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In Luce Tua

Comment on the Significant News by the Editors

Back From the Brink

We are among those critics of the administration's Far Eastern policy who have come in for some pretty rough criticism by the President and the Vice-President. The President has made agreement with his policy a criterion not only of ideological chastity but even of ordinary sanity. And the Vice-President labeled the hapless State Department functionary who, in line of duty, divulged information on the unpopularity of our Far Eastern policy a saboteur.

We are prepared to concede to any man who must carry the intolerable burden of the presidency the right to a reasonable amount of testiness and, whatever the President may think of the patriotism and good sense of his critics, most of us still think that he is doing the best he can within the limits of his knowledge and ability. As for Mr. Nixon, it is nice to know that high office has not changed him and that he is still the uncomplicated opportunist that he was years ago.

What is gratifying in recent developments is that, however stupid and ignoble the critics of our Far Eastern policy may have been, the policy itself has (at least as of yesterday) undergone some radical and wholly desirable changes. Of course, by the time these words appear in print, it is perfectly possible that we shall have still another policy. But at least at the time of this writing Mr. Dulles had come to the point of allowing that Generalissimo Chiang "might have to renounce military reconquest of the mainland" and that "if an internal revolt occurred in China, it was 'hypothetical' and 'problematical' as to whether Chiang would head the new government." (The New York Times, October 5) This is a considerable switch from what the President and the Secretary of State had been saying a week or two before, and the switch is significant enough to permit some hope that we may be moving toward an intelligent and defensible Far Eastern policy.

Despite our impatience with Chiang, we are not so naive as to suppose that the United States can permit any change in the present status of Formosa. And certainly we recognize a basic moral obligation to guarantee the independence and the security of Japan and the Philippines. We do not think that Chiang's retention of Quemoy and Matsu are essential to the accomplishment of any of these objectives and we don't think that this is the time to try bluffing a tough and realistic enemy.

Election Preview

The Senate of the United States is not only the world's most exclusive club; it is also the world's most influential legislative body. The quality of its membership is not, therefore, the concern only of those states which will be electing senators this year but of all of us — American, Englishman, Russian, and Filipino — whose lives will be affected by decisions that will be made, either by action or by inaction, in the Senate. In presenting our recommendations for Senate seats which are at stake this year we have not, therefore, been influenced by partisan considerations but by a desire to see men of intelligence, conviction, and courage elected to the Senate. In cases where a sitting Senator is opposed by a man of apparently equal ability we have taken into account the relationship between seniority and influence in the Senate and have given preference to the incumbent.

The two most interesting Senate races this year are those in New York and California. In New York, a distinguished Republican Congressman, Representative Kenneth B. Keating, is matched against a lackluster Democratic wheelhorse, District Attorney Frank Hogan. Mr. Keating should be elected, if only to administer a well-deserved rebuke to Mr. Carmine DeSapio who ramrodded Mr. Hogan's nomination through the Democratic state convention. In California, the race is between two nonentities, Republican Governor Goodwin J. ("Goodie") Knight and Democratic Repre-
The Authentic Democratic Lt.-Governor Philip A. Hart. And in we have seldom had occasion to agree, is opposed by surprising was the overwhelming majority by which they a completely ineffective Democratic governor and claims. Could be given a good recommendation except that he is pitted against an exceptionally able young man, and Roman Hruska, who may be dead. Mr. Malone claims to be a Democrat, Messrs. Malone and Hruska Republicans. Leaders of both parties dispute these claims.

Finally, there are three very difficult races to call. In Wisconsin, Democratic Senator William Proxmire has been (to us) a gabby and ineffective disappointment, but his opponent, Judge Roland J. Steinle, doesn’t send us. In Michigan, Senator Charles E. Potter could be given a good recommendation except that he is pitted against an exceptionally able young man, Democratic Lt.-Governor Philip A. Hart. And in Arizona, Republican Senator Barry Goldwater, with whom we have seldom had occasion to agree, is opposed by a completely ineffective Democratic governor and former Senator, Ernest W. McFarland. If we had to vote in these states, we would give the nod to Proxmire on grounds of seniority; to Hart on grounds of ability; and to Goldwater on grounds that he is an effective spokesman for a political point of view which is not otherwise well represented in the Senate.

The Authentic Voice of France

No one was surprised that the peoples of France and of the French community ratified Gen. Charles de Gaulle’s proposed constitution for a Fifth French Republic. After all, what was the alternative? What was surprising was the overwhelming majority by which they ratified it and, simultaneously, rejected Communism as a solution to the difficulties which had plagued the Fourth Republic.

France has now followed the example of the two other great states of western Europe in turning to a man of faith and evident piety for leadership in a time of apparently hopeless crisis. What DeGasperi did for Italy, what Adenauer did for Germany de Gaulle has been asked to do for France. The record to date would indicate that de Gaulle has both the ability and the courage to do it.

And what is it that de Gaulle must do for France? First of all, he must restore integrity to government, the integrity of leadership which sets duty above popularity, realism above ideology, and the responsibilities of power above the trappings of office. And, secondly, he must graft France back onto the deep spiritual and moral and intellectual roots from which her secular and periodically nihilistic leadership has attempted to cut her loose since at least 1870.

Those of us who have loved France have long looked forward to the day when the basic piety and the sound common sense of Jacques and Jeanette would call up leadership worthy of France. This has now been done, and few can doubt that the aloof, tough-minded, painfully honest old soldier speaks, and speaks very well, with the authentic voice of France.

The Sopranos Carry the Tune

Leave it to the women to cut through the hokum when words and deeds agree not together.

When the local booby organized to desegregate the desegregated high school in Van Buren, Arkansas, the school board fell back upon that favorite old device for shifting responsibility, the public meeting. Thus, unwittingly, they gave the fifteen-year-old president of the student council a platform for some of the straightest talking that Arkansans have heard in recent years, to wit: “We [the majority of the student body] think it is only fair that the Negroes be permitted to attend this high school. . . . Have you thought what you make those Negro children feel like, running them out of school?” Asked afterwards why she had said that, President Jessie Angeline Evans said, “Someone had to speak up. I just don’t think segregation is a Christian thing.”

In Little Rock itself, a Methodist clergyman who has been a strong advocate of desegregation in the schools was embarrassed when an anti-integration white woman brought a Negro woman along as a guest to his church. The ushers tactfully asked the woman to leave and take her friend with her. She didn’t.

Significant Article

For an excellent, dispassionate account of what actually happens when white and Negro children attend the same elementary school, see “Interracial Schools—Do They Work?” by William A. Kramer, Associate Secretary of Schools for the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. It’s in the October issue of Advance, published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis.
There will be those, no doubt, who will see the contact lens as a natural and even inevitable development from such artful compensations for natural deficiencies as the dental plate, the toupee, and arch-supports, and seeing it thus will be inclined to greet it as another landmark on man's progress to the heights from which he will be able to see all of nature lying submissive at his feet.

Before we all bring our spectacles to the mass burning on the public square, however, I would like to be assured that the contact lens really is a more efficient substitute for spectacles. I start from the assumption that the correction and/or improvement of vision, while it is undoubtedly the prime function of glasses, is not, and should not be considered, the only function of glasses. Indeed, for certain people and in certain situations, this practical function is so unimportant as to be hardly a necessary function at all.

It is not, I think, altogether accidental that contact lenses have found their greatest and most immediate acceptance among women. It is seldom to the advantage of a woman to reveal infirmities. Men, on the other hand, can use the judicious revelation of infirmities not only for selfish ends but even for the accomplishment of proper and laudable purposes. The use of glasses for these purposes is known as glassmanship.

Glassmanship embraces all of the uses of spectacles for purposes other than improving or correcting vision. Peering over the top of spectacles set low upon the bridge of the nose is a form of glassmanship, its purpose being to suggest a certain degree of aggressiveness or skepticism. The slow removal of the glasses, followed by massage of the eyeballs and perhaps a concealed yawn, is another form of glassmanship, a wordless suggestion that while other members of the committee have undoubtedly come clear-eyed to the meeting after a long and refreshing nap, Glassman has driven himself to the point of exhaustion and manages to stay with the discussion only by the exercise of an iron will. The gripping of the right arm of the spectacles (left arm for southpaws) transforms the slow and turgid ramblings of a glassman who is groping for something to say into the measured pronouncements of a sage whose language is altogether inadequate to the depth of his thinking and intuition. And a studied carelessness in fitting the glasses to the face can give the impression that Glassman lives in a rarefied atmosphere where the physical is altogether inconsequential and only the things of the spirit and the intellect matter.

Someone will say at this point that what I am suggesting is that glassmanship is a form of hypocrisy. If hypocrisy is defined in its literal sense, as play-acting, perhaps that is just what I am suggesting. And for that I make no apology, because a certain amount of the right kind of hypocrisy is necessary in a world where it is not given to men to know each other as they really are, but only as they appear to be. Society would collapse if we could all see each other as we really are. One of the things we owe each other is to seem to be what others need us to be. Whatever struggles of soul our pastor may be enduring, we need to get an impression of spiritual strength from him when we go to him with our troubles. However shaky the bank balance may be, our children need to believe in Dad's absolute competence to provide for his family. There is something as indecent in baring one's soul as there is in walking about naked.

I don't want a boss or a pastor or a wife or a friend that I can 'see through,' any more than I want to live in a nudist camp. When I hand in this column each month, I assume that it is satisfactory and will be accepted for publication. But if the editor has any understanding of the feelings of a columnist, he won't just mumble "OK" and throw the column into a folder. What he will do is give an impression of reading it, allow a slow smile to creep over his face, deliberately remove his glasses, and say: "That's not bad." I don't think that the effect would be at all the same if he were to allow his contact lens to drop into his hands and say, "That's not bad."

The careful reader will have noted that I have said nothing about the chewing of spectacle arms and the polishing of lenses (accompanied by a wrinkling of the eyebrows) as substitutes for comment in committee meetings where one has lost the train of the discussion. It seemed to me unnecessary to divulge all of the professional secrets of those of us whose jobs require that we spend a considerable part of our time in committee meetings. It will be obvious, of course, that the limitations upon the use of the contact lens suggested in the paragraph above apply with even greater force to these aspects of glassmanship.
The Organization Student

By Richard H. Luecke
Pastor, Messiah Lutheran Church
Princeton, New Jersey

A Hazen Foundation study, carried forward by Philip Jacob of the University of Pennsylvania and an impressive list of other social scientists, purports to measure what college is doing to student beliefs. A limited edition of the results of this study was distributed among educators more than a year ago. Now it appears in a cloth edition, at a handsome price, to help heap coals of indignation on eggheads for having failed to do for our younger generation during their college years what somebody somewhere has obviously failed to do. The study is entitled Changing Values in College, and what it shows is that college (at least in its curricular aspects) isn't changing values very much at all.

The foundation study acknowledges, and reveals, the usual limitations imposed by its method. It refers to students in general rather than to students in particular and certainly not to any student reading this article. "Values, attitudes, and beliefs" are not defined except by the questions which were asked in the questionnaires (just as "intelligence" in "intelligence quotient" means simply that which the intelligence test tests). It exhibits the usual charts, the usual jargon, and the usual results — usual in this day of "the lonely crowd" and "the organization man."

It turns out that college students have their radarscreens tuned, too, to a particular peer-group. Only this peer-group does not include the great thinkers of the past, or even their teachers of the present; it seems confined, rather, to the members of their fraternity or club. William Whyte, Jr., has already described today's college students as a "generation of bureaucrats," passively conservative in politics, willing to accept what they are told, and desirous chiefly of coming to a secure place in some secure business organization. Philip Jacob and his associates have tried to measure this. Their result: college students place a high value on "having a college education," even on having an education at the "right college," but not so much for the sake of intellectual training or of deepened moral and social understanding as for the sake of vocational and professional advantages and for something called "skill in social adjustment."

The Faceless Professor

Varieties of curricula, of instructors, and of teaching methods were all examined for their effectiveness in "changing values." Neither the sequences in "liberal" or "general" education, nor the new basic courses in social science, as it turns out, appear to be producing such an effect. There are shifts in interest (engineers sometimes switch to philosophy), but not in values. Information imparted in course work seems to be a function of attitudes, rather than the other way around.

College students were quick to rate their instructors as "good" or "bad," and they were generous in their estimates. They liked instructors who showed a personal regard for their students and who made their materials interesting. But instructors rated "good" and instructors rated "bad" by the students themselves seem equally effective in altering student attitudes, which is to say they are equally ineffective. In the general student's picture, college teachers merge and fade with the books, blackboards, and visual aids. The solid old notion of "the noble and lasting effect resulting from the personal and subtle communion between teacher and student" appears in our day to have come a cropper.

Whether a "student-centered" approach or the "lecture-recitation" method is employed in the classroom makes very little difference, either, though here we must allow for different preferences expressed by more "autonomous" or more "authoritarian" students. And here it was discovered that "striking gains" can be made with a certain type of student — long the despair of college faculties — if a specially-adapted method is taken with him. This is the grossly "authoritarian" student (three-quarters of them, according to the report, belong to "fundamentalist" or "orthodox" churches!), who distrusts learning, and who adopts a "you tell us and we'll write it down in the exam" attitude. "Changes" can occur, and do, if such students are identified early in the game, placed together, given well-ordered syllabi and assignments, and placed under the tutelage of instructors patient enough to wean them gradually to the new.

But, all in all, the report gives few such happy surprises. Some colleges, to be sure, exhibited a peculiar potency by virtue of a distinctive "college personality." With respect to the basic curricular functions of colleges up and down the country, however, Philip Jacob and his colleagues have served only to puncture a few remaining myths. Students are not being "liberalized" in college; Jacob describes the change which takes place in them as "being socialized." The general differences between those who have been to college and those who have not are only that the former are a little more concerned for prestige, rather more distrustful of welfare economics, and somewhat more "tolerant." The overall effect of college education today is to bring about a general acceptance of standards and attitudes characterizing "college-bred men," who are more alike.
and more innocuous after four years of costly schooling than they were before.

"Ghostly" Religion

Swallowing the bitter pill (if it is one) that college course-work isn't changing them very much, what are the "values, attitudes, and beliefs" which stay the same in college students — or only become more so? The various questionnaires given to students on many campuses focused on the following topics: self-confidence, self-interest, morality, social participation, tolerance, and religion. Their answers fell into an unmistakable pattern. In general, students today are "gloriously contented"; they are conformists, or "non-conformists" strictly within the limits set by their particular peer-group. They are "self-centered" — not "inner-directed," however, but looking forward to self-gratification in the "team-work" of contemporary business society. They accept inherited moral attitudes unquestioningly, but also unheroically — that is, they also expect and accept deviating behavior by themselves and others. They will discharge their minimal governmental obligations, but will leave the burden of government to others. They expect an international war, but are preparing themselves for a long and rewarding life.

What are their religious practices and beliefs? One-fourth of them attend services every week, one-fourth not at all, and the other half fall somewhere in between. Most of them expect such "attendance" to confer some sort of spiritual or moral benefit upon them but they do not see religion as an active (much less determinative) factor in "practical" affairs. There is a "ghostly" character to their religion which defies intelligent or even understandable articulation.

More recently there has appeared a book, The Unsilent Generation, in which a member of the Princeton university faculty records the views, opinions, and prejudices of a number of Princeton students. Most of the young men selected seem still to be speaking the language and attitudes which characterize the peer-groups formed within college dormitories, fraternities, and clubs. Accordingly, it may be questioned whether they would express themselves in quite the same way today, only a year later. (The student who wanted to find a girl who "either doesn't want children or, better still, is unable to have them" is reported to be well on his way to fatherhood today, and, to all appearances, happily so.)

Not one of these students names among his formative influences any great thinker, whether of the past or the present. Several go out of their way to say that their college teachers have left no mark upon them. There is a stubborn reluctance on the part of most of these students to talk "ideas" — almost as though this (though certainly nothing else) would constitute an indecency. Their parents, their romantic experiments, their social encounters, have made them what they are. Their college education, which most of them regard with pride as the very best available, has rounded them off; but it has not made them self-responsible.

If anything, these young writers seem more permissive orally, more self-centered, and more unabashedly materialistic than the "general student" of the Jacob study. There have been defections in religious adherence; but again there was, and is, little substance to their religious beliefs. The picture is hardly brightened by the curious assumption on the part of one student that, while he finds little need for church or religion now, "it will in all probability assume a greater importance as I grow older"; or in the hope of another that "after I get away from this atmosphere of questioning everything" (and marry properly), "I will be able to regain and strengthen my faith and once more accept what it teaches in toto."

What Can the Colleges Do?

Studies like that of Jacob, and expressions like those of The Unsilent Generation, have constituted a blow to the aspirations of many modern educators, especially to the recent missionary fervor of certain social scientists. They are also a blow to the ambitions of the Annual Funds Drive chairman at Princeton. But is it the proper course, in our bewilderment and chagrin over the present college generation, to join the hue and cry for the scalps of the administrators and teachers in high education?

Almost everyone agrees that college as such is meant to do more for its students than, to all appearances, it is doing — also something more with respect to their "values, attitudes, beliefs." The father who boasted that four years of college "didn't change his boy's beliefs a bit" was probably too easily satisfied. ("In fact," this father went on to illustrate, "he still prays every night when he goes to bed, 'Now I lay me down to sleep.'") Let's all agree that college is meant to have more effect on a student's beliefs than that.

But what effect? Must we not be careful what kind of expectations we raise? One of the problems bedeviling formal education today, and hindering its proper tasks, is that almost everything is expected of it — not only training in the three R's, in thought and expression, but also training in vocational and social skills of all sorts, in home management, in bowling, and now also in ethical and religious life. In an address given almost ten years ago, entitled "Morals, Religion, and Higher Education," Robert Maynard Hutchins issued several sharp disclaimers. What a college or university can do, he said, is limited by the age of its students when they arrive, by the length of the time they stay, by all the other influences impinging on them, and by the very nature of secular education in a democracy. Eighteen years is a greater age than we who are past it are willing to admit, and basic "values, attitudes, and beliefs" are already formed. How much "change" is
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to be expected—or desired? What a college can require is that its students read and think and assume a measure of self-responsibility for their espousals. Even so, twenty-two years is too young an age to have completed that process. Moral and social questions have the particular prerequisite of much practical experience. For this reason Aristotle prescribed that “the young should not listen to lectures in moral philosophy.” Such sobering considerations may partly explain the failure of social studies to do the job which many of their practitioners have claimed for them. They may also support a contention that the liberal arts are, after all, the proper formal pursuit of young people at this stage of their development.

In his inaugural address at St. Adrew’s, John Stuart Mill said something about the province of secular education which bears repeating:

No one can dispense with an education directed expressly to the moral as well as the intellectual part of his being... (But) the subject we are now considering is not education as a whole, but scholastic education, and we must keep in view the inevitable limitations of what schools and universities can do. It is beyond their power to educate morally or religiously. Moral and religious education consist in training the feelings and daily habits; and these are, in the main, beyond the sphere and inaccessible to the control of public education. It is the home, the family, which gives us the moral or religious education we really receive; and this is completed, and modified, sometimes for the better, often for the worse, by society, and the opinions and feelings with which we are there surrounded.

To the role of home and family we may wish to add that of the church, which nurtures its members long before they reach college, during their college years, and hopefully through all the years which follow. But let us set down, as a first step in evaluating the performances of colleges and universities today, that their distinctive purpose is intellectual, and not moral or religious. To shift and mingle these responsibilities is to confuse the processes of education and to endanger the last prerogatives of family and church.

Can Ethics or Religion be Taught?

Having issued this warning against expecting too much, let us ask what colleges as such can do about morals and religion. With respect to morals, the colleges can teach descriptively the ethical practices of various communities; they can compare the various theoretical foundations which have been found for morals; they can read representative ethical systems. But, except for requiring compliance to certain rules for continuance at college, they can not actually get morality.

To illustrate: certain college librarians complain that the kind of books most frequently pillfered from the stacks are textbooks in ethics. Aristotle’s ideal citizen is a man whose virtues, though “natural,” are quite beyond the actual capacities of most of us—as Aristotle himself (who characterized man not only as “rational” but also as an “animal”) half admitted. The Christian ideal may be even higher, but it is possible through grace in a way that Aristotle’s ideal is not attainable by nature. The “good life” or the “good state” can not be brought to pass simply by showing their “reasonableness.” Something more is required. Something like religion.

Very well, what can a college or university as such do about that? In various departments whose subject matter includes religious phenomena, or in a special “religion department,” the college can treat religious cults historically and descriptively. It can teach systems of “natural religion”; it can read sacred theologies; it can help to clear up intellectual difficulties with respect to faith. But in all such activities the required end is knowing or passing, and not yet religious being or commitment. The class atheist may score an A while his classmate of unquestioned piety flunks. To be sure, believing instructors may sometimes make appeals, whether privately or in class, in behalf of their own faith. But these are extra-curricular and are not yet that appeal within the context of the Church which begets and sustains Christian faith.

Since faithful commitment is an acknowledged ingredient in a complete education, it may be asked why colleges do not require a religious adherence on the part of entering students, or at least require that their faculties be staffed by members in good standing of, say, Christian churches. In God and Man at Yale, William Buckley proposes something of this sort, both in the interest of making free course for Christian faith on the campus and in the interest of a certain brand of economics which he thinks belongs to that faith. But is is clear why not all colleges can do this and why it would be unfortunate if many of them did. Education is needed by all, for the good of all. But faith is not acquired in the same way; indeed, it is described as a gift and can not be required of all. The college or university is charged, moreover, to think most deeply about everything. A second-rate chemist who is a believer may not hold up his end of the discussion as well as a first-rate chemist who is not. One function of the university is to assist the society it serves to grow; it can not do so if its freedom of discussion is limited by that society itself.

Sensitive college administrators are encouraging the recruitment of capable college teachers who are also faithfully committed; they cheerfully make provision for college chaplaincies, and sometimes also for a college chapel. Yet this is only to invite, or to entreat, communities of faith to do something which is es-
sentential in education, but which public colleges themselves can not do. — and must not be required to do. All of this may appear to converge upon an argument in favor of the church-related college. Perhaps it does. But there we must admit the gigantic, and seemingly overwhelming, administrative and fiscal problems of doing both jobs properly and with integrity. Strangely enough, the Jacob survey found in the church-related colleges which it studied that most students did not "increase in faith" (italics his) during their college years. It is equally scandalous, if not more so, when such colleges sacrifice penetration in the disciplines, or the educative encounters with conflicting faiths and statements of faith, to the unsafe safety of churchly conformities.

**Two Communities in Tension**

There are always voices calling for the subordination of one function to the other, or of one community to the others. During recent controversies in Princeton, a very colorful and truculent Aquinas chaplain called upon the board of trustees and the administration to act in the light of certain "universal truths" which, so conceived and formulated, are universal chiefly in the Roman Catholic church. To be sure, he also appealed to expressions of eighteenth-century natural law theory in the Declaration of Independence, and to the motto of the University, to make this seem also the patriotic and loyal thing to do. But the danger is apparent. What will the board of trustees decide for next? What about the function of a university to provide a meeting place for all thoughtful views, and to foster the examination, refinement, and restatement of all formulations?

On the other side of it, there are always belligerently secular voices calling for the subordination of communities of faith and for the silencing of all "dogmatic authorities" within the university. One need not look hard to see the peculiar faith and dogmatism implied also in this position. It is one to which the Christian community, in particular, can not yield. For the faith which Christians find to provide the vantage-point for life and for inquiry is not found by inquiry itself, or by ratiocination and discussion. It is created within them by the Word and the Sacraments.

It is the way of evangelical Christianity to recognize and to accept two communities in inevitable, and even wholesome, tension. Each has a distinctive function to perform, and neither can concede its function to the other. A church which holds to "justification by faith" does not fear a conflict of opinions, for the "faith" implied in that formulation sustains even during siftings of opinion, and while statements (even statements of doctrine) are examined and refined. It does so, not out of the romantic notion that in free discussion truth will always triumph, but out of the circumstance that debate exposes error (also one's own), and that truth has one advantage, if only one: namely, that it always stands the chance of being rediscovered.

To define the relationship between church and college, we may find useful the much-worked phrase, "disparate yet conjoined." The failures we have noted in the education of modern college youth are a result, in part, of our failure to see their disparate character. Home and church have given over to the school what was, at bottom, their responsibility. Such failures are also a result, in part, of our failure to see that the functions of church and school must always be conjoined.

The church has been culpable on both counts. It has not entered into the discussions of the university in ways which would keep its statements relevant and applicable to the scene. The result, as Jacob points out, is this easy compartmentalizing of religious "beliefs" on the one hand, and of academic learning on the other. The twain do not meet; therefore there is no marriage, and there is little creative issue from either side.

But, even more basic, the church has not always accepted as its own distinctive function the freeing of human minds, also for the tasks of learning and teaching. The result is this split between faith and practical decisions, and specifically between faith and study. The church is shrugging off its bounden duty if it makes the Jacob study and similar reports an occasion for complaining rather than for confessing. "Other-directed-ness," listlessness, self-centeredness, false ambition — what are these but evidences of "the world," and of the more or less special forms of "bondage" which it is imposing upon men today? If rules imposed by school administrations, or learned ideas themselves, seem unable to free students from such bondage, is that any news to the church?

We talk a lot these days about "ideology," and about the pressures of unacknowledged forces on our thinking — whether economic and social, as in Marx, or sexual and psychic, as in Freud. To know these things is, in some degree, to overcome them. But the Bible speaks even more profoundly of how the mind is hopelessly in the service of a false and prideful self. The Bible never distinguishes neatly among the mind, the heart, and the liver. Unless a person is renovated by grace, he distorts inevitably in the interest of self. He is prone to accept too soon statements professing to express the truth, or to give up seeking them at all. Consider the importance for a student of St. Paul's appeal: "Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that you may prove what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect." Consider the importance of his doing the Offering with a Christian congregation: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me!"

The task of the church is different, but must never be separate, from the task of education. She is saving her students not from, but for, the university.
This essay reconnoiters the problem of Lutheran quiescence and its relationship to the German political personality.

Since 1870 the western world has been upset by the problem of German power. The Hohenzollern empire bodily asserted its fresh strength and willingly duelled with European apprehension and opposition. Germany played a spotlight role in the prelude to World War I and was later indicted, falsely or justifiably, as the primary culprit. She reacted with vehemence and her responsibility for World War II is much less debatable. Thus in our own time we have experienced the tragic distemper of a fine national civilization and the related European collapse. America was involved and today stands guard over the imperiled civilization of the west. And as western political leaders try restorative therapy, western historians seek a deeper explanation for the European fall and the crucial German dereliction.

One could not expect the German and western scholars to make identical interpretations of the German past. Individual, or national, experience is probably ever veiled to the outside observer. And again that outsider may see traits and connections which elude introspection. German and western analysts translate the hieroglyphics of the past according to their different cultural values and interests. Both do agree that German political form, and ideals, have been more authoritarian than those of the west. But the German is not yet convinced that semi-liberal government necessarily leads to militant national policy or even to less worthy personal freedom.

The Geographical and Historical Setting

German scholars are not at a loss for an empirical explanation of their authoritarian past. Their centrally located people could not afford dilatory parliamentary methods; a fast sword hand seemed requisite to survival. They employ a familiar geopolitical maxim that the measure of military security directly governs the degree of executive authority. Some reason that small-state Germany, as it existed between 1270 and 1870, could not hope to inspire political energy and pride among its subjects. Perhaps the economic decline of Germany after 1500 retarded customary bourgeois pressure for representative government. We may note here that the 19th century industrial revolution did generate liberal action but it was sidetracked by Bismarck's autocratic genius and by the bitter circumstances of the Weimar Republic. All these are concrete considerations in the problem of German political values. But many German historians also step beyond mere empirical logic and affirm that their national spirit has quite properly elevated group discipline and personal duty above pursuit of happiness and constitutional passion. They give ethical justification, as well as factual explanation, to the German deviation from western liberalism. They find collective harmony in the authoritarian ideals of Luther, Kant, and Hegel and they do not feel that such ideals infringe on personal freedom and dignity.

Western writers do not discount the geographic, economic or federalistic factors. But they look askance at any idealization of duty and wonder if this is not the real taproot of German political quiescence. This suspicion began to develop after 1914 as German system threatened to overshadow the liberal west. The danger became an extended one and western critics probed the German past with new purpose, intent on the recognition, and correction, of this alien spirit. Such war-conscious scholarship intensified during the Hitler crisis and an ever increasing galaxy of German greats were dragged into the stocks of western approbation. And not a few of the western analysts began the chain of German subservience with Martin Luther, now the deceptive liberator and the fascist forerunner. This Luther issue is our subject proper but we must yet mark one final orientation point.

Most historians accept an eternal missing link, an ultimate uncertainty, in their reconstruction of the past. Pragmatists may ascribe this to missing source material. Idealists doubt that even the complete record of human activity could chart the spiritual electricity of life. Economic or political histories are often less resistant to empirical penetration. Intellectual history, the analysis and sequence of thought and action, is much more speculative. And in trying to register Luther's influence on four hundred subsequent years of national history, we are confronted by just such a problem. His own life and influence may seem to be within the range of empirical approximation. But who will thread his spirit through the centuries? I can think of no comprehensive effort to master such a monumental theme. And I find it strange indeed that it is the western experts who have dared the most decisive conclusions about the German soul. Often lacking full literary contact, these psychoanalysts yet presume to diagram the growth of a national personality. We seem to be in a trend of incisive, useful interpretations which are mostly shallow and intuitive, frequently malicious. The speculative interpretation of nations and centuries
is a legitimate effort if done with scientific restraint and thoroughness. Maybe Luther did help fashion a German tolerance of authority which entrenched autocracy and led to later tragedy. As yet, however, this concept lacks both scholarly certification and objectivity.

**Luther's "Otherworldliness"**

Now we can examine the Luther seed itself. He accepted biblical authority for his theology and for his political values. This life is temporal, our fortunes in it are irrelevant except as we receive and maintain our faith in Christ. The Christian's social behavior will be cheerful, industrious and tranquil; he will perform an "active life-work" out of a "full heart." But his world is, and will remain, evil and un-Christian. God appoints his hangmen princes to scourge the lawless, to preserve and intermittently plague the faithful. But they must be obeyed, except when mad or when they try to forbid the Christian's performance of his duty to God. And even in the latter instance, the Christian must resist in peace. For what does it matter if he be wrongfully deprived of wife, child and home? Divine justice will redeem all. Luther's biblical view of authority is probably well expressed by the Pauline command to civic obedience: "Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but bad. Would you have no fear of him who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval. For he is God's servant for your good." Of course such words sound strange to modern ears and are evaluated, if at all, in terms of constitutional correctness rather than prince and subject. But Luther and his contemporaries read Paul quite directly into their own autocratic political context and I daresay the Roman apostle was not misread.

Unlike the papacy, Luther did not seek to direct or counter-balance the state. Secular authority helped implement the break from Rome; it directed all aspects of public life, including charities, schools and churchmen. Luther wanted his reformed church to preach the Gospel, not to engage itself in worldly activities. Thus Luther gave new theological impact to 14th century ideas about the spiritual duty of the church and its administrative subordinacy to the state. Such church withdrawal from public affairs both purified and secluded the Christian life and thus incubated subsequent Lutheran strength and limitation. We know that Luther entrusted the government of the evangelical churches to the princes and thus opened the door for later state control of the church. Many authorities think Luther initiated the concept of paternal bureaucracy and broke path for later forms of the *Rechtsstaat* or the *Kulturstaat*. For Luther did enjoin the princes to govern and civilize in a spirit of Christian ethics and enlightenment. And we need not overlook his monstrous tirade against the peasantry in the interest of general stability. Luther is no saint and must not be treated as such. He was a religious revolutionary and he led one of the great western emancipations, at ultimate risk. Let our revolutionary cultists bear that in mind when they judge the progress and spirit of others. But Luther also had a conservative view of society and he was not inclined to tamper with the physical world. We have in Luther, I think, a medieval peasant, an ascetic monk, a biblical radical and, in later life, a conserving ecclesiastic.

**How Lutheran is Germany?**

Despite some exceptions, such seems to be a representative digest of Luther's political philosophy. We may now ask whether his indifference and obedience toward the state was transmitted to subsequent generations. The flow of any such development is beyond our scope but it does seem permissible to point out some obvious similarities. The Germans after Luther will also incline toward political indifference or the idealization of authority. Luther did not idealize the state but his acceptance of its incontestable sovereignty is functionally comparable. Does such apathy toward political self-determination then begin with Luther or does it have deeper historical roots? Some think the German is characteristically a spiritual, or theoretical, type who tends to disregard the material, or the practical, once drawn to an idea. Certainly the German mystics and the great literary themes of medieval Germany convey a spiritual, or heroic, idealism which disassociates itself from the practical consideration. But medieval Germany also had its share of the mundane: merchant profiteers, realistic republicans, stubborn knights, and egoistic princes. In fact, no medieval nation can claim a unique hold on the spiritual point of view. But it may be that Luther's transcendental stress sustained and revitalized the German's medieval instincts before they had been decisively secularized. And thus the Pauline evaluation of the state again took hold, giving spiritual approval to autocracy and diverting German interest from political reform.

Even sympathetic historians describe the German Lutheran states of the 16th and 17th centuries as Christian police states. Those were years of developing absolutism and consolidating orthodoxy everywhere. Executive leadership seemed natural enough in that setting of confessional rivalry and Baroque system. And the Lutheran pietists who broke from the church expressed their obedience to the state in terms of personal indifference rather than corporative adaptation. Prussia organized her Lutherans into an efficient hierarchy and perhaps it meant something when Frederick the Great's soldiers marched into battle singing Lutheran hymns. And of course there was Kant, who made...
virtue conformable with duty; and Schiller, who eulogized the triumph of spirit over body; and Goethe, who looked down on the political ant-heap with Olympian detachment. These men seemed to share Luther's disregard for things physical, but they cannot be described as Lutheran spirits. Was Luther's influence now left behind or had it become an unconscious force?

We might further mention the strong-state philosophies of Fichte and Hegel, or the religious idealization of power by the historian, Ranke. The autocratic Bismarck gained initial political traction by way of a pietistic circle and he always understood himself to have a Lutheran outlook and conscience. And the Lutheran church itself gave dedicated service and support to the Prussian system and many a Junker officer took his spouse from the pastor's home.

Luther's thought and church at least seemed to complement, if not develop, Prussian autocracy. And, of course, it never conceived of itself as a political force. Furthermore, it must be recognized that German intellectual life was essentially separated from the church as it entered into the political activity of the 19th century. Must it necessarily be heir to Luther's political ideas or might it not do some spontaneous thinking of its own? It has a reputation for the latter talent. In fact, these Germans of the classical and romantic period admired Luther precisely for his spiritual freedom, and they cherished that quality for themselves as well. Imperial Germany was materialistic and Nazi Germany was atheistic and amoral. Can we assign these fruits to Luther's spirit? Has modern Germany continued, or neutralized, the Lutheran legacy? Is Luther a sire of Hitler because he preached civic obedience and cursed at the peasants? I find the combination far too tenuous and anomalous, and it is time to rock this theory of Lutheran responsibility for autocratic form and excess.

About half the Germans remained Catholic during and after the Reformation. Their political psychology developed in step with their Lutheran neighbors. The most despotic states in Europe during these centuries were Catholic Spain, Austria, and France. And if Lutheranism breeds autocracy, how do we explain the exemplary democratic life of Lutheran Scandinavia?

Obviously, political form is not controlled by the religious confession. We describe modern Europe as a secular society and every freshman learns that the church lost its influence on political life. Is Germany the unique exception? Is German Realpolitik and aggressiveness the paradoxical product of religious quiescence? And let us not forget that the tranquil Lutheran twice fought for his confessional life against the massive potential of Charles V. After the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555, each state chose homogeneous confessional form and the need to fight for religious freedom no longer existed. The Calvinists found less immediate security and carried their fight for religious political rights deep into the 17th century. There is no denying that Calvinist ego and congregational organization activated a greater civic interest and a deeper habit of autonomy. Luther would not be too much concerned by that. But the rather stereotyped comparison of the freedom-fighting Calvinist and the docile Lutheran subject lacks political nuance and spiritual perspective. And, of course, this controversy also lacks Christian sense.

Is Luther or the Bible Under Attack?

In conclusion: the charge that Luther seeded modern German authoritarianism seems to be little more than an intuitive comment. It has been a product largely of war-time feeling and of skimpy a priori investigation. Such method seems to suit our ideological century but it does not yet have scientific approval. Tyranny and war have been eternal plagues and we need not overload the peasant monk from Saxony with Germany's 20th century faults. In fact, his tranquil, pessimistic view of history might well be a timely anchor of security in a time when mere effort fails. And if the German Lutherans really incorporated all that Luther said, then we might just as easily make the Lutheran Bible responsible for the 20th century atheists, for Luther's political views were directly reflective of Biblical instruction and Biblical values. And I suspect that some of his critics would not at all shy away from such a prosecution.

Theology does not completely fulfill its obligations when it concentrates with singleness of mind upon its subject, the witness to revelation. Its second concern consists in relating the truth of revelation to the history of thought and the world's current intellectual conceptions. Theology's insights and judgments cannot therefore be isolated, in principle, from the general striving for knowledge that goes on in the world.

Walter Kuenneth, "The Foundation and Freedom of Theology," 
Lutheran World, September, 1958.
Profane and Sacred Love off-Broadway

By Walter Sorell
Drama Editor

The season began more hesitantly than usual on the Great White Way. As a matter of fact, the ballet stole the interest with three major companies appearing at the same time. Jerome Robbins, who gave us last season the exciting dance drama, "West Side Story," impressed the public with his new ballet, "New York Export: op. Jazz," in which he caught the spirit of our time in balletic terms.

A few shows destined for Broadway folded on the road and, after five days, "Howie," a guileless comedy by Phoebe Ephron on TV quiz shows, died on Broadway. In spite of some excellent acting this feeble attempt at laughs about a topic that has become ethically questionable and a problem with rather serious connotations gave up the little spirit it had.

It is still the off-Broadway theatre that is daring and has something to offer. Lack of experience and the necessary means may sometimes prevent a polished performance, but the material chosen is mostly of such interest that poorer acting and insufficient preparation seem of less importance. So far the European play has dominated the scene. Arthur Schnitzler's "Anatol" was presented by Karl Mann, and the only question coming to my mind is whether it was wise to revive just this play.

It was chosen to make the theatre-goers better acquainted with this typical Viennese playwright whose soul-searching was sincere and whose comments on life and love to the point, then it was badly chosen since "Anatol" was Schnitzler's first effort, and neither the structure nor the dialogue of this play does justice to this neglected writer. It was a forerunner of his greater works and now impresses us as a series of light vignettes, little essays (or "feuilletons" in the best European tradition) on love, fidelity and frustration. Schnitzler, a physician by profession, was also a doctor of the human soul as a writer, and you can even feel in his first attempt that Freud was living around the corner from where this was written. As a matter of fact, Freud made his first explorations into what makes man tick only a few blocks away from where Arthur Schnitzler had his study. Considering the time when it was written, 1893, "Anatol" still stands up quite well and even weather a direction and a cast which brought neither the necessary elegance of style nor the charm to this play of an author — some of whose other plays would deserve to be seen in this country.

If, however, this play was chosen for its "sexy" theme as the advertisement makes us believe, then David Ros has done better in choosing another German playwright mainly associated with this topic: Frank Wedekind. Unfortunately, he is even less known in this country than Schnitzler. His approach to sex — it was revolutionary at the beginning of this century — is that of a vitriolic social critic who is infuriated by bourgeois hypocrisy and its warped attitude toward some of man's basic instincts.

Wedekind proclaimed that the flesh has its own spirit. But to play him, and particularly his "Lulu," in a naturalistic vein, as it was done in this production, shows a grave misunderstanding of this writer who finally discovered that bodily joy as such is in the end joyless. In the prologue a whip-cracking horseback-rider invites the audience to enter the circus. A beautiful specimen of the female sex is carried in, shown around — and the play begins. Wedekind sees society as a circus and men as beasts devouring one another. He sees nobility in nakedness and the hypocrite in the bourgeois who suppresses the genius in man, wherever it is found.

The circus pictured in "Lulu" is full of tragic clowns. Lulu is the incarnation of sex and devours man; she may the symbol of Lilith, the female demon. Everyone wanted to be married to her at one time or another, as one of the characters says, and in spite of the fact that she ruins and kills man after man that crosses her path. At moments, Wedekind extolls the beauty of the human body, the cleanliness of its joy, the purity of ecstasy, and in the next minute he shows the inevitability of this carnal trap, the mire in which it flowers. Like moths flying against the light, the men in this play cannot help but consciously ruin their existence for the sake of this woman.

Next to these two thesis plays of profane love the New York theatre was enriched by the production of James Forsyth's "Heloise" at the Gate Theatre, a play of great profundity about love moved quite a few levels higher. This play is beautifully conceived and written in a poetic and lucid style. It has meaning and tells the world across many centuries that love of God and love for man have the same source and cannot be separated, that there can be purity in the love for man as there must be purity in the love of God. Heloise is convinced that in loving Abelard she also loves her Maker.
Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man: for thou regardest not the person of men. Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Caesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's. When they had heard these words, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way. — Matt. 22, 15-22.

The present-day hearer of this story may want to keep himself comfortably distant from the first incident, rejoice in the discomfiture of the enemies of Jesus, and wonder that a man so good could also be so shrewd. Or the present-day citizen of the United States may listen to this story, mildly interested in Jesus' anticipating by 1,700 years a doctrine of church and state; and then go back out into life with a good conscience, practicing his own citizenship in a compartment sealed off heretically from God. It would be better for us all, however, to face the full meaning of the “and” — “Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.” That “and” does not join two ideas that stand on the same plane; but it drags up the whole first one and unloads it onto the level of the second. In this text Jesus Christ did not propose to run counter to the whole meaning of the Old Testament covenant and the holy revelation of God to His people and His own personal mission in which He came to do the will of God, by suggesting that Caesar operated a series of demands sealed off from those of God. Rather was Jesus telling men also in their citizenship and life under human authority to let God be God. And that He says to us: Give Government its Due — For God's Sake!

The Pharisees tried to put Jesus into the uncomfortable position of looking like a radical reformer, one who tampered with the public order of the community. It is important for us to review Jesus' rejoinder — “Show me the tribute money,” and see in it not just a clever sparring, or saving face with the people. According to the Gospels many people came to Jesus with questions, and He asked them questions in return. But always He did it to lay bare to themselves first of all what their inner life really was. The lawyer had to face the realization that he tried to justify himself. The rich young ruler had to discover that he worshiped wealth more than God. James and John had to face the fact that they wanted ease and glamor from Christ's kingdom rather than persecution and death. And so Jesus' question laid bare the unholy alliance between Pharisees and Herodians, those who perverted the covenant of God into a keeping of rules with those who put over the adoration of the most high God the toadying to civil overlords.

For the tribute money bore the image of Augustus or Julius Caesar surrounded with symbols not just of power but of deity. The Jews had been warned not to make graven images for they were almost always in the ancient world representations of deity. The tribute money was a symbol, not just of value, but of idolatry. It reminded of a civil power that was putting itself in the place of God. But it also reminded of human frailty that prized human power at the expense of the will of God. The questioners went away "marveling" — and they stood aghast not just at their being outwitted in debate but at their harboring of death and vanity in the heart.

Thus this ancient word of Jesus reaches with the power of judgment and of summons down to us this moment. We have lived in a time that has seen the deification of human government to replace the will and presence of God. Adolf Hitler confronted God's judgment on this idolatry in the vault under the Tiergarten. What God proposes to do about Krushchchev and his worshippers of man remains to be seen. But we aren't through with the idolatry of government and power merely with the destruction of some of its arch-priests. There remains with us the fateful urge of man to throw himself at the feet of whatever gods he can see. Even the good things — food and drink
and family and livelihood and science and invention, the resources of nature and the wisdom of man - can be shaped into this dreadful image and idol. Government sways the behavior of men into patterns of order which they would not necessarily yield to without compulsion; it is God’s own tool for order. But what an idol it becomes if kept in a compartment separate from God.

This happens when “separation of church and state,” for example, becomes an authorization to raise generation after generation of the nation’s children without the knowledge and fear of God. This happens when people like you and me, otherwise religious and God-fearing, spend their life in the community and pay their taxes and even go off into armed service unmindful of the purpose and authority of God in it all, and sometimes rebellious and blasphemous about it.

There are things to do to Caesar. Under a totalitarian government St. Paul could list respect and honor and prayer and taxes cheerfully paid. In the democratic process we have to add the sharing in government by discussion and voting and information and public office. But now for the “and”! It doesn’t mean that something else is to be rendered to God. But it means that all of this is to find its place in the scheme of God. For all things are to be done to God — all things, all of life. Governments are His plan, St. Paul tells Timothy, for keeping a world in order in which the Christian witness can meet its man and thoughtfully set forth the truth of God’s redeeming purpose in Christ. The ordinances of government, St. Peter reminds us, are processes in which we are to share cheerfully, not because we are thrust into them by fear of penalty, but for God’s sake. For Christians live under government, not to worship it, or to obey it unthinkingly, but to share in it, so that they may bring their Lord of love and service to their fellowmen in the community of families, and the community of nations, always for God’s sake, who is the author and maker of the love which He puts into our hearts.

Hence let us give Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, as an act of that love to people which God Himself has shaped in our heart by loving us in Jesus Christ. For our life under government along with our life by ourselves and our life in this community and our life in our families and our life in the holy Christian Church is all for God; and by the power of His Spirit we pray to offer it up to Him a sacrifice for a sweet smelling savor.

Letter from Xanadu, Nebr.

Dear Editor:

The Missus just got back from visiting Tillie Schreck who is in the hospital with bruises and a fractured jaw which she got from old Pete, her husband, when he came home drunk last night and couldn’t find the grocery money which Tillie keeps hidden away so he won’t use it all for liquor.

This is the third or fourth time in the last five years or so that Pete has given Tillie a beating-up and he seems to be getting meaner all the time. I feel sorry for him because when he is sober he is as nice a guy as you could want to know, but he isn’t sober very often any more. Tillie is scared to death of him.

I told the Missus that if I was Tillie I would get a lawyer and put a stop to this business right now. Maybe she hasn’t got any grounds for divorce as far as the church goes but you can’t tell me that she has to put up with this sort of thing for the rest of her life. She’s young yet — in her middle thirties, maybe — and she could still make a decent home for herself and her kids if she would give old Pete the heave-ho and find herself a man that would treat her right.

The Missus won’t buy that idea, though. She says that Pete hasn’t been guilty of adultery and he hasn’t deserted Tillie, so he is just a cross that Tillie has to bear and there is nothing that she can do about it except pray that one of these days Pete will come to his senses and start behaving the way he ought to. So I asked her how she would like it if I started drinking and beating her up and she said she would knock my block off, which I told her would be as bad as getting a divorce since she is supposed to obey me in everything. Besides, she says, nine times out of ten when a man takes to drink it’s the woman’s fault for driving him to it.

She may have something there. It used to be that divorce cases were fairly simple things. There were innocent parties and guilty parties and you excommunicated the guilty party and let the innocent party have his divorce. But nowadays things always seem so complicated. But then, the older I get the more complicated everything seems.

Regards,

G.G.
The Fine Arts

Campus Corner

by Adalbert Raphael Kretzmann

Someone will surely be reminded of Longfellow and the "melancholy days." Someone else will wonder what moved a man to take such a picture. Was he interested more in the light or in the shadow? Did he feel that here he had an answer to "the melancholy days?" Was he quite sure that he had caught the vision of "a golden street" where the fact that you had a chance to walk in freedom and in the shining light meant more than the vague security of the shadowed houses beyond?

What was he trying to recapture when he set his camera so carefully that all the concentration was on the fallen leaf and the rain on the pavement? What taught him that rain was not only wet, but had a glisten and a glory to it? Or did he feel that the staggered pattern of the paver's art took on a finer gold by night and rain than in did in the dry of yesterday's noontday sun?

Was it the tree with its long, tall, and strong support that fascinated him? How far it had gone off from the straight and the true, lay exaggerated on the glistening stone. Did he really hear "the joy among the angels in heaven" when the slender stem came back to the straight and true? Or were the golden, glistening leaves, like scattered coins upon the shining wet, a sign to him of happy angels living in the light?

What memories of other corners and of other turns had gripped his soul? Long, long ago there may have been a Reformation Day bound up with Halloween. The corner close to home had looked like that when suddenly the rain had stopped when he came home for Thanksgiving many years ago.

Or could it be that he was old — that he remembered walks like this in student days when cares were far away and all the world of dreams around the easy bend? Was there a chance that this dark glistening stone looked like the pattern of his life with one good shining path of light and all the hopes of home and love in the shadows just beyond?

A thousand corners such as this are part of colleges across the land and even far across the sea. They are the shining symbols of a way of life, of youth undampened by the rains that fall unconscious of the shadows laid across a beam of light. The eager feet of those who love to walk have come unheeding round this easy turn. But someone thought it had a beauty all its own, for some have eyes to see the things that others never know. They are life's hallowers — the eyes of us half blind — the nerves of an untender age — the feelings for a numb and blunt majority.

Why waste the space to print the picture of a sidewalk wet with rain? To ask the question means that any answer would be wasted. Why answer any man who asks you why you thrill to stars, or laughter of a child at play, or leaves and lights behind a tree? These are the fabric and the life blood of the soul. No man who needs to ask can have an answer ready made. He too must walk alone and find the gold in leaves and ordinary paving blocks, and light, like angel wings, fanned out, and tree trunks black against a path of light.
Some time ago I was discussing Gustav Mahler and his music with one of the most famous conductors of our day. "I like to conduct the compositions of Mahler," the well-known musician told me, "but I do not consider Mahler a great composer." What did he mean? "Mahler," he reasoned, "had such a wonderful mastery of the art of orchestration that it is a joy to read his scores and to give directions as to the proper way of performing them. Their content, however, does not stir me."

I agree wholeheartedly with the statement that Mahler wrote for the orchestra with dumbfounding skill, but I disagree with the conclusion that Mahler cannot be regarded as a great composer.

Not long ago I was overjoyed to receive what, in my opinion, is a completely authoritative reading of Mahler's Symphony No. 2, in C Minor, commonly called the Resurrection Symphony. The work is played by the Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra of New York under the direction of Bruno Walter, who was associated with Mahler for a long time and is one of his most ardent, devoted, and competent champions (Columbia M2L-2563). Emilia Cundari, soprano, Maureen Forrester, contralto, and the Westminster Choir, of which John Finley Williamson is the director, take part in this memorable and stirring performance.

Mahler spent seven years writing his Resurrection Symphony. He completed the work in 1894, and the premiere of the entire symphony took place in Berlin on December 13, 1895, under the leadership of the composer, who will go down in history as a great conductor even though many refuse to acknowledge him as a great creator.

Richard Strauss, who like Mahler was a past master of the art of orchestration, set great store by the Resurrection Symphony. "One score," he told Walter, "lies always on my piano — that of Mahler's Resurrection Symphony. And I never cease to learn from it." I like to cast this statement into the teeth of those critics who seemingly take delight in belittling and even degrading the ability of Mahler.

The Resurrection Symphony is a gigantic work dealing with death and, above all, with resurrection. After Mahler had written those portions of the composition which have to do primarily with death, he was at a loss how to continue. In 1894 he was present at the funeral of Hans von Buelow, the renowned pianist-conductor. Here he heard a choral setting of Klopstock's Resurrection Ode. "Suddenly," writes Walter in his invaluable program notes, "Mahler recognized that only in the idea of resurrection could his Finale conclude a symphony that had begun with a song of death."

In the Resurrection Symphony Mahler uses parts of Klopstock's ode and some words from his own pen. In addition, the character of much of the work is deeply influenced by Des Knaben Wunderhorn (The Youth's Magic Horn), a collection of medieval folk poetry which, as Walter states, "was to take hold of his creative imagination and, through the years, exert a powerful influence on him."

Concert-goers in the United States seldom have an opportunity to hear Mahler's Resurrection Symphony. Now, however, they may listen again and again to a recorded performance which, in every respect, is the very last word. Nothing will ever keep the name of Walter from being associated with the name of the master who conceived and created the Resurrection Symphony. The two discs on which this composition is recorded are, in reality, a historical document of the utmost importance. Those who have been in the habit of speaking and writing in a belittling manner about Mahler's ability as a composer should become acquainted with this recording. Is it too much to hope that Mahler's authentic and heartfelt reading will show them the error of their ways?

Some Recent Recordings

Space permits no more than the mere mention of six of the latest Archivc Production releases, recorded by the Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft and issued in this country by Decca: DIETRICH BUXTEHUDE. Five Sacred Cantatas (Herr, nun laest du deinen Diener; Quemadmodum desiderat servus; Lobe den Herrn, meine Seele; Ich bin eine Blume zu Saron; Ich suchte des Nachts). JOHANN KUHNAU. Musikalische Vorstellung einiger Biblischer Historien (The Fight Between David and Goliath; The Marriage of Jacob; Hiskias, Very Ill and Restored to Health). Fritz Neumeyer, harpsichord, with Fritz Uhlenbruch as speaker. GEORGE FRIDERIC HANDEL. Four Concertos for Organ, Orchestra, and Continuo, played by Eduard Mueller, organist, with the Schola Basiliensis under August Wenzinger. JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH. Magnificat, for soloists, choir, and orchestra. Conducted by Ferdinand Leitner. Concerto for Violin (and Two Violins) Strings, and Continuo. Wolfgang Schneiderhan and Rudolf Baumgartner, violinists, with the Festival Strings of Lucerne. JEAN BAPTISTE LULLY. Dies Irae and Psalms 50: Miserere mei Deus. Presented under the direction of Marcel Couraud.
RECOMMENDED READING

THE GOSPEL OF THE INCARNATION

By George S. Hendry (Westminster, $3.75)

This is a provocative study of the Christian Gospel as the incarnate God’s “living of forgiveness.” The title of the book, perhaps, is misleading. The word “incarnation” must be understood as encompassing all the activities of the incarnate One. This book should be read.

The author’s basic concern is that so often certain aspects of the Gospel are emphasized to the exclusion of others. This leads to what he calls “a fragmentation of the Gospel.” He writes further, “It is the main contention of this book that this kind of preoccupation with single elements of the gospel, such as the incarnation or atonement, to the relative neglect of others, has been the bane of Christendom and has much to do with our unhappy divisions.”

Hendry also attempts to analyze the basic causes of this fragmentation. He writes, “The principal cause of the fragmentation of the Gospel has been the neglect of the incarnate life of Christ, and this in turn is traced to the metaphysical misconception of the humanity of Christ in the thought of the early church, as it is enshrined in the second Homo-ousion of the Chalcedonian Definition.”

The author illustrates this fragmentation with a discussion of the valid but distorted emphases of Pietism and orthodoxy in their apprehension of the work of Christ, with the antithesis between Catholic and Protestant on the nature of the church, and finally by showing how much of what separates the Eastern and Western churches is simply a dominant interest in either the incarnation or in the atonement. This is all a matter of emphasis, but also of distortion. The author attempts to tie all of these together through another emphasis, I fear, on “the historical life of the incarnate Christ.”

George Hendry claims that while Calvin and subsequently Luther gave place to the “prophetic office” of Christ, this office does not form an essential part of their theological structure. He writes, “The fundamental structure of the Gospel would remain intact, even if Calvin were to pass ‘incontinently’ from the Nativity to the Passion and omit the whole story of His life. ... The fact of the historical life is emphasized; the actual content of it is not.”

Hendry traces this essential neglect of the life of Christ to the thinking behind the Chalcedonian formulations. This forms one of the most interesting sections of the book. Here the author takes the “dead frame,” as we like to call it, of orthodoxy and re-examines its basis. The phrase “true God and true man” is subjected to close analysis. And with this the terms once again come alive. He analyzes the thought-categories of the ancient Greek Church which produced this formulation. The things which so often are “patent phrases” and “dead issues,” but also held up by the non-critical-historical theological mind as “the only orthodoxy,” become somewhat less mysterious and certainly more questionable. We in Lutheranism need this re-examination of our formulations. It might put more “theological life” back into our orthodoxy.

Hendry shows that as these formulations entered the western theological mind they could not be completely assimilated because the West was not interested so much in the incarnation as in the cross. “Incarnation theology” reaped lip service, but little more. The “objective” necessity of Christ’s humanity as formulated by Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Hilary of Poitiers (a Latin father who spent many years in the East), and Cyril of Alexandria has been sloughed off as “mechanical” or “too physical” by the Western tradition, who in turn, though paying lip service to the Chalcedonian formulations, neither understood nor accepted the philosophical categories that demanded it.

The West, illustrated by Anselm, Aquinas, and Calvin, asked the same question, How does God forgive in Christ?, but asked it in a different way.

Not being concerned so much with the restitution of man’s corrupted nature which formed the incarnational theology of the Eastern fathers, the West was more concerned with the guilt of sin. This guilt of man before God had to be eliminated. Certainly the great modern English study of this is Aulen’s Christus Victor. Hendry relies heavily on this treatment, perhaps too much, in his review of the various attempts of the West to bring vicarious atonement into a systematic theology. Here we need only note that, according to the author, the philosophical categories (“legal” rather than “metaphysical,” “ethical” rather than “ontological”) of Western thinking forced concentration on the cross rather than on the incarnation.

“The discussion and, needless to say, the formulation of any real theology of atonement in the West has been complicated by the questions which arose out of the era of rationalism. Possibly we ought rather say that this is the West’s way of beginning at the beginning (relationship of “reason” and “history” in the Christian faith) in an attempt to restate ‘the faith in terms of our own thought categories. The Reformation, understood in this sense, especially in the experience of Martin Luther (who is relatively neglected in this study), found the door through which the faith might be formulated in the West, but never found the key. (The old bromide that Luther was a theologian but not a systematician!)

The author completes his book by attempting his own formulation. He tries to do it in Western categories. He states the problem in this way, “Can the truth that the classical Christology sought to express in terms of abstract essence be more adequately expressed in terms of the history of the incarnation? Can we perhaps say that the ‘universal manhood’ is the real meaning of the ‘Jesus of history?’” Hendry employs the oft-used “I and Thou” relatedness category to describe the work of Christ. We feel he does a good job of restating the Gospel in a modern framework. Certainly from the traditional point of view we could accuse him of everything from “adoptionism” to “monophysitism,” but actually this would be missing the point. He is restating the Gospel outside the tradition.I categories. Read it and you’ll see what we mean!

This book is only an attempt to “recover the wholeness of the Gospel” as a contribution to the ecumenical movement. The author’s viewpoint is that “the causes of our unhappy divisions are not limited to the differences on specific controversial issues, but they include also partialities and deficiencies in the apprehension of the gospel, from which no communion is exempt.” We agree . . .

WALTER OETTING

THEOLOGY IN CONFLICT

By Gustav Wingren (Muhlenberg, $3.25)

This book by Professor Wingren of the University of Lund, Sweden, exemplifies simultaneously the acuteness of Swedish theological analysis as well as the systematic limitations of using the distinction between Law and Gospel as the final theological criterion.

Wingren concerns himself here with two kinds of “presuppositions,” the “anthropological” and the “hermeneutical,” which determine the theological views of three dominant figures in European theology: Nygren, Barth, and Bultmann. The two kinds of presuppositions are treated sepa-
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Among the anthropological presuppositions Nygren's understanding of the relation of philosophy and religion; Barth's understanding of the radical opposition between God and man and the consequent emphasis upon man's lack of knowledge (rather than lack of righteousness); Bultmann's existentialist-oriented understanding of law and guilt --- all of these distort the Biblical message. The hermeneutical presuppositions of Nygren, who regards Scripture as "religious affirmations" or "propositions"; of Barth, who emphasizes the Word as mediating new knowledge to man; of Bultmann, who "spiritualizes" the Law because in his demythologizing view of the Kerygma, the death and resurrection of Christ are not concrete events in history --- these presuppositions again lead to a conflict with the Biblical material.

Since Wingren's purpose, in this analysis, is to determine the extent to which these theologians can be said to be faithful to the Scriptures, the treatment is not a philosophical critique but a historico-descriptive analysis (p. xi); the assumption of the author being that "such elements which disturb the comprehension of the Biblical material that is to be interpreted ought to be removed" (p. xvii) if they disturb "essential parts" and not just "certain aspects" of that material ( xv, xiv). Unfortunately, Wingren himself makes the additional rather bland assumption that that is essentially Scriptural which preserves the Lutheran understanding of Law and Gospel. This, he claims (p. 82), is not just a "confessional Lutheran accentuation, as Barth maintains"; but since he nowhere undertakes to defend that claim, he leaves unanswered two important objections: 1) How account for the fact that a good many New Testament exegetes (of whom Bultmann himself is one!) do not find the same clear unanimous testimony to the theme of Law and Gospel as Wingren seems to find? 2) How get out of the circularity of the definition of the "essential" in Scripture as meaning 'preserving the Lutheran distinction of Law and Gospel'? Until we receive a fuller definition of that distinction from the author, I see no reason why Barth, e.g., could not claim for his part that Wingren's understanding of Law prohibits him from comprehending the Biblical material concerning man's knowledge of God. Or might not Bultmann meet Wingren's charge that he arbitrarily circumscribes the New Testament exegesis because of his attachment to Heidegger with the equally valid counter-charge that Wingren arbitrarily circumscribes it by his attachment to Luther's view of Law and Gospel (p. 62)? Prof. Wingren believes that it is "necessary to start with man's subservience under the Law in one way or another, to make this the point of departure, and approach the Biblical material from this point of view" (p. 101). But does he beg the very question that the "conflict" (p. xvii) raises, viz., Why that starting point and not another? The only answer one seems to receive is the obtuse one: Because it is scriptural.

Wingren's presentation is lucid and penetrating. I am not sure that he has not partly distorted the views of some of his theologians: It seems to me his criticism (pp. 18ff) of Nygren's categories rests on the false assumption that the forms of experience are discoverable as temporally prior parts within experience rather than being, like the Kantian forms, conditions of all experience. (Thus the author argues on p. 21: "Nygren assumes that man is void of 'ethical ideals' until he chooses one historically given "). Again, with Barth, he leaves the impression that the notion of "sign" (p. 123) inescapably leads to a positioning of God's withdrawal from the world; he seems to assume that "das Nichtige," being negative, cannot for that reason be actively evil (cf. 109f.); and he gives no indication of having seen that there is a close connection between "revelation" and "justification." Nevertheless, apart from these few points the representation seems to be fair and adequate, as far as I can judge it, and is at the same time one of the most lucid accounts available in English of the dominant themes of these three men. That fact in itself makes the book worth studying.

Concerning the translation: 1) Nowhere is the title of the original (Die Methodenfrage der Theologie) given by the publishers. That is a deficiency which is hard to understand or to excuse, particularly when the English title itself has so completely altered the original. 2) A spot-check of the translating (pp. 36ff; 52ff; 85ff) would lead me to conclude that the streamlining which has occurred in the process and which undoubtedly gives the book a little snap that it would otherwise have lacked still resulted in a number of puzzling omissions or inaccuracies. So, among other things, are left out: a decisive "auch" on page 36, line 8 ("evil too" or "even evil" it should read); an important "schon" (p. 32, line 14); "ourselves" should be inserted before "our attitude and our actions" (p. 37, line 4). Erroneously translated are: "im Blick auf Jesus Christus" as "from the point of view of Jesus Christ," (p. 37, line 7); "umgekehrt" as "on the contrary" (p. 37, line 11); "Factor" as "factors" (p. 87, line 14, where the singular form is impor-
tant). Questionably rendered are: "vor-
being," "verworfen," and "Vergangenes" --- all as "passed by," which impose an unnecessary poverty on the English which would provide a nice contrast in "passed" and "past" (p. 36, lines 21-23); "ent-
spricht" as "is perfectly analogous" (p. 37, line 14), whereas the idea of correspondence rather than analogy is of significance; "es ist nicht mehr erlaubt" as "it is not proper" (p. 37, note 24, which is an example of the translator's penchant for leaving out temporal designations like "noch" or "schon" or "nicht mehr"); "heben Barths Lehre ganz auf" as a weaker "contradict Barth's ideas" (p. 38, line 15).

Finally, two errata which I noticed: P. xxi, line 10 should read "At" not "As." P. 70, note 7, the "op. cit." is superfluous.

Robert Scharlemann

THE GIFT OF CONVERSION

By Erik Routley (Muhlenberg, $2.50)

This is a discussion of conversion in non-
thological, everyday English. This is not to say, however, that the thought structure of the book is easy to follow. You have to stay with Routley or you will lose him (sounds redundant). He has thought through this process of "being born again" in his own way. The only author he quotes with any idea of following his thought pattern is Paul Tillich. The book indicates what one of my studious Tillich friends tells me, that Tillich's "anxiety of being" and his "the courage to be" are Lutheran enough as an analysis of the human situation.

Routley begins by discussing certain misconceptions about conversion which stem from the wrong use of "mythology" such as the conversions of St. Paul, St. Augustine, and John Wesley. It is his conclusion that these dare not be made normative for every conversion lest we do the Gospel grave injustice. He writes that we must certainly renounce self-sufficiency and be ready to be assisted by those we admire, but the "wrong reason for claiming a share in the experience of the saints is the readiness to be enslaved by those whom we admire, an anxiety to agree uncritically in order to be spared the risk and trouble of private judgment." This is the wrong kind of "anxiety." Routley does not mention Luther's experience. But certainly his apprehension of the Gospel dare not become normative either. It is just this which we often refuse to understand. The questions which agonized Luther are not exactly the same questions asked today.

The author develops his biblical analysis of conversion in the middle chapters. Using the story of Bar-Timaeus as his pattern he insists that the Law-Grace categories of theological speech express most adequately the "anxiety of death," the "anxiety of guilt" and the "anxiety of meaninglessness" — pre-conversion states of be-
ing rather than merely emotions, as well as the "wholeness" that grace gives in Christ.

This "ontological" understanding of conversion requires us to avoid a number of rather common modern ideas. The fruits of conversion are not primarily moral nor does conversion bring simply "rest of mind."

The final chapter is really the punch line. If Routey's understanding of conversion is true, then all these gimmicks to force decisions on people are really demonic. They lead to false conversions which are actually worse than the first state of the people concerned. Without ever having the courage of Bar-Timaeus "to be," these people fall back into worse slavery, either to an evangelist, to Bible quotes (!), or to a legal Christ. This chapter especially ought to be read by preachers. Indeed the whole book, especially on second reading, ought to have a profound influence on our preaching of conversion.

WALTER OETTING

GUIDE TO CHRISTIAN LIVING

By Otso W. Heick (Muhlenberg, $3.00)

Whenever we read anything by Otto Heick we wish he would say just a little more. We are quite sure this book would leave the uninstructed reader rather confused about the basic outlook in Lutheranism concerning Ethics because of the sketchiness of the first chapters, and on the other hand for the same reason would utterly bore anyone familiar with the topic.

We appreciate the basic Lutheran outlook. However, we feel that the author is attempting to state what cannot be stated. Giving solutions — even generalizations — when no set of rules but only an existential confrontation of the Gospel of God must motivate the Christian. But if there must be Guides, the second half of the book is not bad.

We are amazed and heartened by some of the material which is included. The author has an interesting grasp of the scope of Christian living for the lay Christian. He not only covers such usual topics as sin, grace, freedom of the will, conscience, natural law, reverence for life, euthanasia, abortion, sterilization, artificial insemination and capital punishment, but also such important but seldom handled topics as the fine arts, the press, censorship, social and service clubs, the scientific outlook, the means of grace, the place of women in the church, and stewardship.

While we cannot agree with some of his conclusions, we must admit that he makes a good case for the Lutheran approach to many problems.

WALTER OETTING

GENERAL

SIX DAYS OR FOREVER?

By Ray Ginger (Beacon Press, $3.95)

The case of Tennessee v. John Thomas Scopes occupies a place in the annals of famous court trials. It occurred during the summer of 1925, and was known popularly as the "Monkey Trial." It was brought to court solely for the purpose of testing the constitutionality of a law (the Butler Act) passed earlier in the year by the State Legislature, forbidding the teaching of evolution in any public school. The American Civil Liberties Union was anxious to finance a test case. A friend convinced a young biology teacher in Dayton, Tenn. (pop. at that time 1,800) that, by becoming the defendant in such a trial, he would be doing a service to the cause of education, and to the people of his state. Scopes was greatly dismayed that the case, instead of being disposed of as a simple misdemeanor, acquired national celebrity and an atmosphere more reminiscent of the carnival than of the judicial bench. Clarence Darrow and Dudley Field Malone volunteered their services, free, to the defense; local citizens, anxious to publicize their town, obtained W. Jennings Bryan to assist in the prosecution. One hundred American press representatives, of whom the most famous was H. L. Mencken, and two from England, covered the proceedings.

The trial began on July 10. It was indeed a clash of Titans. Bryan and Darrow, although not necessarily representing the forces of good and evil, as many thought, did represent completely irreconcilable points of view: Darrow was an agnostic, and a passionate believer in the rights of the individual; Byran, besides being a chief apostle of fundamentalist doctrine, was firmly convinced of the infallible wisdom of the popular majority.

The case had some flamboyant aspects, quite apart from Darrow's purple suspenders. The trial judge was apparently not only ignorant, but more interested in newspaper publicity than in legal matters. Darrow became increasingly rankled by oppressive restrictions forced upon him, and finally allowed his contempt for the jurist to become outrageously evident. An expression of contrition in best revival fashion saved him from jail. Then Darrow made a bold and almost unprecedented move — he called to the witness stand William Jennings Bryan. His aim was to crumble this pillar of fundamentalism. Intellectually, Bryan was no match for him, and was brilliantly, and cruelly, held up to ridicule by his opponent. This complete deflation of his ego is thought to have been a factor in Bryan's death five days after the trial's conclusion.

A directed verdict of "guilty" ended the trial. The State Supreme Court refused, on technical grounds, to review the decision, and forbade its appeal elsewhere. The law still stands, despite efforts to repeal it at various times. It is generally ignored, and no attempt at enforcement is made. The harm accomplished by the Butler Act, and tremendously augmented by the Scopes trial, lay in its tendency to force a choice between religion and science. Implicit in the Act, though unintentionally so on the part of its sponsor, was the belief that no Christian could be a scientist, and vice versa.

The author aims, he states, "at recording in a straightforward and direct way the moving chaos that was this specific chunk of historic reality. But I wanted to do so in a way that would suggest significances far beyond the narrow story being told." This necessitates, among other things, showing "how occurrences at Dayton were shaped by national, sectional, and state-wide forces." To this end he discusses the various facets of postwar repression (prohibition, the KKK, restrictive immigration laws, and, particularly, fundamentalism and the anti-evolution movement). In attempting to explain the attitudes represented, and the issues involved, he gives consideration to the South as a region; to urban-rural conflict; to evolution as expounded in several recent full-length studies; to Judaism and Christianity viewed by eminent modern theologians. In addition to generous biographical data concerning Darrow (whose life he is writing) and Bryan, he attempts to interpret and evaluate the personalities of these men and their impact upon society.

All this effort produces an exhaustive study, scholarly, though easy to read, incorporating a real life drama with elements of both farce and tragedy. The whole is exceedingly interesting, particularly for one who remembers the controversy at close range.

MAN IN MODERN FICTION

By Edmund Fuller (Random House, $3.50)

The Judeo-Christian concept of man, as revealed in fiction, has remained relatively unchanged over the years. Religious differences have been apparent upon occasion, but, for the most part, in the Western historical-literary tradition, man is seen as a unique and responsible person, who is inherently imperfect in himself, but who has infinite possibilities for redemption and reconciliation with God.

With some few exceptions, Shaw for example, this concept has been generally accepted. But in the last few years this concept has been changed. In some of the new schools of modern fiction, man is pictured as something no longer unique; he has become an evil, irresponsible, and aimless being, adrift and beyond help in a hostile world.

In his book, Edmund Fuller exposes this new concept of fictional man as completely false and dangerous, which it is, and he takes to task some of our leading modern novelists who have helped develop this depraved view of man, namely, James Jones,
Some Minority Opinions on Contemporary American Writing."

One would like to think his opinions were not those of a minority, but considering the sales of novels written by the authors just mentioned, he may be right.

Continuing a trend started in the French existentialist movement, these novelists, Fuller points out, write within no moral framework. Failing to understand true compassion, they substitute false sentimentality. Novels filled with this warped sentimentality — Fuller calls them sniveling novels — include Algren’s The Man with the Golden Arm and A Walk on the Wild Side, Mailer’s Barbary Coast and Deer Park, Jones’ From Here to Eternity and Some Came Running, and, to a lesser degree, most of Steinbeck, beginning with Tortilla Flat. All of these novels contain characters who are, by any recognizable standard, amoral bums, yet the reader is expected to sympathize and identify with them, but never to blame or judge them.

Fuller diagnoses many other weaknesses in the modern novel, including the tendency toward more clinical detail, the mechanical use of sex for effect alone, and the loss of contact with reality as exemplified by the hipster of Kerouac’s books. He notes also the disappearance of women as real characters in modern novels, where, instead, women have become, according to Fuller, “female zombies,” objects rather than persons.

In a pithy chapter on that author, Fuller acknowledges the near-genius of Joyce and his influence on modern writers, but he deplores his image of man. In another chapter, he delivers a rebuttal to John Aldridge and his In Search of Heresy, which lament the conformity of the non-realistic novels. But each chapter is important and very readable for Fuller has a sense of humor and he understands true compassion. He is not the typical reformer, but he has the vision, intelligence, and courage to see something he dislikes and to let the public know about it. His is a short, timely, and well-organized book and it deserves a wide reading.

SECOND-RATE BRAINS
Edited by Kermit Lansner (Doubleday, $1.50)

This new book is not the rabid castigation of our educational process that might seem indicated by the title or the near hysteria that arose throughout the nation after the advent of the Russian satellites. As much as it can be, it is an objective comparison, achieved through a carefully balanced collection of personal observation, comment and discussion, of the educational systems of the United States and Russia and the effect these systems have had and will have on basic research and general technological development. The impact of the systems on foreign policy is included in an introductory discussion.

The views of the contributors are not in complete harmony on all point, but these divergences only emphasize the complexity of the educational problem and the need for not only a better understanding of the purpose of our educational policies, but for a restatement of these policies and goals in view of the scientific age in which we find ourselves.

A good starting point for a sane and serious consideration of our educational practices is presented in the four parts of this book: Brains and History, the Russian Achievement, Mediocrity, U.S.A.? and Goal: First-Rate Brains. Facts and figures are used to give a quantitative picture of the Russian achievement. The quality of the achievement is assessed, in part, through a glimpse into the lives of two young members of the Soviet scientific elite and the comments of Dr. I. I. Rabi and Dr. D. J. Hughes. Dr. Rabi, Nobel Prize winner and chairman of President Eisenhower’s Science Advisory Committee, has been intimately connected with the U.S.A.’s nuclear defense program, whereas Dr. Hughes, senior physicist at the Brookhaven Laboratory, reports his impressions of an extended informal visit to many research centers in Poland and Russia.

Pointing up the mediocrity of American education are such able men as Rear Admiral H. G. Rickover who here does not make use of the vituperation with which his utterances are usually accompanied — at least according to the educationists. Max Lerner, Professors Henry Steele Commager and Arthur Bestor uphold Rickover’s views and touch upon such controversial topics as local vs. federal financing and control of schooling, and “progressive education.”

There is no final statement setting forth the steps necessary to correct the inferior educational system now seemingly firmly entrenched in the United States, but certain steps are plainly implied in the various criticisms of the present system and its products. There would seem to be two basic things of urgent necessity: (1) educate the teacher rather than train him in methods, and (2) raise standards all along the line. Before such steps can be taken, there will have to be an awareness of their necessity and a willingness to attempt them on the part of the politician as well as on the general populace. The furor over the satellites should have shown that something is amiss. Books like “Second-Rate Brains” should help pin-point and clarify the solution.

T. C. SCHWAN

I SAW FOR MYSELF

By Anthony Nutting (Doubleday, $3.00)

The writer of this book, Anthony Nutting, former British Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, resigned his post because he disagreed with the British-French military action against Egypt in the fall of 1956. Following his resignation, at a time when his stock was high in the Arab countries, he made a trip to North Africa and the Middle East. I Saw for Myself is the result of his tour. In it he reports details of his conversations with Arab leaders who must have been very open and frank with him because of his proved friendliness toward the Arabs.

The young diplomat made his trip and wrote his book still fresh from the Foreign Office, and conscious of the relatively important position he had held there. He has a strong sense of self-importance and firmly believes in the correctness of his political judgment.

While this reviewer recognizes the broadness of Nutting’s view of the problems of international politics in general, and the fundamental correctness of his approach to the vital questions of the Middle East in particular, he is rather doubtful concerning the diplomatic tact of the writer. The book is highly undiplomatic.

Nutting’s interesting accounts of the confidential conversations he has had with leading personalities of the area, revealing as they are in some cases even for the expert, must be highly embarrassing, even damaging, to some of the interviewed leaders. Only to mention one instance, it must have been rather upsetting to his Iraqi and Saudi friends, to whom he by implication imputes the story, to read in this book about a plan supposedly hatched by the rulers of Iraq and Saudi Arabia, under which “King Saud would recognize Iraq’s Crown Prince Abdullah as king of Syria.” If such a plan existed, the plotters surely did not mean to waste it before the world except for the whole world. The present rulers of Iraq, whose revolt started with the assassination of their great opponent, Crown Prince Abdullah, used this very insinuation against the ill-fated Prince, accusing him of plotting the destruction of the Republic of Syria.

On the other hand, much as these revelations might upset the concerned statesmen and trouble the already over-disturbed political arena of the Middle East, it must be recognized that the writer by his indiscreetness does give a rather intimate insight into the personal relations of the leaders, their respective opinions of each other, and their actual roles in the politics of the area.

Nutting himself, having pronounced opinions about the politics of this part of the world, is very outspoken in his sizing up of the interviewed personalities. He is
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critical of the business-minded young Shah of Iran. Mrs. Golda Meir, Foreign Minister of the Republic of Israel, is pictured as a living antithesis of everything which makes a good diplomat. Nasser is said not to be a statesman, but only a conspirator. On the other hand, the three murdered leaders of the pre-revolutionary Iraq regime, King Faisal, Crown Prince Abudillah and Prime Minister Nuri, all killed at the start of the revolt, are described not only as loyal friends of the West and broadminded statesmen in general, but also as serious persons who had the welfare of their people in their hearts, and who selflessly worked for the modernization of their country and the lifting of the living standard of the masses.

Nutting uses very strong words when he censures the French for their shortsightedness and stubbornness in their dealings with the Arabic-speaking nations of North Africa. Neither does he always approve of the American policy in the Middle East, which is, as he implies, not always considerate of friends, though soft on foes, often noisy and tactless, and sometimes contradictory and confusing. He also strongly objects to some features of British foreign policy. He criticizes his government for standing with the feudalistic rulers of the Persian Gulf States, and for compromising their own interests by not giving up the British protectorates in this area, which are becoming more and more liabilities.

With all the advantage of hindsight, it would not be fair to point out all the mistakes in the author's prognostication. However, it is hard not to mention one. Recent events in Iraq must have shocked him deeply, because he had a very strong belief in the stability and competence of the pre-revolutionary pro-Western regime of King Faisal.

He was incorrectly optimistic in his estimate of Nasser's declining power and diminishing influence. The predicted isolation and fall of Nasser might still be in the cards. However, since the book was published, a series of events have taken place which rather strengthened his international position and added to his influence on the Arabs. We refer to the birth of the United Arab Republic, its federation with Yemen, Saudi Arabia "rapprochement" to Nasser, the Iraqi revolt, and the recent events in Lebanon and Jordan.

While the book is made interesting and is important because of what Nutting reveals of the confidential information he received from the "mighty" of the Middle East, he is not respectful of the opinions of the young intellectual "reformers," and of the people. His snub of the Shah of Iran, like evident dislike of India's Nehru, might have been motivated by some personal reason. Nevertheless, what he says about feudalistic conditions in Iran and his warning of the imminent danger of a social upheaval there should be taken very seriously.

Although the author is not oblivious to the upsurge of Arab nationalism and its strength, he seems to have a tendency to underestimate the role it plays in the disturbing events of our days. On the other hand, his advocacy of a Moslem Confederation, which would embrace about 300,000 Moslems in one political fold, seems to be, at least for the time being, far-fetched and unrealistic. Nevertheless, it has to be said that such a confederation, if realized, would divert the presently rather destructive forces engendered by Arab nationalism into more wholesome channels, and might even present an ideological and physical defense against Communism.

ZOLTAN SZTANKAY

PURELY ACADEMIC

By Stringfellow Barr (Simon and Schuster, $3.95).

This novel has been written by a man whom I consider an absolute genius in the field of the humanities. I was acquainted with him while we were both at the University of Virginia prior to his leaving Virginia to set up a new and very original program at St. John's College in Annapolis. In addition to eliminating many of the "Joe College" activities at the institution, Stringfellow Barr, as president, abolished the elective system and introduced a course of study that required four years of mathematics and of laboratory sciences for all undergraduate students. The book is delightful reading particularly for people who have had any extensive and intimate acquaintance with college faculty activities.

The book attempts — very successfully, I felt — to portray the academic-political activities of a university faculty. The principal character is a Professor Schneider, head of the history department, through whose eyes most of the activities are developed.

There are a number of bits that are well worth quoting:

"..."Professor Manley claimed the trouble with his colleagues was that they had lost their amateur standing in the world of ideas. When Manley thought about something, whether a woman or a poem or a philosophic concept, it was because she or it interested him; he would be thinking about it whether he received a university salary or not. But most of his colleagues, he had noticed, thought only about things that paid off, just as their students studied only to get grades."...

"You don't approve of research?"

"I consider it an occupational disease," said Schneider. "Like silicosis, which is also caused by digging where there is already too much dust."

"But if he isn't to write a third book, should he do committee work or what?"

"That I cannot permit — although I have no authority here. That would require him to dictate letters, issue memorandums, and go into conference, the way little business men do. In fact, committee work is the professor's way of proving that he is just as important to society as businessmen are. No, I'd rather he risked a third book."

"... this sociologist was easily the least witty and the most desperately lacking in social sense. Presumably, it was precisely this defect that had drawn him inexorably into sociology, where he could hide his blindness behind the discreet dark glasses of a vague and voluminous terminology. Or, alternatively, thought Schneider, he might have been driven in by that powerful law of psychological compensation which Schneider had watched operate in so many of his colleagues. If you could not learn to add, you became a professor of mathematics. If you could not find your way to the business section of a college town, you became a professor of commercial geography. If you had trouble expressing even simple ideas in clear English, you took up semantics. If, he reflected bitterly, you could not remember dates, as indeed he himself could not, you became a professor of history..."

"Let me propose," said Schneider in a modest, conciliatory tone, "a square banner for the Marshal to carry in lieu of the mace he has recently pleaded for. Let there be inscribed on it symbols that describe the principal functions of these wandering scholars. At this point let us list these functions, in order of importance: research, committee work, and — last but also least — teaching."

"... I give you, to symbolize research, a pair of scissors, opened to form a square, above which you write, 'professor rampant with three students...'."

"... as a symbol for our second function — committee work — something very simple, almost banal; a snarl of red tape."

"Could I interest you in some symbol with action in it? Let us suppose, simply to have something on the table to discuss, a professor rampant with three students dormant.""

"I will not agree," said Weed, "unless you can produce a Latin motto that will — well, sort of tie the whole thing together. It needs — 'packaging,' I believe, is the word now used."

"Permit me to package it," said Schneider. He pondered a moment, mopped his brow again and then said, "How would this be? IN SNAFU LABORAMUS?"

"But is a foundation as much a racket as a university?" said Schneider. His voice registered incredulous horror.

"There's no real difference," said Denby. "Except in detail. Both have trustees,
and the trustees have been entrusted with money. Nothing destroys your imagination quicker than being entrusted with money. Then there are minor ailments. Hungry, ambitious academics sit around, from coast to coast, cooking up 'projects' with an eye to pleasing the foundations. The projects all look as if they had been re-written for style in some Federal bureau or other. They begin, 'It is believed that ...' And sooner or later, some of them have to be 'finalized' or 'activated'. Administrators in projects — an eye to pleasing the foundations. The And sooner or later, some of them have to 'up' to show why it is believed that their institutions are strategically fitted, either by their geographical location, or by their clientele, or their architecture, to carry out the mission under discussion.

"If you give them the money — and you have to give some from time to time — that's what a philanthropoid is hired to do they use it for some other ill-disguised purpose." "Professors form research teams with small herds of secretaries, not to solve problems, but to study approaches to problems. More problems have been approached with foundation aid than you can imagine. It's an absolute miracle that one or two haven't been solved, if only by some untoward accident. But they're still being approached. From time to time a survey has to be made of fifty or sixty of these approaches; and eventually the surveys have to be correlated, so we can see what the foundations are accomplishing."

I thoroughly enjoyed this book but I would have enjoyed it even more had the author stopped half way through. No satirical work should go much past pages and most of the author's brilliant work is in the first half. Recommended for all in the academic world.

H. C. HESSE

ANNE FRANK, A PORTRAIT IN COURAGE

By Ernest Schnabel (Harcourt Brace, $3.95)

The world well knows the reaction of the German people to the dramatization of Anne Frank's record of a Jewish family in hiding from the Nazis in the occupied Netherlands. So poignant an observation of man's inhumanity to man, the diary of Anne Frank demands some further insight into the story of this fourteen-year-old girl. Mr. Schabel attempts, by means of interviews and research, to reconstruct some of the life and atmosphere which surrounded the now internationally famous child.

"What is the use of my going over it ... what is the use of your writing a book about it?" One of Mr. Schnabel's forty-two witnesses poses this haunting question to the probing author, and the question remains ringing to the reader after the completion of the work. By means of her simple restrained story, Anne was capable of producing an historic reaction of shame and remorse among the German people. She accomplished this without hate, without bitterness. How anti-climactic, how impotent are her biographer's by contrast, for each tries to bolster her rather final articulation of this black episode of world history. What more can be accomplished by the repetition of the already established statistics of Belsen and Auschwitz? If Mr. Schnabel's nationality is German (not explained by the jacket), then I prefer the German reaction of silence to this self-condemnation.

His technique of presentation leaves much to be desired. He presents the reader with the bits and chips of a mosaic with which he has made little if any attempt at synthesis into a readable important documentation of Anne's life. The whispiness of Anne's trail becomes even more foggy as Mr. Schnabel dissects a given situation into the independent impressions of several witnesses. One is forced to skip from bits of Anne's diary to accounts by her friend Lies, to snatches of Anne's other unpublished works, back to other witnesses in such chaotic procession that soon one asks how each piece fits the totality; what point Mr. Schnabel is making here; or even worse, what is the totality of his book. The several magazine articles which have appeared on the post-diary life of Anne Frank, and now Mr. Schnabel's work, leave the most eloquent, the most restrained, the least condemning, the most understanding words to the comprehension of the question, "What manner of child is this?", to the sometimes enigmatic, sometimes explicit recording of the Diary itself. Mr. Schnabel's presentation of the biography is merely the raw material of his research.

HOME TO POLAND

By Christine Hotchkiss. (Farrar, Straus, & Cudahy, $3.95.)

It all began in October, 1956. That was when Wladyslaw Gomulka, Communist boss of Poland, met with Russia's Krushchev; that was when Poland, long oppressed by both Germany and Russia, gained a new freedom and a new mode of life.

In 1957 Christine Hotchkiss, wife of an American businessman, visited her homeland after and absence of 18 years. The Poland that she met combined the fear of former state domination with budding individual enterprise and memories of the past. Small, privately-owned shops were daily increasing in number, but the collective farms and industries were still in evidence.

Because of her knowledge of the Polish language and her ready abundance of friends and relatives, Mrs. Hotchkiss was able to make an extended tour of the country and to meet many of its officials. Home to Poland is the first-hand account of life in the "new" country, plus memories of what Poland had been before the war. For instance, there was the visit to the estate that had been her childhood home. The stately mansion still stood, but the hired hands of earlier years now occupied the house (oftentimes several families to a room), and the extensive fields had been parcelled out to numerous individuals. Then there is the chapter with the ironical title, "The Joys of Bureaucracy." Here the author describes the difficulties under which liberated Poland was forced to function.

Mrs. Hotchkiss' book is written in a rambling, readable style. If at times the paragraphs on political history seem lengthy, this minor detraction is excusable because the subject discussed is a timely one. Home to Poland bring the reader to a realization of what is happening in Communist-controlled countries and makes him glad that his homeland is America.

STEPHANIE UMBACH

AMERICAN ENGLISH

By Albert H. Marckwardt (Oxford University Press, $4.50)

THE HUMANITY OF WORDS

By Bess Sondel (World, $4.00)

Intended for laymen, these two guides to the power of language are timely and inexpensive. Each book serves the cause of effective communication, an area of our human relations which is receiving revitalized attention in our tenuous times. The authors are professors at, respectively, the University of Michigan and the University of Chicago.

Subtitled "A Primer of Semantics," The Humanity of Words groups its 48 chapters around the following five units: How the Communication Process Relates to Man; an Analysis of The Meaning of Meaning by C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards; an Analysis of Science and Sanity by Alfred Korzybski; an Analysis of Signs, Language and Behavior and of The Open Self by Charles Morris; and Miss Sondel's own Field Theory of Communication. By presenting basic principles of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, the evaluation of all three major book-sources of semantic theory proceeds convincingly to its motivated emphasis on thinking. At times there is abstract terminology; not enough, however, to mar the cogency of this Field Theory. A selective bibliography is included.

Enjoyable beyond expectation is the best description of American English. Its nine chapters inductively trace geographic, historic, and psychological threads so gracefully that you put the book down reluctantly. You readers who know H. L. Mencken's The American Language volumes, or G. P. Krapp's The English Language in America will find this 1958 presentation of U.S. Eng.
lish more spirited and up-to-date. A concise work, it is full of surprising morsels of information about the words we use; e.g. the section on "The Language of the Colonists" has significant etymologies from Indian, French, Spanish, Dutch, German, and other sources plus the obvious English. Like Margaret Nicholson's recent A Dictionary of American-English Usage, which is based on Fowler's Modern English Usage, Marekwardt's lively book deserves a place on every reference bookshelf.

HERBERT H. UMBACH

TV AND OUR SCHOOL CRISIS

By Charles A. Siepmann (Dodd, Mead, $3.50)

This volume is referred to as "the first authoritative report to the public on the possibilities of television in schools and colleges." Educational television, like its predecessors, educational radio and educational films, is creating only a ripple on the American school scene. In an attempt to influence a wider audience, Mr. Siepmann has cleverly omitted the horrid word "education" from the title and added the popular phrase, "school crisis."

Unfortunately, the author is now committed to discuss both topics. The combination leads Mr. Siepmann to the dubious conclusion that educational television is the answer to the problems facing American schools.

Admitting the limits of available research and a realistic listing of the objections and problems involved in educational television does not necessarily qualify this report as an objective study. The answers given the critics and the solutions to the problems tend to label it as mere educational propaganda. One cannot answer the problem of cost by merely stating, "Whatever the figure turns out to be, it will not exceed our national resources. Not our capacity, but our will, to pay — that is the question."

"To pay" remains the big question in the solution of many problems facing American education. We were not convinced that they pay for educational television is the best answer.

DON ROSENBERG

MAN AND NUMBER

By Donald Smelitzer (Emerson, $2.50)

This little hard-cover book is sub-titled, "An account of the development of man's use of number through the ages." The book has the size and shape of an unambitious paperback. It should have been one.

The author, formerly Lecturer in Education, King's College, Newスクorpon Tyne, is completely correct when, in his preface, he says, "My indebtedness to the writers referred to in the bibliography, and especially to Dr. D. E. Smith, will be apparent to anyone familiar with their works. I cannot claim any particular origi-
nality for the material which I have presented . . . " His discussion of man's learning to count, learning to write numbers, and seeking to calculate with greater ease is nothing if not standard. After discussing "the modern number system," with the usual juxtaposition of the observation that man has ten fingers and that he nowadays employs a decimal system, Mr. Smelitzer makes the (usual) sound observation that a duodecimal system would give us certain advantages but the switchover period would be chaotic.

The publication of this work for the general reader would be justified if the book appeared in thirty-five-cent form. But when the publishers ask two-fifty — well, duty demands that we say a mistake is being made.

MAN HUNT IN KENYA

By Ian Henderson (Doubleday, $3.95)

This book describes the campaign carried out during the first ten months of 1956 by the Government of Kenya in order to bring to justice the Mau Mau leader, Dedan Kimathi. Mr. Henderson, who is connected with the Special Branch Detachment of the Kenya police, planned and led the whole procedure. The key to the success of this project lay in the author's familiarity with the Kikuyu people, their customs, and their language. This knowledge enabled him to persuade terrorists to break the hideous oaths by which they were bound and to assist the government, while pretending still to be Mau Mau devotees. As the number of "pseudo-gang" members increased, so did the danger of treachery. The operation was ingeniously planned, and quietly, patiently, courageously executed. It was successfully concluded with the capture of Kimathi, who was tried and hanged for his many crimes.

The author tells an involved story with clarity, relates details of Mau Mau activity without luxuriating in their gruesomeness, and further earns the reader's gratitude by narrating his own exploits (which brought him two George medals) with unobtrusive modesty.

THE EDGE OF TOMORROW

By Thomas A. Dooley (Farrar, $3.75)

Here is told the story of a medical mission instigated, financed, and carried out by the author in the Kingdom of Laos. It began in July, 1956, and lasted for sixteen months. Aided by three ex-Navy friends, and, later, by two Notre Dame students, Dr. Dooley fought all the types of disease which occur wherever filth, poverty, and ignorance are prevalent. He was the only doctor of medicine by international standards in a country of two million inhabitants, with the exception of the one who served as Minister of Health. He and his companions won the respect and gratitude of Laotian government officials and of countless patients.

Back in the United States, Dr. Dooley persuaded the International Rescue Committee to change its charter in order to enable it to sponsor medical teams to be sent to areas critical to us. Thus was formed MEDICO (Medical International Cooperation), a division of IRC. Dr. Gordon Seagrave now heads this work in Burma; Dr. Dooley returns to Laos; four other teams were being shaped as the book went to press.

The author writes: "I wanted to show how vast the horizons of the spirit can be. And especially I wanted to show that we Americans possess an instrument not too well developed, more powerful than any bomb yet devised. It is the force that can relieve ugliness and tragedy. It is the force of gentleness." More power to him.

YOUTH DESERVES TO KNOW

By G. Curtis Jones (Macmillan, $2.95)

This is a compact, readable hand-book for young people regarding some of the prominent problems of Western society and how men and women can best meet them. Youth Deserves to Know is relevant for youth and youth workers. Forthright, chaste, humorous, clergyman Jones handles the more difficult topics like Sex and Marriage with courage and care, and has included hard-hitting chapters on Drinking, Freedom, and Security. Because of its brevity, it lacks detailed analysis of problems; it would therefore not serve as a class-room text or source-book, but rather as a quick reference of short readings on pertinent topics. There is just enough virile discontent with a life of ease and comfort and with religious complacency to disturb at least some of its readers. Recommended for high school students and college freshmen.

OLIVER E. GRAEBNER

BELOW THE SURFACE

Alice I. Hazeltine, comp. (Abingdon Press, $3.95)

Anyone with the status of teen-ager, grandparent, or something in between, will enjoy this book if he likes to read about the discovery of treasure or vanished cities; underwater adventures or exploration of caves. Each of the seventeen chapters is reprinted from a book or magazine article. They are almost equally divided between underground and underwater discoveries and experiences. Some of the more well-known authors represented are: J. Y. Cous- teau, William Beebe, Alan Moorehead. Subjects range from a sandhog's job in the Holland tunnel to Schliemann's discovery of Troy.

Even though you may have read some, or most, of the material in its original, you will find this compilation interesting.

THE CRESSET
FICTION

BALTHAZAR

By Lawrence Durrell (Dutton, $3.50)

Lawrence Durrell is trying something new in the field of the novel. He is writing what he calls a four-decker novel, of which Justine was the first and Balthazar the second of the four. Based on the author's conception of the relativity proposition, the first three novels do, and will, represent space, and the fourth time. Consequently, Balthazar is not a sequel, but a "sibling." Each novel should be complete in itself and, for the most part, is, though readers of Justine finished the book with many questions unanswered.

The narrator of both novels, Darley, is a man of whom we know little except that he is an Irish school teacher turned writer. (The projected third novel will feature Darley as a character, rather than as narrator.) This time, however, most of his material is furnished by a friend, Balthazar, a psychiatrist, who comments on their mutual friends described in Justine. It appears that Balthazar knew these friends better than did Darley, and, as a result, when these characters are viewed from a totally different angle, many of the questions raised in the first novel are answered.

Alexandria, a city of beauty and evil, is again the setting, and Justine, the beautiful Egyptian Jewess, married to the Coptic official, is still the principal character. From this new point of view it is clear Justine is not in love with the narrator, as he supposed, but with the famous English novelist, Pursewarden. These four, plus the subsidiary characters, Narour, Nessim's brother, Clea, the artist, and Scobia, a policeman, go through most of the same motions as in the previous novel — except each ends with a different murder — but this new perspective helps to advance the author's theme, which is essentially an investigation of modern love.

The reader will have difficulty identifying with a few of the characters, since this circle of friends, either because they are so extraordinary and exotic, or because they live in this particular time and place, operate outside any known moral code.

What makes this novel important is that its author seems to be succeeding in his experiment, and more important, he is one of the best novelists of our day, writing with a vigorous and beautiful style which often brings his prose quite close to poetry.

THE BRIDES OF SOLOMON AND OTHER STORIES

By Geoffrey Household (Little, Brown, $3.75)

So much experimentation has gone on in the field of the short story in the last couple of decades that it is a rarity to find a good author writing short stories in the old tradition, stories with a beginning, a middle, and an end, in which the subject is covered concisely and completely and the reader is left with a feeling of satisfaction. Such a writer is Geoffrey Household, and this collection of his short stories is a great reading pleasure.

These sixteen stories are for the most part adventure stories, and they are set — in a wide variety of locations, in the Middle East, in South America, in Africa, and in Europe. Longest and best of the stories is "The Case of Valentin Lecormier," a witty, first-person account of a French Foreign Legion deserter, hiding in Syria, who is writing an explanation of his experiences to French officials so that his children will be recognized as French citizens. It is a story with sufficient material to fill a book in itself, and it is an example of Household's ability that he has been able to compress Lecormier's misadventures without losing any of the excitement or the clarity.

"The Brides of Solomon," the title story of the visit to a saintly missionary in the Brazilian jungle by a bishop's representative and a district official, is the best known of the stories, and it is a good example of the use of the O. Henry technique of sustained suspense until the last relieving line. These are not essentially humorous stories, but each has its touches of wit and humor. They are primarily stories in which plot is all-important and character development is secondary. Unusual for a collection of this type, these stories are not uneven in quality but are all of a consistently high level.

ST. DINGAN'S BONES

By Julian Callender (Vanguard, $3.50)

If rated by a laugh meter, this short novel would hardly register on the decibel scale. The muted punch line and skillful understatement prohibit any guffaws, but a very shy, quiet sense of humor, eliminating throughout the malicious in favor of the sly, keeps the whole story deceptively light.

The author's style reminds me of an invalid I once met who had a very rich sense of humor, but who spoke always so softly and gently that one had to strain to hear his asides to the conversation that babbled on around him. Perhaps this suggests why the book stands up so well for repeated readings: one doesn't have to strain so much to hear the asides the second time through.

Then, too, Mr. Callender — a pen name — has roughed in a surprising amount of fine-lined characterization in a very limited amount of space. Each of the many characters introduced is a fairly stock one, but each retains an individual personality. And even if style and characters are secondary in light reading, and all you require is a good story, the author has provided that. Merely place a far from homogeneous group of people into a quiet Irish village when some typical Irish children see a vision and find a bone. With Mr. Callender's very witty assistance, all one could ask for is a few uninterrupted hours to enjoy the book.

ALAN GRAEBNER

THE SOUTHERN WILD

By Ruth Chatterton (Doubleday, $4.50)

This novel suffers from too great length, excess of violence in the action, implausibility of characterization, inaccuracy in its persistent use of dialect. A small town in an unnamed Southern state is the scene of conflict between two groups of characters, each group composed of both whites and Negroes. One represents entrenched, traditional attitudes supposedly still existing between Negroes and white people of the older generation; the other represents present-day camaraderie supposedly existing between the younger members of the two races. Verisimilitude is completely lacking. In addition, inability (alas! only too common) to distinguish between tolerance and sentimentality leads the "good guys," apparently with the author's approval, to endorse some dubious moral values.
The Republican campaigners charge that Reuther is "Reutherizing" the Democratic Party.

With eyes turned to heaven and with a "Lord, deliver us" on their lips, they maintain steadfastly that this is true and that this is bad.

What is involved in these claims? For one answer, we can turn to one of the more ardent advocates of this approach, Judge Roland J. Steinle of Wisconsin. Formerly a Wisconsin Supreme Court judge, he is now campaigning to keep Senator William ("Billion Buck") Proxmire in Wisconsin after the November senatorial election.

Basically, he is saying the following all over the state: "Proxmire is just another link in the chain for a Reutherized America and I pledge that if I am sent to Washington, I won't kowtow to the labor barons and I won't catch pneumonia every time they sneeze."

But is not only the Democratic Party and the likes of Bill Proxmire that are diseased. He has also accused the leaders of the Farmers Union in Wisconsin of "indisputably selling out the membership of the organization" to big, bad labor leaders. And if this happens, the fury of hell is not far behind: "Once these labor bosses are supreme in the control of the nation and the state, the farmer will be their captive. Unquestionably the farmer will best protect his interest by keeping his farm organization unlinked with political parties. The farmer's bargaining opportunity in the market place and with labor and industry will fast be impaired if he permits his leaders to cast his lot completely with a political party."

The assumption seems to be in this somewhat garbled statement above: if the farmer casts his lot with the Democratic Party, he has cast his lot with Walter Reuther; and if he casts his lot with Reuther, he will just have become another link in the great conspiracy of a "Reutherized" America.

The "Reutherized" constituents of this conspiracy are said to be primarily the CIO and the UAW, the ADA'ers, the spenders of the New Deal, G. Mennen Williams, Hubert Humphrey, John Kennedy, and Adlai Stevenson. Conversely, the soul-mates of Judge Steinle are people like William Jenner and Harold Handley of Indiana, Clarence Manion also of Indiana, Barry Goldwater of Arizona, and William Knowland of California.

And lately, I am beginning to think that Vice-President Nixon has returned to the ranks of the traditional Republicans. In a speech at Indianapolis (September 29, 1958), it has been reported that he orated as follows: "If more Democrats are elected to Congress this year, they will unquestionably be radical ADA-type Democrats; and we will all be in for a wild spending binge by radical Democrats drunk with visions of votes and not pink but dead elephants."

And during this speech, the congressional candidate from the second district of Indiana, Charles A. Halleck, was reading the newspaper. We wondered how many people noticed this!

Is there any symbolism in Halleck's reading of the newspaper on the same stage from which the Vice-President was speaking? Was Charlie really saying: Now, Dick, you are no longer my kind of a Republican; this is not what the President has stood for all these years! Or was he saying: Hey, say, just what kind of a game am I caught in now?

We are wondering too what the game of forces does have in store for the two major parties. I am quite certain that 1958 is going to be a Democratic year. But what does this mean? Does this mean that the Democrats are still running on the New Deal and the Fair Deal?

If a Democratic year implies a return to radicalism, I do not think that it will be that kind of radicalism. Samuel Lubell has this to say in a syndicated column: "However heavy the Democratic gains this November may prove, it would be a mistake to interpret them as an indication that the country is turning back to either Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal or Harry Truman's Fair Deal."

It is a mistake to roar back to the thirties and the forties. But we are still hearing the same lines: from the Democrats, that the Republicans will drive us down the way Hoover took us; from the Republicans, that the Democrats will lead us the way of Roosevelt's wars.

It is childish to stand on political platforms that are thirty and forty years old. It is time to read the paper!
A new season in TV viewing is under way. Some old favorites are back, and many new programs have made their debuts. The fate of all these programs - old and new - may be said to be in the hands of "the four horsemen of the co-axials." This is the unflattering term used by the industry for the four powerful TV-rating services: A. C. Neilson Co.; Trendex, Inc.; Pulse, Inc.; American Research Bureau.

In an address to the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Representative Emmanuel Celler, of New York, said that, in his opinion, these services constitute "the soulless evaluation of the artistry of a human performance." He deplored the fact that sponsors and advertising agencies place undue emphasis on the figures compiled by the rating services. As a result of this practice, he charged, "what most people want, all people get." Some time ago the New York World Telegram and Sun published a series of articles titled Murder by Decimal. Here, too, "the four horsemen of the co-axials" came in for harsh criticism.

The September issue of Harpers carries Bernard Asbell's excellent article TV Ratings - What They Really Mean. Mr. Asbell not only explains the manner in which the four principal rating services operate but discusses as well the effect ratings have on what we see and hear on television. In addition, he examines various changes and remedies which have been proposed to bring about a more accurate and comprehensive evaluation of TV programs. If you wish to know more about TV-rating systems, by all means read Mr. Asbell's absorbing account.

Advance publicity blurbs claim that this is to be "a very special season" on the three major networks. ABC has announced several new westerns, at least two musical extravaganzas starring Bing Crosby, a visit with the world-famous humanitarian Albert Schweitzer, and - to go from the sublime to the ridiculous - a new daytime series featuring Liberace.

NBC inaugurated the fall season with a parade of stars, among them Milton Berle, known as Mr. Television, and veteran comedian Ed Wynn, on the Steve Allen show. On the same evening and at the same hour Ed Sullivan presented many of the big-name personalities who will be seen on CBS during the coming months.

CBS opened the fall season with two outstanding productions. The Plot to Kill Stalin (Playhouse 90) featured an all-star cast in a dramatic, suspense-filled re-creation of a crucial period in recent history. Earlier in the same week Mary Chase's engaging and imaginative fantasy Harvey was presented under the sponsorship of the Du Pont Company.

Harvey has won many honors and awards on the legitimate stage and on the motion-picture screen. The TV production was equally noteworthy. Art Carney gave a superb performance in the role of the gentle, introspective Edward P. Dowd. Marian Lorne was completely captivating as Vita, the fluttery, long-suffering sister. Both stars received splendid support from a fine cast. Much of the success of the presentation must be attributed to George Schaefer's excellent direction.

Incidentally, for the first time in television history New York critics were invited to attend the final dress rehearsal of a "live" network program. Reviews of the dress rehearsal of Harvey actually appeared in print in advance of the premiere performance. It will be interesting to see whether this daring experiment catches on. The dangers and drawbacks inherent in such a procedure are obvious. It puts everyone on the spot, as it were - sponsors, producers, and, of course, the critics. A successful dress rehearsal does not necessarily insure an equally successful network presentation.

Another experiment in television got underway recently. For the first time a TV college course with college credits has been offered to viewers. The experiment is sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and is financed in part by the Ford Foundation and in part by industry. The program is being carried by NBC. St. Louis can boast of a fine, highly successful educational TV channel. KETC has been on the air since September 20, 1954. Each year has seen an increase in the number and variety of programs presented. KETC will carry the courses presented by the College of the Air.

Space permits only a brief mention of current film releases. Warfare and the aftermath of war are depicted in The Hunters (20th Century-Fox) and in Imitation General (Warners). By and large, movie-going has been dull in recent weeks. Two sparkling comedies relieved the tedium: The Matchmaker (Paramount) and The Reluctant Debutante (M-G-M). More movies next month.
The Beauty of Holiness

A strange, mysterious and almost forgotten combination of words... beauty and holiness... Outside of the pages of Holy Writ they seldom stand near each other in modern speech... Even the word "holiness" is not used very often when we are talking about people... Perhaps there is a certain humility behind this... We are aware of the fact that none of us is perfect... that we are sinners... and that whatever is good and holy in us comes from Him who came from heaven to give it to us on a Cross... Holiness is, therefore, a free and given thing... the greatest gift of God to man...

And yet... even though it is a free gift of God we must speak about it occasionally as the possession of the human soul, for it is holiness and holiness alone in the minds and hearts of the children of the Cross which offers any hope to our dying world and any sound compelling basis for true Christian service... Just what is it... Certainly divine revelation makes it clear that it is a deep, pervading consciousness of the will of God for ourselves and our lives... a nobility of soul... a great measure of constancy and self-discipline... an ever growing effort as the years pass to become what God wants us to be and what He has given us the power to be by the dynamic of the Cross... His loving, following, remembering, obedient children... 

Certainly now in 1958 much could be said about the world's tragic need of holiness, our own forgetfulness of it and its potential meaning for the future... These lines, however, want to point out only one thing about it... its incredible, unearthly beauty... the mysterious beauty of holiness... Perfect beauty, as perfection in everything else, belongs only to God... It follows that those who love Him must share in His beauty for he who has God has everything... It is axiomatic that it is only the life of holiness that is beautiful in itself that makes the lives of others more beautiful... It brings beauty into life because it brings God into it... The lives of the true children of God may be marred and scarred by sickness and age, but there will always shine through them that beauty which nothing but sin can take away... The beauty of holiness cannot be touched or changed by the years for it is the beauty of God Himself in Whom there is no shadow or change or pain or varibleness of turning...

Certainly one of the great experiences of life is to see the reflection of that beauty in the lives of others... the strange beauty of the sacrificing mother, the faithful sister, the loving father... All these are greater than the passing beauty of face and skin... It is one of the surpassing joys of life to see this beauty in men and women, their humility before God and man, their perfect joy and peace... They and they alone have the beauty of surrender of love, of mercy, of God Himself touching us with the sunlight of heaven...

Certainly the world would be much better off if there were a few in each generation who would seek and hold the beauty of holiness... It is not mere pious sentimentality to say that ultimately this is the answer to our personal problems and the problems of the world... Today we are again confused by many voices... We often do not know what to do... It is well, therefore, for us to remember that a good man long ago, who did not know where to turn or what to do, went up a mountain side into a cave and waited for God to tell him what was coming next... There was, you will remember, a great and strong wind but God was not in it... After the wind there was an earthquake, but God was not there... Then came a fire, but He was not there... Then finally at last and mysteriously and strangely there came a still, small voice and Elijah knew what he must do... Holiness had touched him with its power and its beauty... This is still the ultimate goal of the intelligent and Christian life...

His is the gentle voice we hear, Soft as the breath of even, That checks each fault, that calms each fear, And speaks of Heaven.

This is it... the gentle voice of God speaking above the voices of the world, beyond the Babel and confusion of our time, enlightening us, strengthening us, calling us to the beauty of holiness... And beyond it He calls us to the long, lovely, holy days that will never end and for which there will be no vespers and no compline... The holy days of eternal recreation in heaven... when all that is ugly and dark will disappear in the eternal, perfect beauty of perfect holiness... To seek it even now and to know it at least in part is the greatest experience of life...