically bound to grow into a resentful tyrant; in point of fact none other than the historian Tacitus himself, the hostile critic of Tiberius, suggests that the emperor displayed no vindictiveness or cruelty (Annals 3.51). Secondly, of the most ancient extant accounts of him, though not one is impartial or consistent, Dr. Maranon brushes aside as untrustworthy the favorable report of Velleius Paterculus, a contemporary of the emperor, and derives his greatest support from the later biographer Suetonius, a scandalmonger whose estimates of the Roman emperors are notoriously unfair, and from the brilliant but prejudiced and pessimistic Tacitus, who as leadator temporis acti constantly betray his republican sentiments, sees little good in the empire that was destined to endure for more than five hundred years, and after the assassination in A. D. 96 of the emperor Domitian, under whom he lived, may well appear too ready to attribute the misdeeds of this tyrant to Tiberius as prototype.

Audiatur et altera pars. Unfortunately the personal memoirs of Tiberius are lost to us, so that we are unable to give him the hearing at the bar of justice to which he is entitled. In view of the incompleteness and conflicting nature of our evidence, therefore, it would seem wiser to continue to hold final judgment in abeyance and not to assume an odium Tiberii, but rather to grant this tragic, enigmatic man the benefit of every reasonable doubt.

EDGAR C. REINKE

LABOR UNION MONOPOLY
A Clear and Present Danger

By Donald R. Richberg (Regnery, $3.50)

The author, an active and leading labor lawyer of many years’ standing, is endeavoring to spell out the dangers of the all-too-rapid rise to power of the labor unions and their leaders. His arguments result in real conviction when the reader realizes that here is a man who has been on the "inside" of the development for several decades.

For readers interested in this compendium of factors contributing to the virtually un-restrained growth of union economic and political strength, the book will prove valuable one-sitting reading.

Unions find their refuge for unretarded expansion in a rather obscure proviso of the Clayton (Anti-Trust) Act of 1914 which renders them immune to the antimonopoly laws. This assumes, of course, the unions are carrying out their "lawful" and "legitimate objects."

Growth of union power, asserts the author, was furthered by conditions within and without the labor organizations. From within came high-powered organizers with Napoleonic instincts; from without came sympathetic political parties (both), government executives, legislators, and judiciaries.

Part of Mr. Richberg’s solution insists on going back to the Clayton Act for rewrite. This can be done by careful legislative definitions of the "legitimate objects" of union activity. Such definitive statements should cover the conditions which now permit undue promotion of union growth and influence, i.e., forceful organizational methods, monopolistic controls over industry, limitation of competition in commerce, and union membership requirement in order to work. None of these new definitions should conflict with any existing law which attempts to maintain peace and order in a community or state.

That such words will clarify the meaning of the 43-year-old provision in the Clayton Act is not to be doubted, but whether such legislative prose proves effective to stem the rather perceptible tide of the growth of union influence will have to await the test of time, many new laws, board rulings, and court decisions.

The author’s real solution lies in educating “the so-called intellectual stratum of American life to a clear-eyed comprehension of the grave menace to our free economy and our free government in the unchecked growth and continuous spread of labor union monopolies.” Herein, it seems, the author has hit the nail on the head, provided he carries the appropriate union card.

RICHARD LAUBE

A PROPHET IN HIS OWN COUNTRY
By Kenneth S. Davis (Doubleday, $5.00)

Again last month attention was drawn to Adlai E. Stevenson’s influence in our country when he was invited to join the State Department in representing the United States at NATO meetings. In his Prophet In His Own Country, Mr. Davis has written of a great man. Aside from his political interests, aspirations and influences, Adlai Stevenson will be remembered in history. The author has successfully shown the qualities of patriotism, sincerity, loyalty and vision along with an almost mythical quality which places the Demo—
cratic party standard-bearer a little beyond normal categorization and criticism.

There is no question but that Mr. Davis has a tremendous respect for his subject. His admiration does not restrain him from presenting Mr. Stevenson objectively and humanly. Certainly the biographer feels that few influences in the life of Stevenson were unimportant and he therefore used great care in presenting completely the political, social, and genealogical background of the Stevenson family. Surprisingly this background is presented in a style far from tedious.

The boyhood of the ex-governor was fertile with influences which shape the man as he is today. The family was closely knit, his sister Buffie always his confidante and friend. From his mother he learned sensitivity in dealing with those around him and a strong respect for financial matters. His father willed him a love for politics and the Democratic party and a high sense of principle in any issue. All of these family influences together with educational experiences and associations are woven into a total personality. The author does not neglect the experiences which the young Stevenson gains as a page in Democratic national conventions and as an inquisitive world traveler.

In spite of the cramming of factual material, names, meetings, dates and the like which are included in this biography, the writer builds up a suspense and unfolds his story in a most interesting narrative pattern.

Mr. Davis does not spend many pages in the discussion of Stevenson as a father but does treat the matter of his marriage, resulting unhappiness, and divorce with an understanding delicacy.

For any student of the operation for the nominating conventions, political bosses, political appointments and administrative pressures, the description of Stevenson's quest for and years as governor of Illinois will prove engrossing.

The climax of the story comes in the Stevenson draft, nomination, campaign and eventual defeat in the race for the presidency. No American could fail to excite over the "inside" story of a fellow-American's realization that he was being considered for the highest office in the country, in his tremendous decisions, his fears of inadequacy, his hopes and resultant disappointment. The story of the years between and the second presidential campaign are less provocative.

Notable is the analogy which Mr. Davis successfully makes to the story of Abraham Lincoln and the influence which this apparent similarity exerts on Stevenson.

In the closing chapters, the author attempts a comparison of the personalities, vision, background and intellectual abilities of Stevenson and Eisenhower. With the knowledge that our author penned Soldier of Democracy, A Biography of Dwight Eisenhower, your reviewer looked forward to these chapters with great anticipation. This section of the book was a great disappointment in its ungenerous treatment of our president. With the superlatives heaped on Stevenson your reviewer felt that Mr. Davis could have been considerably more charitable toward Eisenhower.

A biography of this type has much to offer. It appeals as a study in government, history, sociology, politics and current affairs. When, as in the case of A Prophet In His Own Country, these are coupled with a well written and well organized narrative, they demand reading.

JOSEPHINE L. FERGUSON

THE TRAGIC PHILOSOPHER

By F. A. Lea (Philosophical Library)

The Tragic Philosopher is a biographical, genetic study of the life and thought of the German philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche. The author, by tracing Nietzsche's philosophy through its various phases, attempts to demonstrate that the obvious contradictions in his thought were due to its dialectic nature. In demonstrating this, Mr. Lea indicates and evaluates various influences upon Nietzsche's philosophy such as his own life, the philosopher Schopenhauer, and the composer Wagner.

Of interest is the fact that the author points up the relationship of Nietzsche's unpopular political views to the remainder of his perspective. Mr. Lea concludes that his political stand was a parasite which mitigated the influence of the preponderance of the philosopher's thought.

Mr. Lea asserts that the mainspring of Nietzsche's thought was his revolt against God. His atheism issued in the hopeless contradictions which form the chief criticism of Nietzsche's perspective.

Nietzsche's attack on Christianity was threefold. It was his notion that: 1. the Christian interpretation of the world is incompatible with that of modern science; 2. if science is right, then Christianity is wrong; and 3. the only absolute truth is that absolute truth is unattainable. Mr. Lea is of the opinion that although Nietzsche did not establish the incompatibility of Christianity with modern science, he did point out the relative truthfulness of Christianity. On the basis of Nietzsche's establishment of Christianity's truthfulness the author concludes that Nietzsche lifted himself above the entire process of life and religion and attained absolute truth.

One of Nietzsche's chief errors was his misinterpretation of Jesus. Viewing Christ, as well as St. Paul, St. Augustine, and Luther, as gnostic dualists, he regarded them as the vanguard of those who condemn and negate freedom and life as it is naturally, whereas, in Mr. Lea's opinion, Christ et al. affirmed freedom and natural existence.

The author describes Nietzsche as a tragic figure because he did not retain the truth at which he had arrived: namely, that one must go beyond the dualistic conception of good and evil to a standpoint which affirms life as it is and wills that such life would eternally recur. This standpoint Mr. Lea equates with that of Christianity. Nietzsche, rather than retaining his view of world-affirmation, concluded his thought on a note of world-negation.

The author criticizing an egotistical, naturalistic perspective from one equally so, doesn't realize that such a view as Nietzsche's necessarily ends in tragedy. Criticizing Nietzsche for stumbling on the person of Christ, he makes the same error himself. And so both Nietzsche's philosophy as well as the author's attempt to revaluate it ultimately end in tragedy.

HILLMAN FISCHER

ENGLISH HISTORIANS

Selected Passages compiled by Bertram Newman (Oxford Univ. Press, $4.25)

This book consists of 66 brief passages on a variety of subjects ranging from Roman Briton to Churchill's recollection of December 7, 1941. The historians represented cover four centuries from Elizabeth Tudor to Elizabeth of Windsor. Each is self-contained, and is designed to be typical of the man's work and of interest to the general reader rather than to the specialist in the field. Since it is undoubtedly true that English historical writing has always been good literature (whereas the main body of American historical scholarship is most assuredly not) there is distinct pleasure to be gained here for those who enjoy beauty of language and adroit phrasing quite apart from the factual information provided. Clio is still a Muse, and not a Univac statistician.

I must confess a certain prejudice against pre-digested material "for the general public." It seems to me that readers already acquainted with the authors (Raleigh and Bacon, Hume, Gibbon, Carlyle, and Macaulay, Froude, Freeman, Stubbs, Acton, et al.) are the ones who can best appreciate this kind of sampling; yet precisely because of their prior knowledge will find somewhat unsatisfactory the tidbits offered. I realize that all anthology-makers and source book editors face similar problems, and whether fewer selections coupled with more extensive introductions would have been better is difficult to say. Those who take time to savor these classic gems will not regret the experience, I am sure.

WILLIS D. BOYD
By Julian Green (Pantheon, $3.50)

In spite of the fact that the author of this novel is a man of American parentage, the work, written and originally published in the French language, is as French as a dish of snails. It is also as little likely as is the aforementioned dish to meet with joyous acclaim by many persons of Anglo-Saxon heritage. (Even a dash of Huguenot blood doesn't help a bit.) On the other hand, it might well be considered delicious fare by the gastronome of literature.

Jean, a poverty-stricken middle-aged man of mysterious habits, is allowed to live in a small, shabby room in the comfortable establishment of the Vasseurs, his wealthy cousins. The same household affords refuge to the orphaned Hedwige. This young woman has the misfortune to fall violently in love with a man introduced to her by Ulrique, married daughter of the Vasseurs, who is, like many other characters in the book, a fit subject for psychiatric study.

Hedwige cannot understand why Gaston remains completely indifferent to her very existence. She cannot understand, nor does she care, why Jean despairingly confesses to her that he is guilty of some heinous, although unspecified, crime, and that this crime is indirectly the cause of all Hedwige's suffering. Jean's sense of guilt becomes increasingly heavy, forcing him first to exile, then to suicide. Hedwige is no more than mildly interested in these events. Her whole being is saturated with the sufferings of unrequited love. Eventually she learns what the other characters have known all along: Jean's guilty misery and Gaston's complacent contempt for all women are the two sides of the same base coin, a homosexual relationship. In an access of emotional agony, Hedwige, too, commits suicide.

By handling this potentially sensational material with clinical detachment, the author achieves his goal: he presents, within the framework of the novel, a detailed intellectual study of emotional anguish. In so doing, Mr. Green shows admirable understanding of his subject. He also possesses considerable merit as a stylist, although occasionally restraint is carried to the point of obfuscation. It is possible that some of this obscurity is caused by difficulties in translation. One gains the impression that the translator, Anne Green, apparently not one of those extremely rare individuals who are truly bilingual, is a little more familiar with the French, than with the English, language. In several instances, the generally excellent English lapses into phrases whose meaning is puzzling, although they are composed of words undeniably English.

In character delineation, the author is extremely successful with a number of minor characters (one of them a dressmaker's dummy!) He is less so with his protagonist, the "transgressor" of the title, for Jean never achieves real life stature. His tortured remorse and his death cannot therefore be for the reader the tragic incidents evidently intended by the author. Moreover, his role in the book seems overshadowed by that of Hedwige. In her, we have the distressing spectacle afforded by complete abandonment to suffering, unmodified by spiritual or mental resources, for she possesses none; nor does she show even a trace of the fortitude or dignity frequently displayed by lower members of the animal kingdom. By the time she has blubbered her way to the final page, the spontaneous sympathy initially granted her has given way to impatience. The shot which ends her life comes not a moment too soon.

Dorinda Knopp
For several years there has been some talk back and forth about the American educational system.

The topics at issue have ranged from little Johnny’s reading habits to big Johnny’s antics at the university, from subsidized athletics to federal aid to education, and from the role of public education to the merits of parochial education. A large part of the discussion was not very complimentary to the persons in charge of education.

The millions of words, good and bad, can be mobilized under a few basic questions. 1) Are American educators teaching the skills of reading, writing, figuring, and thinking? II) Have our teachers inspired our youngsters to learn, to reflect, and contemplate? III) Have we tried to give all our children, regardless of talents, the same kind of education — just to be true to the tenets of universal democracy? IV) Have educators hesitated to give failing grades because F’s will injure the personalities of young people? V) Is, in fact, more time being spent to develop personality and the quest for social approval than is being spent to give information, achieve knowledge, and to create the potential for wisdom?

Regardless of how the readers answer these basic questions, perhaps the most serious charge in the face of the prevalent claim of American educators to be teaching good attitudes at least is this: 1) our youngsters do not want to learn; 2) education is important to our “kids” so long as it helps them to get on with the business of making money; 3) as a result, very little time is spent in developing an intellectual posture; and 4) to sum it up rather drastically, a lot of persons want Ph. D’s but not an education. Or: a lot of schools give diplomas, but how many an education?

Among those who have made fun of present educational methods, it has been fashionable to lay most of the blame at the feet of the persons who populate departments and schools of education, teachers colleges, and boards of education. It seems to me that, if the charges above have any basis at all, a lot of the people associated with these agencies should come in for their fair share of the blame. To be very sure, some of the persons in my own experience who teach educational philosophy, psychology, and methods or whatever are none too creative, imaginative, and dynamic.

But let him who has no sin be the first to cast the stone! What about the rest of us, especially those of us who teach the social sciences? It is becoming evident that teaching social scientists are often sloppy, imprecise, casually pedagogical, moralizing, and anything but dynamic.

This columnist contends that we all, perhaps in a slight burst of social irresponsibility, have fallen victim to some strong and long-range cultural trends. Chief among these, it seems easy to list the American penchant for anti-intellectualism. Dr. Harold C. Urey, a famous scientist and winner of a Nobel Prize, betrays the bitter disillusionment of post-atomic energy beginnings: “It seems to me that the population of this country has a considerable predilection for trusting essentially stupid people and mis-trusting those who are brilliant.”

Even in the field of education per se (education in the non-professional sense), the accent is on waiting tables. College professors and presidents, deans and heads of departments, as well as elementary and secondary educators have been forced to succumb to the pressures of our days — to become mongrel combinations of a little education, public relations “know-how”, itinerant mendicancy, and business administration and/or manipulation. We all have to a great degree lost our positions as society’s critics and professional censors, its intellectual monitors.

Why? It’s hard to tell! Yet it appears that many people want us as educators to wet-nurse their youngsters, to spoon-feed them, to help them gain approval of their peers. Teachers, short on courage and long on the desire to feed their wives and children, have been willing to “milk-toast” themselves along the way of life’s quiet desperations.

In accord with such inclinations, teachers and educational institutions have spent much time developing young people adjusted to the pursuit of approval, preserving young egos against the realities of “hard-nosed” discipline, and perpetuating the self-deception that these guys and dolls should get an education because they are such darlings — even if they do not have the spirit of a Plato, an Aristotle, or of an Einstein.
TV: Treasure Chest or Idiot Box?

By ANNE HANSEN

The fabulous infant industry which we call television is just ten years old. Newspapers, magazines, and TV producers have made much of the anniversary. The December issue of Cosmopolitan featured a special television section devoted exclusively to a review and evaluation of the brief but spectacular history of this amazing new entertainment medium. Statistics show that in 1947 only 12,000 telecasts were in operation in the United States. Today the number has grown to 44,000,000, and there are still 9,000,000 families who do not have a TV set.

A thought-provoking article by Maurice Zolotow—titled “Treasure Chest or Idiot Box?”—should be read by everyone interested in the future of TV. Young as it is, the fabulous infant has already passed through many phases and stages of growth—and of decline. Mr. Zolotow discusses at length the early years, when ingenious new techniques, contagious enthusiasm, a fresh approach, and a sincere effort to achieve artistry made a TV set a real “treasure chest.” It seems strange to ascribe a “golden age” to so young an art form. An yet Mr. Zolotow declares that the outstanding achievements of the period from 1950 through 1954 must be regarded as the golden age of TV. This is not only a devastating commentary; it is a serious indictment as well.

Today, Mr. Zolotow says with regret, too much of the spark, ingenuity, and genuine talent of the early years has been lost because networks and sponsors have become slaves to what he calls “the ratings disease.” He points out that many fine programs have vanished from the air waves because ratings compiled by the Nelson Company, Trendex, the American Bureau, or Pulse have indicated lack of interest on the part of viewers. However, many players and producers are inclined to doubt the value and the reliability of these ratings. Mr. Zolotow quotes the opinions of prominent stars, producers, and TV executives—all outspoken in their condemnation of the ratings system and the unhappy effect it has had on the industry.

Other voices have been raised against the apathy and creeping mediocrity which may reduce TV to the stature of the idiot box. In his new column, The Air, which appears in The New Yorker, John Lardner points out the obvious shortcomings of much of the fare offered to TV viewers. John Crosby, one of the most widely read of the TV critics, has often emphasized the danger inherent in the current trend toward standardization and imitation in TV programming.

And we have the views of the critics who appeared on Wide, Wide World when a special program, The Fabulous Infant, was presented to commemorate the end of the first decade of television. At this time Harriet Van Horn, of the New York World Telegram, declared that there is too much violence, too much vulgarity on TV, and that there are too many bad films. She expressed a wish for more “live” programs and a greater attention to music and art. Hal Humphrey, of the Los Angeles Mirror-News, charged that TV productions are far too costly, that sponsors mistakenly believe that every program must be designed to please everyone, and that “too many shows, notably the westerns, have barnacles on their bottoms.”

In an interview with Mike Wallace, Bennett Cerf, well-known publisher, lecturer, and author, deplored the current overemphasis on the western, or horse opera. Do you realize that at present there are nineteen westerns on TV? Mr. Cerf pointed out that Sunday afternoon, a time considered least desirable by sponsors—has become the “ghetto of intellectual shows.” He is right. Many of the finest productions are crammed into this short period—often competing with one another, thus making it impossible for interested viewers to see all that is offered.

What is your reaction? Do you regard the TV set in your home as a treasure chest? Or is it in truth an idiot box? The future of TV actually is in the hands of the viewer. In a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post Stanley Frank concludes a searching examination of current trends with admonition that programs will improve only if and when the public demands and supports better programs. He warns that if vapid and undistinguished shows continue to glut the air waves, we must place the blame where it belongs—on ourselves. So which is it to be? Treasure chest or idiot box? Despite the phenomenal growth of TV radio is by no means obsolete. Each year many thousands of new radios are sold. It has been reported that college students listen to radio in preference to viewing TV programs. Radio still makes available many fine musical programs. One of the outstanding ventures is that undertaken by WNYC, a station owned by the city of New York. Since WNYC devotes its time exclusively to educational and cultural programs, John Crosby has called it “the eggheads’ last stronghold.” The term “egghead” no longer carries the sting it once did. Suddenly we feel a need for “eggheads.” WYNC should prosper and flourish.
Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor:

The purpose of this letter is to comment upon Clemence Sabourin’s book, *Let the Righteous Speak*, of which a review by Andrew Schulze appeared in the *Cresset* for the month of September. Aghast at the review, this reader postponed comment until a careful study of the book had been made.

Perhaps it would be well to say first that Mr. Schulze’s review is technically incorrect, although he has caught the spirit of the book, in insistence upon the continual terror of physical violence experienced by the Sabourin family during their trip through several Southern states two years ago. At no time during that trip did they encounter a situation, or undergo an experience, which offered them the remotest threat of physical violence. A search of the book reveals this one mention of such fear: “In Mississippi we wanted to keep going. I don’t know why we were afraid.” Next paragraph: “When we analyzed the facts, we felt that our fears were groundless.” (p. 22)

Pastor Sabourin comments upon the increased intermingling of Negroes and whites which has taken place in the South during the ten years of his absence. He remarks many occasions of helpfulness, of courtesies freely granted his family by white Southerners (ameliorating incidents overlooked by Mr. Schulze). The actual extent of the injustices suffered by the Sabourins on this trip is as follows:

They were denied admittance to the former home of the late Joel Chandler Harris, in Atlanta.
They endured the customary segregation in churches, lodgings, eating places, playgrounds, including beaches, and public conveyances.
They were caused discomfort by the scarcity, and often inadequacy, of tourist accommodations for Negroes.

This list of grievances is not responsible for the impression of imminent danger, of potential violence, of continual humiliation, with which the book leaves the casual reader. This impression is achieved by a rehashing of old outrages, an anticipatory narration of those yet to come, a retelling of hearsay incidents — all charged with an emotional content which becomes increasingly pervasive and intense as the book progresses. The unmistakable inference is that all these outrages are a result of segregation laws, that they could have happened only in the South, and that violence against Negroes is typical of the white Southerner. None of these is correct.

The Southern states have no laws which permit criminal acts against Negroes. Violence in racial matters bears the same relation to segregation laws as violence in labor disputes does to labor legislation. In both cases, violence is completely extra-legal. The average white Southerner does not engage in, nor condone, violence any more than does the average member of a labor union, nor, for that matter, any more than does the average individual in any of the Northern cities which have been the scenes of damaging race riots.

Both the incidence of crime, and the violent nature of that crime, in the Chicago area as reported daily in the news, are truly appalling. Does anyone seriously advance the theory that the average Chicago citizen is a criminal? Yet, in this book, the reader is led to believe that the white Southerner who is not enthusiastic about integration possesses no attributes either decent or honest; and that every attitude or action he takes in relation to the Negro is based on a motive invariably evil, even though on the surface it may appear quite innocent. This thesis is never stated explicitly by the author, but the implication is obvious throughout the book. It is greatly at variance with truth and justice.

It is regrettable that the haze of emotionalism through which the author views his subject prevents him from giving much evidence of the reason and the Christian charity which are so desperately needed from all concerned in racial differences in the effort to arrive at solutions in accord with justice and amity. Any book written by a “white supremacist,” employing the tone and the techniques of the one here discussed, would be rightly denounced by Pastor Sabourin’s admirers as hopelessly biased and intellectually dishonest. One is therefore faced with the dismaying conclusion that prejudice against the Negro is vicious, but prejudice in his favor is virtuous. Is not this concept the very essence of prejudice?

The case against segregation should be able to stand on its own merits. It is anything but strengthened by the use of such tactics.

Dorinda H. Knopp
Valparaiso, Indiana
Call Home the Heart

Surely now at year's end the Pilgrim's motto is illumined by the universal momentary awareness of the passing of time. . . . Pilgrims we are, members of a pilgrim people, whom God gives marks along the way beside which we may take pause for a moment and reflect. . . . Such a milestone in our journey is New Year's Eve 1957. . . . Tonight we know again that man is always a traveler and the winding road is ever a symbol of his life. . . . Though year beyond year towers dark a voice from long ago sounds clear and true: "Strangers and pilgrims" - "we have no continuing city." . . . The strong men and women in the world are those whose life is a continuous New Year's Eve - men and women in whom the sense of being pilgrims and strangers in the earth is most vivid. . . . Theirs is the God-given power to see the temporal in its true setting of the timeless. . . . They alone do not become citizens of this world, and they alone know that they must work while it is day, ere the night cometh when no man can work. . . . For them alone life is the tentative trumpet which finds its last meaning only in the matin choir on the other side. . . .

Now at year's end we inquire again concerning our needs for the way which lies before. . . . It is the ultimate wisdom to know that the things we actually need are very few - but they are very great. . . . "Now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three." . . . Without them we have no glorious past, no blessed memory, no sure future, and no-eternal destiny. . . . Perhaps it is the tenderness of God that places Christmas and year's end so near to each other. . . . We go into the hidden year in the light of the serried ranks of angelic choirs singing of hope and forgiveness and joy. . . . It may be a heavy world tonight - black, outworn, and hopeless - but the flaming ways of God are as near and clear as they were on that first Holy Night. . . . The angels did not go away forever. . . . We walk with them unawares, and a pierced Hand lies in ours. . . . Theirs, ours, and His is the great companionship of solitude and the warm voice of silence. . . .

With Him life can never become too tame or too terrifying. . . . He brings courage and adventure, and takes away the fear of the secret years. . . . When men say that the future is uncertain they forget that there are more futures than one, and some are very certain.

. . . One of whose coming we can be sure is the end of our pilgrimage — ten, or thirty, or fifty years away. . . . God's grace will be strong then and the end will be like the lighting of a candle in a holy place. . . . Nothing uncertain and fearsome there. . . . There is another future which also holds no fear. . . . That is today and some of tomorrow — the steps which lie just ahead. . . . We know what we must do today and tomorrow, and we have no great fear that we shall not be able to carry on until sunset. . . . But all the days that lie between these two futures? . . . They are full of darkness and perilous bridges and rough weather. . . . They are heaped black with foreboding. . . . And for these — above all else in life — we need Him Who knows the way and is the Way. . . . Lord and Leader, Friend and End, He alone can make our pilgrimage a prelude in the same key as the trumpets on the other side. . . . The Pilgrim bids you God-speed to the next milestone — and beyond. . . . Beyond the last milestone there is only the glory of His redeeming Presence. . . .

And since we are yet in the light of the Christmas season we may close today with something which is not only good verse but also poetry. . . . Miss Catherine O'Hearn gave it to us:

"What are dollars, what are dimes
When all the bells are sounding chimes?
And what the revel and the feast
When Kings are marching in the East?
The call to shine as other men
When You light up the world again?
Come, fold my hands upon the Why?
The finite, circumstantial I,
And furnish me with love to keep
Who kneel beside Your ox, Your sheep."