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The Cresset
The Alumni
In a Family Way

As excellent as a Valparaiso University education can be, some recent graduates are surprised to discover that one of their social functions and divine services is rearing a family. Prepared for all else, some find the arrival of a family something of a shock. And while a family is more than a "social function" and "divine service," it is probably the most important civic responsibility and stewardship of creation most alumni undertake in their lives.

Alumni letters about their families over the last decade often reduce me to laughter and tears—and alert me to the possibility that universities like mine do a perfectly awful job teaching students about their coming families. It is obvious that most students will rear families, but probably few universities adequately teach students the obvious and still fewer teach them how to think about the obvious.

Our November alumni contribution to IN LUCETUA helps us do some of that important thinking. Mark R. Schwehn, like the various writers in the series of articles the Cresset has recently run on the family, assesses the pressures on the contemporary family, identifies pressures moving the family toward renewal, and warns against pressures moving the family toward anomie and accidie.

Having served his senior year as Student Senate president, Mr. Schwehn graduated from the University in 1967. He returned to Alma Mater to undertake major work on the 1968 Student Summer Task Force Report on education at Valparaiso University, a document which inspired several of the general education reforms at the University in the early 1970's. Mr. Schwehn took his Danforth Fellowship to Stanford University where he earned his Ph.D. in history and humanities. This past April his dissertation won the Allen Nevins Prize awarded annually by the Society of American Historians for the most distinguished doctoral thesis in the field of American History.

In his immediate post-doctoral years, Mr. Schwehn was a William Rainey Harper Fellow at the University of Chicago where he is today Assistant Professor of Humanities in The College. He and his wife Ricki now worship at Grace Church, an independent Lutheran congregation in River Forest, Illinois.

He is presently polishing the publication manuscript for his doctoral dissertation on Henry Adams and writing a new work on the American novelist, Herman Melville. In moments free for worry he asks himself "what it means to be a son and/or father in American culture."

The Cresset welcomes alumnus Schwehn to IN LUCETUA.

The Editor

IN LUCETUA

The Disenchantment of the Family

Mark R. Schwehn

For a great number of my contemporaries, the political action of the 1960s never ended. Rather, it left the streets and moved indoors. The rhetorical energy, the moral and intellectual seriousness, and the fierce combative spirit that fueled the anti-war protest movement a decade ago have been redirected into a sometimes silly and often destructive process of transforming the family into a political arena. When we said that the war in Vietnam had finally come home, we spoke better than we knew. Today too many of us ignore South Africa, the Middle East, and Cambodia while we prepare a systematic domestic policy that will withstand the most careful theoretical scrutiny of our politically minded friends.

Consider the following episode. In anticipation of our firstborn, my wife Ricki and I began attending classes on childbirth and parenting. During the third session in a series of ten, the instructor addressed herself to the topic of husband-wife teamwork during labor. Early in her presentation, she issued the following directive to the husbands: "During labor your wife will often reach out to you for support. When she does so, do not hold her hand. Rather, stroke her forearm very gently. Handholding is a gesture of dependence, and you do not want to begin your family with the wife in a position of dependence upon her husband. This will have very destructive long-term implications. Arm-stroking on the other hand is a gesture of support among equals."

Notice first of all that Ricki and I were in a classroom. Ten years ago we were criticizing our school for standing in loco parentis. Today we are going back to school to learn how to be parents. Instead of pondering Marx's labor theory of value, we are wondering about the value of La Maze's labor theory. These ironies seem innocent enough. Indeed, though we withdrew from the class in question, we have since enrolled in another one. And, given the alternatives available to us these days, we would recommend some sort of childbirth class to all prospective parents.
Two other aspects of this incident seem quite distressing, however, and they reflect certain cultural trends that are already alarmingly widespread. Notice that the instructor made reference to the vague, but nonetheless menacing, long-term implications of what would appear to be a rather simple gesture. This pernicious notion that every little squeeze and stroke, every frown or smile, and every cry or gurgle might well have horrendous long-term consequences upon both parents and children has become an article of faith within the burgeoning childbirth and parental guidance industry. The notion has the effect of eroding parents' confidence in their own ability and authority, and of increasing their dependence upon teachers, therapists, doctors, nurses, and the rest of the helping professions. And of course it creates unspeakable fears in the minds of the parents. Think of the untold horrors inflicted upon parents and children in this century alone by the sinister practice of hand-holding!

Notice finally that the instructor interpreted a spontaneous gesture of affection as an act of domination. To a generation trained by necessity and experience to see political implications in everything, such interpretations have become habitual. The civil rights movement, the anti-war movement, the feminist movement, and other liberation movements fed into one another in ways that we still do not altogether understand. But whatever the full story, we have inherited an acute self-consciousness about our roles as husbands and wives, a growing body of family law, and a tendency to separate sex from sentiment. In short, we have politicized the family to an extent that was previously unthinkable. Hand-holding has come to be seen as an expression of power.

**Let Us Remember Families Are Particulars, Not Universals**

Why all this fuss over a bad childbirth class session? Three reasons. First of all, the whole question of socialization, the means by which children become citizens, promises to become the most searching and urgent public question of our time. Indeed, the question of the extent to which child-rearing should be a public matter might be the most fundamental issue for debate. Second, the choice to regard the polity as one large family or alternatively to regard the family as but a little kingdom are options both of which have profoundly disturbing cultural consequences. Third, many of us have set a very perilous course for ourselves by our efforts to rationalize child-rearing. The course is perilous, because it is foredoomed to failure. Since the problem of socialization is so complicated and so momentous, I can only offer the following scattered suggestions as stimuli to your own thinking on these matters.

I. I concede to my social-science-minded friends that the family is in part a configuration of power relationships and that, up to a point, it can be profitably regarded as a political institution. I concede to my female friends that my own hitherto complacent attitude toward politicizing the family derived in part from the fact that the dominant political form of family life has been patriarchal in this country, and that my current fears must in part spring from a perceived threat to this pattern of authority. Yet I must remind all of my friends that the family is not simply or even mainly a political institution and that those who have chosen to so regard it have found the most tragic unhappiness. William James once agreed that from one point of view Beethoven symphonies were just so much horse hair on so much cat gut. Reductionist views of symphonies and families have this much in common: they both miss life's music. If you doubt the dire consequences of treating what is private and emotional as something public and rational, of confusing realms as it were, you might turn to three dramatizations of the problem: *Oedipus Rex*, *King Lear*, and *Billy Budd*.

II. I think we need a basic strategy for dealing with the "helping professions": social workers, nurses, doctors, psychologists, childbirth instructors, and lawyers. I propose that we seek counsel and aid so long as we feel that the education we receive at the hands of these "experts" enhances our own sense of self-worth and self-confidence as parents. As soon as we feel less worthy or more dependent as a result of some book or lecture or course of instruction, we should, I think, abandon the process regardless of its source or its substance. At least we should be extremely wary of those who seem eager to help us lose faith in ourselves.

III. I think we should very often remind ourselves and each other of an obvious truth: human beings, large and small, and even family units are particulars, not universals. Parents learn this soon enough, for one of the greatest gifts that their little ones give them is a daily stubborn refusal to conform to all the descriptive norms that have been put forward in the literature about children. Even so, many of us vainly imagine that there is a right way and a wrong way to raise children, that there exists some universal standard against which we can measure our performance as parents. We are accordingly disposed to be excessively critical of or excessively threatened by others who have chosen to rear their children in different ways. If we remember that we are particulars, we can free ourselves from the haunting fear that someone somewhere might be right but that we are not that someone. Furthermore, we can applaud diversity rather than being threatened by it.

IV. I agree with Kenneth Keniston and the other good people who prepared the report for the Carnegie Council on Children when they say that "families are not now, nor were they ever, the self-sufficient building blocks of society, exclusively responsible, praiseworthy, and blamable for their own destiny. They are deeply influenced by broad social and economic forces over which they have no control." Such observations are salutary, because they ease our sense of failure by reminding us that the sources of some of our disappointments are not within the scope of our own powers. And by lending some historical perspective to discourse about the family, the
work of Keniston and others can soothe some of the more apocalyptic fears for our own culture (including the ones that I am occasionally prone to exhibit). The nuclear family with its deep affectional bonding is, after all, a rather recent and a rather rare occurrence in Western history.

Such consolations, however, can be insidious. Writings about the family will be increasingly filled with references to impersonal forces and other mysterious and polysyllabic agencies that are alleged to control our destinies. Most of these writings will be authored by social scientists or "helper" professionals. If so, you will be able to recognize them quite easily, because the inscrutable forces in charge of your fate will always have names ending in "tion," e.g. urbanization, industrialization, rationalization, and politicization. But besides making us talk like we have mush in our mouths, such abstract writing can make us forget that we ourselves or people very much like us created the economic and political order. Worse still, discourse about mysterious agencies has the often convenient consequence of making people more dependent upon the new secular priesthood of health care professionals.

Are We To Be Better Parents Than Our Parents?

Above all else we must resist the urge toward methodical rational manipulation of our families' lives. We will be told: "Never let your child cry for over five minutes without holding it; to do so will cause irremediable traumas." Or again: "It is best to share the child-rearing on a fifty/fifty basis between father and mother." We should respond to such advice with consideration but also with a firm determination not to confuse rules of thumb with political, moral, or ideological imperatives. We should furthermore recognize that morality entails the cultivation and exhibition of character more than the observance of rules and maxims. A sense of humor, courage, temperance, and devotion will make us much better parents than will scores of books offering the rules of family management or interpersonal relations. When we are told that because of our readiness to seek expert counsel and because of our own more advanced knowledge of the principles of parenting we will surely be better parents than our parents, we should recognize this assurance for what it is—an invitation to a sense of failure more profound than any our parents could ever have imagined.

Yet in the face of increasing appeals to intellectualize parenting, the greatest gift that we can give to one another is the gift of grace, of acceptance of self and of each other with all our inevitable disappointments. The radical antidote to methodical rationality is not irrationality or anti-intellectualism but grace, for grace removes the anxiety from the distinctions whose force we most feel as parents: right/wrong, success/failure, amateur/professional. We need not surrender our responsibility to the experts and the impersonal forces, nor need we retain a sense of guilt created by the pernicious desire for rational control. Grace lets us be responsible but forgiven, and more important still, it lets us give this same gift to our children.

The American family, Christopher Lasch has recently told us, is no longer a "haven in a heartless world." Perhaps not. But the family can and should continue to resist the grim process of rationalization that Max Weber believed was the inexorable destiny for modern men and women. Those who seek methodical mastery over an institution as fluid, as organic, as highly emotional, and as particular as the family are foredoomed to the most distressing experiences. But if they should ever succeed in achieving such control, the culture that ensues will probably look very much like the one that Weber himself outlined at the end of his most celebrated work. "Specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart, this nullity [will imagine] that it has attained a level of civilization never before achieved."

So when we begin to grow worried that we have failed to adopt and persist in the right method for raising our children, let us recall the advice that Creon once gave to Oedipus: "Do not seek to be master in everything." Of all the lessons that sons and daughters should have learned from the Vietnam War of the 1960s, this one could be and should be the most pertinent to those who have since become the parents of the 1970s.
I am keenly aware, on this occasion, of the bonds of our generation with the founders of the Lutheran University Association, the University's four prior presidents in its life under Lutheran auspices, and past and present members of the Board of Directors and administration, faculty, staff, and student body, Alumni Association and Guild, individual, congregational, and churchbody supporters and benefactors, and hosts of others through whose faith and vision, prayers and labor the University was adopted and nurtured.

In the two months since arriving on campus I have sought to grasp and appropriate something of Valpo's genesis and genius, heritage and hopes, problems and progress, potentialities and prospects particularly in its period of Lutheran sponsorship since 1925. It is perhaps understandable that on this day the inauguration messages of presidential predecessors have special significance.

For Dr. W. H. T. Dau, who assumed the presidency of the University in 1926, a program of higher education that would deal effectively with the relation of science and religion was a prominent concern of the members of the Lutheran University Association who assumed ownership of Valparaiso University the prior year as an institution of higher education for lay persons. It was the conviction of these laymen and clergy from congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Missouri, Ohio, and other states, Dr. Dau said in his inauguration message, that studies of the universe, with all its wonderful powers and mysterious workings, and studies dealing with man, should be pursued in the light of scriptural truth and the presence of the all-wise Creator and Ordainer of all that is. The sciences are not filled with threats to the student's faith, Dr. Dau declared, for the student is assured that the God who loved man when He might have cast him aside, and who secured man's righteousness in His sight by the sacrifice of His own Son, is the Lord of all creation. President Dau's view was that all studies of sciences and arts, pursued in this way, would give substance to the University's motto, "In luce tua videmus lucem."

Dr. O. C. Kreinheder, who came to the presidential office in 1930 when the Great Depression endangered the life of many social and educational institutions, declared that "the highest ideal of a noble life is the Christian ideal and the Christian ideal is the ideal of service."

President Kreinheder stressed as the University's mission service to the country through the education of men and women of Christian character, and service to the church by furnishing an educated laity. Dr. Kreinheder's administration provided critically important means to realize these goals by the establishment of the Alumni Association, The Valparaiso University Guild, and the Department of Public Relations and Development.

World War II had begun in Europe when Dr. O. P. Kretzmann assumed the presidency of the University. It was a time of twilight in the western world which, in Dr. Kretzmann's words, called his generation to turn again to those lights by which men find their way between eternities, light which will not die, through a quest for Truth which is greater than power and for wisdom which is sharper than the sword. For President Kretzmann, a university is essentially an association of free men and women in a community dedicated to the search for Truth, free and unbroken. The destiny of Valparaiso University, he said, does not lie in a negative approach to its problems and opportunities, saying "No" to reality, by ignoring the impact of science on the life and thought of man, the manifest tensions in the social order, and the constant crying need for intelligent reorientation as scholars throughout the world push back the horizons of man toward the unknown. Rather, the University must immediately and incessantly appropriate every newly discovered truth, place it in the permanent reference of eternal Truth, and lead in the progress of knowledge. Valparaiso University, in particular, must make men wise as well as scientific, give them understanding as well as knowledge, and make them noble as well as useful by recovering the one great fact the wayward world has forgotten: the reality of God and the individual's responsibility to Him, a responsibility which can be met only by the fact of the Atonement and the re-establishment of an intimate relationship with the Ruler of the Universe through Him who once entered the stream of time in order to tell men that they could know the Truth and that the Truth would make them free.
A new war in Indochina which divided the nation and brought unprecedented turmoil to college and university campuses was under way when Dr. A. G. Huegli succeeded Dr. Kretzmann ten years ago. Noting changes and tensions, conflicting demands and uncertainties all around, President Huegli in his inauguration address took up the matter of what it means to be a Christian University which maintains academic integrity with passionate concern for questions of ultimate social and moral significance. He set forth two major goals: (1) academic excellence through quality faculty committed to highest professional standards and students committed to quality in educational work; (2) educational freedom linked with spiritual commitment and academic dialogue which draws in Christian scholarship and traditions, resists fragmentation of learning, respects the wholeness of reality and the priority of ultimate issues, and "... continually underscores those values which are grounded in the law and love of God." Dr. Huegli identified five means to achieve these goals: (1) an accent on exciting and effective teaching; (2) liberal studies which free the mind to probe and penetrate beneath the surface; (3) attention to the student as an individual person; (4) building a campus community which, cherishing diversity of gifts while also prizing the bonds that bind together the life of students and faculty, calls for self-limitation of one's own freedom so that the benefit of all may be achieved, a community of concerned persons ready to support and help one another; (5) increased special service to the church and the local and Northwest Indiana community.

During the administrations of these presidents, the University confronted challenges and opportunities in a context of social and political upheaval and economic and institutional distress. This is a sobering and encouraging corrective to those of us facing the challenges of the 1980s who think that our times alone are out of joint. I shall not recite the familiar litany of financial, enrollment, and other problems now facing higher education.

The first point to be made by this fleeting review is that through divine blessing and the commitment and collaboration of untold members and supporters of the University family on and off campus, many of whom are here today, Valpo was able to confront its challenges, redeem its opportunities, and move into the mainstream of the American academic community as a notable national institution of Lutheran higher education. I wish to pay special tribute to Dr. Kretzmann, "The Pilgrim" through whose indomitable faith, vision and inspiring leadership Valpo came of age as a University. And I wish to pay equal tribute to Dr. Huegli, through whose solid academic statesmanship, administrative skill, and executive expertise Valpo has moved forward as a well respected university. It was in "the Huegli years" that the $28-million "Forward to the Eighties" program, now over ninety percent completed, was begun, through which, in large measure, the University has been judged by higher education authorities as financially "strong and gaining." Throughout fifty-three years the University has met its challenges. We have been bequeathed a most substantial legacy and notable heritage.

The second point to be made is that the thread which binds together the fabric of Valpo's history as a Lutheran university is the common commitment and shared vision of the members of the University community, on and off campus, during this half-century. In the remarks which follow I wish freely and joyfully to identify myself with the mission and heritage of this University under the Cross under the theme, "Promise and Calling, Purpose and Commitment."

**Promise**

The Church is a gift of God through His Spirit, who calls it into being by the Gospel, enlightens it with His gifts, sanctifies it and keeps it with Jesus Christ in the one true faith. Established in Christ as the adopted and redeemed people of God through Baptism, brought to repentance by God's Law, nourished in faith by Word and sacrament, and renewed by the gifts of the Spirit, the Church lives by the promises of God.

The people of God are summoned to live out their calling in a life of servanthood and of responsible citizenship in the social order. They are to work together to promote justice and seek the common good through individual action and by means of corporate activity. Valparaiso is one such means of corporate activity by Lutheran Christians who established the University to help men and women fulfill the potentialities, prepare for the personal and professional calling, and contribute to the well-being of church and society. Those who built this University trusted the promises of God. As an institution of higher education, the University is grounded in human nature. Man is created by God as an intellectual, moral, and social being who is
I have sought to grasp and appropriate something of Valpo's genesis and genius, heritage and hopes, problems and progress, potentialities and prospects particularly in its period of Lutheran sponsorship . . . . I wish freely and joyfully to identify myself with the mission and heritage of this University under the Cross . . . .

able to learn, to seek truth, and to gain knowledge, understanding and skill. The fact that men are not justified before God by knowledge or scientific and cultural achievement does not diminish the fact that education is the gift of the Creator. It is a means to enable human beings to develop their God-given abilities for personal and social uses. Effective teaching and learning, as well as sound scholarship, research, and creative work are in accord with the good and gracious will of God.

Valparaiso University is a community of learners—teachers and students—engaged in an earnest quest to understand more fully the demands upon life which God imposes and His gifts to them in nature, grace and reason. The basis for the creation and continuance of Valparaiso as a church-related university is its members' trust in the Word and promises of God. Those who built it trusted the Lord's promises. So may it continue to be in our time. This is our heritage. This is the source of our hope and courage for the future.

**Calling**

The call of God comes to each of us as individuals through the Gospel, which is the gift of forgiveness of sins and new life. God calls us to be who we are in Christ. This call, centered in the gracious presence among us of the living Christ, is the foundation of the calling we are to live out in our personal and social lives and in our station in life, whatever occupation or vocation or profession we pursue.

Valparaiso University has *its* calling. Although as a university it shares with other institutions of higher education many common academic characteristics, it is called to be what it is as a church-related university in the Lutheran confessional tradition.

In broadest terms, the calling of Valparaiso University is to assist the men and women it serves in developing all aspects of human character: spiritual, intellectual, personal, moral, social. In and through various formal studies and campus life and activities, the University is to exhibit concern for that wholeness of personality which marks the integral Christian person.

Central to the University's work is its calling to proclaim and teach the Gospel and provide settings and activities through which its members may experience a serious and sustained encounter with the Gospel. The University fosters Christian learning through theological instruction, particularly the study of sources and traditions of the Christian faith: Biblical and confessional theology, systematic and historical theology. There is concern for doctrine but not a doctrinaire approach in teaching. There is affirming instruction but in an atmosphere of mutual respect and trust in which teacher and students deal with one another as responsible individuals. The University calls upon its teachers of theology to be effective instructors and responsible scholars; indeed the quality of instruction in religious studies needs to equal or surpass the best offered in other disciplines and fields of study. There needs also to be provision for ongoing dialogue involving teachers of theology and teachers of the various arts and sciences disciplines, discourse which deals with topics and issues that appear at the interface of scientific, humanistic, and theological inquiry.

As an institution of higher education, Valparaiso's calling includes commitment to the quest for truth through study of the main areas of human knowledge. Work in classroom, library, laboratory, and studio is central to the calling of the University and in the lives of teachers and students. The University in *its esse* is an academic community—not in pejorative sense of the word "academic" as connoting abstruse and impractical knowledge, but in the proper sense of developing and using critical and constructive reason and creative imagination. The University affirms the high value of learning and a belief that knowledge and understanding, sought with vigor and applied with love, enhances human life. A primary part of the University's calling, therefore, is the pursuit of truth, the preservation, transmission, and augmentation of human knowledge and understanding, and the cultivation of creative and artistic expression through instruction in arts and sciences disciplines. The University carries on these activities, however, acknowledging that human knowledge is limited and that no system of knowledge is absolute. All that we know through the arts and sciences is what other minds
have made of them and what we ourselves can make of them. All knowledge has been fashioned by human beings—a truism that is often forgotten. Academic "subjects" are bodies of information and truth-claims made by human beings and reflect their ways of perceiving and judging, their interests, and their modes of interpretation and methods of inquiry. The accumulation of scattered, unrelated, and uninterpreted information is not education. Our goal in higher education is to present the disciplines of knowledge in such a way that no statement stands alone, divorced from its human creator.

Another aspect of the calling of the University is to provide settings in which ideas and issues—secular and religious, academic and social, ecclesiastical and political—may be freely presented, discussed, and studied. The allegiance Christians give to God, Who was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, is a giving of themselves to Him in whose service is perfect freedom. This includes the free and responsible use of the reasoning powers God has given them. The calling of the University does not lie in shielding students from uncommon ideas but in helping them to place all ideas and truth-claims in the kind of perspective which helps them to think about these ideas in light of all the rest we know, including the best we know. Freedom to teach and freedom to learn is not freedom from obedience to law but the responsibility to respect the law, the discipline, of inquiry and to resist the temptation to escape into trivial and time-consuming activities which deflect teachers and students from serious study, scholarship and professional activity. The teacher's freedom includes his responsibility to develop competence in his discipline and in the craft of teaching so that he knows what he teaches and how to teach it. Unless teachers exercise their freedom to pursue their disciplines and develop their teaching skills, they will have nothing to teach because they will not be masters of their disciplines. Students will have little to learn from teachers who have nothing to teach or who do not know how to teach. And the student's freedom to learn includes the responsibility to be engaged seriously in learning activities. Unless students devote time and energies to reading and study, they will learn little no matter how effectively their teachers teach.

Education at Valparaiso University is free for the Gospel, that is, free to let the Gospel be the Gospel. University teachers do not offer salvation through their disciplines and fields; the Gospel is not the work of professors or of curriculum committees, but is God's gift. Freedom for the Gospel is a voluntary and insistent refusal to make a "god" of human knowledge. Freedom to teach and learn, at Valparaiso University, calls upon teachers and students to acknowledge and appreciate the real but limited nature and uses of human knowledge, to let the Gospel be the Gospel, and to limit one's knowledge-claims to their areas of competence. Responsibility to the Gospel also entails pointing out false prophets and ideologies and showing that to make ultimate claims for human knowledge is fraudulent and obstructs the Gospel. The Gospel is best served by its forthright and unhindered proclamation and teaching and by no other means. This is why the University commits itself to the freedom that lets the Gospel be the Gospel and to intellectual freedom and responsibility in the disciplines of knowledge.

In the unrestrained and uncovered presentation and discussion of ideas and issues, the University is responsible to refrain from becoming an advocate of a particular social, political, or economic doctrine. The University's calling is not to espouse causes but to prepare students for participation in the world by an education which imparts understanding and moral discernment. The University must resist those who, in the interest of their own cause, seek to prevent free inquiry or to use the University to advance their particular cause. To fulfill its calling the University must keep its integrity.

From this discussion of the academic dimensions of the calling of members of the University community, it might seem that students and teachers are disembodied intellects. Of course this is not so. The University joyfully affirms the holistic nature of the human being as an integral person: body, mind, and spirit. The life of the mind cannot be separated from the lived world where we act and feel and interact with others and where we live out our values and commitments. Along with concern for academic learning there is concern to create and sustain a community of care for one another by persons who respect and love each other.
Liberal studies are needed and the time has come for an open, straightforward defense of liberal arts education. Out of new values gained and older values refined, liberally educated persons learn new obligations for themselves, new disciplines for life, and some creative renunciations.

As a living-learning community, the University views its calling as not confined to classroom, library, laboratory, and studio but as including our common life in residence halls, on playing fields and gymnasias, and the whole of social, cultural, and recreational life and activities on campus. Physical and manual activities help the student gain self-understanding, awareness of his emotions and how to cope with them, and awareness of his potentialities and limitations. Self-awareness, emotional expression and control, and effective inter-personal relationships provide bases for personal unity and stability. Friends, roommates, peer groups, and student culture set the framework and living patterns of student life. Residence halls and campus activities, vital elements of the living-learning community, deserve and receive careful and caring attention of members of the University family.

Valparaiso has a special responsibility and opportunity to provide members of the community with regular services of worship and to sensitize its members to the central place that proclamation of the Gospel, prayer, and the celebration of the Eucharist have in the Christian life. The University also offers a variety of forms and processes for providing pastoral counseling and care to meet the needs of students and contribute to their well-being. The intent is to help the student understand and accept himself as an adopted member of God's family who is liberated by the Lord of the Church for wholeness of being, fullness of living, and a life of service.

The calling of the University includes offering means for spiritual formation, serious academic activity, free and responsible inquiry, and meaningful social, cultural and residence hall life. Valpo seeks to keep hearing and heeding this call.

**Purpose and Commitment**

Valparaiso University is in sound shape today in most of its essential features. Our generation inherits a rich legacy and noble heritage. But there are challenges to meet, new tasks to take up, if the University is to keep moving forward. Following are some of the challenges which should engage our early attention.

1. In our complex social order, students, parents and others are concerned with the question of what kind of higher education prepares best for specific careers in vocational and professional life. Enrollments in liberal arts programs have stabilized or declined while those in vocational and professional fields are growing. In many places growing specialization of studies is squeezing liberal studies out of the curriculum. A vibrant and viable university will insist that both liberal and professional programs be of high quality. The fundamental question is how to instill in students not only professional capabilities but also intellectual and moral competences that can steer developments in science and technology along humane lines. Liberal studies are needed and the time has come for an open, straightforward defense of liberal arts education.

A truly liberal education is one that forms, guides, and nurtures persons who know how to think, to express their thoughts, to receive the thoughts of others; persons who can follow the lights and shadows of a printed page, discerning what is central and what is secondary; persons who have gained control of methods of acquiring knowledge that will lessen their ignorance as time goes by and afford them ways of continuing their education throughout their lives. The liberally educated person has gained perspective through knowledge of the natural world, of the scientist's methods, and basic truths about society. Music, art, literature, history, philosophy, theology, and the social sciences are not means of escape or unnecessary appendages to human understanding but are sources of high values. Liberal studies provide for breadth, open the student to alternatives, and allow for changes in direction and lateral movement as interests enlarge, clarify, and alter. Out of new values gained and older values refined, liberally educated persons learn new obligations for themselves, new disciplines for life, and some creative renunciations. Enduring values and principles persist beyond the shifting data of existence and abide in spite of changing fashions in the world. Liberal education is no sleek adventure in shrewdness and calculating self-advancement. It has
one objective above all others: to open the mind and heart, under God's law and promises, to the highest excellence and most significant life possible. Liberal studies are humane but they also give vocational help to the learner. For the future business and professional person, they offer a basis for associative thinking, applying the experience and methods of one field to problems of another, and means for carrying on one's own education after graduation from the university. All this is clearly a "vocational" asset, even when vocation is too narrowly defined in terms of occupation or job alone. More broadly, liberal studies can provide a disposition to view all one does as part of his Calling, all of life as of a piece. Those who represent the University in admissions activities and in any other way need to "get this story out" to prospective students and others.

We need to provide meaningful commonality in our undergraduate programs, scrapping the cafeteria-line approach to the general studies curriculum, by defining anew the meaning and nature of undergraduate general education in terms of essential learning. The Educational Policies Committee of the University Senate is to be encouraged in the work it is now doing along these lines. We need also to recognize the interdependence of professional and liberal learning, to promote better integration of professional and liberal studies, and to find new ways to relate and apply academic learning in concrete situations, and to provide experiences that link academic disciplines with social, professional, and vocational realities and that relate theory and practice in the world. A marriage of the theoretical and the concrete, of the academic and the instrumental, is both possible and beneficial and is not inimical to the life of mind or hostile to academic standards or subversive of continuing commitment to the preparation of young people for the higher professions. Students and faculty can make optimum use of the University's Counseling Center and career planning program by exploring careers for which liberal studies provide effective preparation.

2. The lesson drawn by Joseph in Egypt, in interpreting Pharaoh's dream as signifying that seven years of rich harvest would be followed by seven lean years, and the need to redeem the time during the seven "rich" years, is instructive for us today. Our human, financial, and material sources, although reasonably adequate to sustain our University during its earlier periods of growth and expansion and its more recent stabilization in size, may well be strained in lean years ahead. The University's continuing strength demands highest quality academic programs and educational services which will make them attractive to students and supporters. We need to create processes for evaluating our academic programs in terms of such factors as quality of program and instruction, place of offerings in overall academic operations, enrollment trends, program costs, and the like, as a basis for setting priorities in the allocation of resources. If the years ahead do prove to be lean ones, we need to take steps now to avoid across-the-board curtailments which would indiscriminately weaken all programs alike, and instead find ways, which faculty members should have a significant voice in determining, to strengthen or discontinue weaker programs, maintain and improve strong programs, and install new programs.

3. A related task ahead has to do with instructional quality. The quality of teaching at the University is high in many areas, but still can be improved. It is less strong in some other areas. We need jointly to establish processes for the systematic assessment and improvement of instruction. We need programs of professional development for members of the faculty which provide increased opportunities not only for research, scholarship, and creative work but also for the improvement of teaching and for personal and professional renewal and retooling. We need evaluation and professional development programs also for members of the administrative staff. Faculty members and administrative staff personnel are critical elements in the University's achievement of its mission and purposes. The integrity and effectiveness of the University rest in great measure on the men and women who teach and serve here. The Univer-
The accumulation of scattered, unrelated, and uninterpreted information is not education. Our goal in higher education is to present the disciplines of knowledge in such a way that no statement stands alone, divorced from its human creator.

sity's most important “bottom line” is the members of faculty and staff. In no university are faculty and staff more important that at Valpo. The University expects much of its teachers: that they be effective masters of their liberal and professional disciplines and fields, interested in working with and advising students as individual persons, doing the kind of course planning and instructional management and the kind of scholarly and creative work which keeps them growing and their teaching vital, maintaining intellectual and theological dialogue with their colleagues, giving service on a selective basis to church and society, and performing the various kinds of departmental and University activities and committee services required to maintain the institution. Not just any academically and professionally qualified persons, however well prepared in terms of customary norms of scholarly and professional excellence, will do, for those who serve at Valpo are expected to support its mission and purpose as a Lutheran university and to carry forward all their activities as parts of their Calling. To sustain and strengthen them in these exacting and demanding tasks, faculty members need time and opportunity for scholarly and creative work, multifarious service activities, and professional and personal renewal. This means that resources of time and money are needed.

4. Earlier we noted the importance of the quality of life in residence halls, fraternities and sororities, social life, recreational and cultural activities in the University's pursuit of its mission and in the overall educational experiences of its students. The impact of the University depends as much on informal living processes and settings as on formal academic studies, as much on community ethos as on explicit ethical instruction. Student services leaders and personnel, including resident directors and assistants, have been working steadfastly in the interest of wholesome residence life and an ennobling campus ethos. Through the reorganized Union Board, the University has taken considerable strides forward in enriching cultural life and in offering a variety of social and recreational activities which give expression to the University's mission in the whole of campus life. With the interest and support of student body leaders and members we can continue to move forward in "...building a campus community of concerned persons ready to support and help one another and in which its members exercise responsible self-limitation so that the benefit of all may be achieved."

5. The University's programs and resources are directed in greatest measure to its five undergraduate colleges and its School of Law. This is as it should be. But the University's resources for graduate programs, evening division, credit-bearing continuing education programs, non-credit-bearing life-long and adult education, as well as the considerable academic and professional resources of the faculty, should be made increasingly available to persons and groups in the local community, the Northwest Indiana region, and the church at large. The programs of these sorts which have been well begun should be expanded in such a way that they are readily available and attractive to these persons and groups. Ways will need to be found whereby adults who wish to begin University studies or to continue interrupted degree programs can do so at times and in places where it is possible for them to do so. The University is a rich cultural and entertainment resource for the local community, and we are grateful that many members of the community share it with us and support the University so well. We can continue to explore new ways of cooperation and mutual support to enrich the life of our community. The University has rendered important service to the church at large by providing facilities for various centers and associations. These have enriched the University and rendered important service to Lutheran churches. We should continue to explore ways to be of greater service to The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and other Lutheran associations and auxiliary agencies and constituency groups. By its nature and in light of its partnership role with the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and other Lutheran churchbodies, the University can serve as a common and unifying resource to the church in mission and ministry.
6. The marvelous support of the University evidenced in the “Forward to the Eighties” program has enabled it to receive substantial funds for capital construction, campus development, building the endowment, and meeting operational costs. The construction of Urschel Hall, which will house the College of Business Administration, is the most recent achievement of this program. Even so, it has not been possible for the University to keep pace with the spiraling inflation in the economy with respect to faculty and staff compensation. We have a loyal, capable, and dedicated faculty and staff. They have served and are serving well. We must find ways to improve their compensation. This will require more unrestricted income, not derived from student fees, that can be allocated to the compensation portion of annual operating budgets. This goal will not be easily achieved. Building up endowment funds is a most difficult task. But we must attend to it as a matter of justice, of equity, and of University self-interest: that compensation levels at the University may reflect its qualitative strength and high service expectations; that special increments may be provided for cases of individual adjustment and to recognize quality of contribution; and that members of the faculty and staff are not forced by economic necessity and family well-being to seek remunerative employment “on the side,” whether in meaningful professional activities or otherwise. To provide increased financial aid for students, as fees inevitably rise to meet the University’s fixed costs, scholarship funds must be built up so that qualified students who wish to benefit from a Valparaiso University education are not prevented from doing so as a consequence of economic barriers. We need also to continue the great steps forward already taken to provide needed facilities—suitable places and spaces where essential University services are performed, not mere expansion for its own sake. This includes improved quarters for some departments, facilities for the performing arts, facilities for recreational sports and athletics, and a center for administrative and other University operations. A plan is needed also for adaptation and use of the West Campus appropriate to its location and potentialities for the years ahead.

With such an “agenda for the 1980s,” it seems timely, indeed essential, that we find ways to initiate broadly based study and planning processes to sort out and order priorities in meeting the University’s needs. One possibility is the creation of a broadly representative Council on University Priorities and Planning which would be given staff support through an office of institutional research and planning. As Dr. Kretzmann noted in his inauguration message after having listed a similar set of immediate objectives, “These more immediate objectives are not only attainable but almost desperately imperative if we are to continue the process of building the University toward the vision and the dream of its founders and supporters. We shall have no time for contemplation of possible failure. Ours is a great task. If we are to accomplish it, our spirit must be great—great in its humanity, great in its devotion, great in its single-mindedness and relentless driving toward the realization of the will of God for Valparaiso University.”

It is this understanding of the University’s heritage and destiny I commend to all of you, colleagues and friends, as together we plan for the future. In what manner and to what degree the University defines its mission and fulfills its purposes as a university which keeps deserving that ascription and as a Lutheran institution of higher education depends on the providence and blessing of God, the clarity of its mission, and the vision, vitality, and commitment of its members and supporting constituency.

Uttered ten years ago, Dr. Huegli’s words speak also for me: “We see the achievements of the past and wonder how our predecessors were able to surmount obstacles so successfully. We look ahead and could easily be overwhelmed by the staggering burdens placed upon us by the future. How does the University approach an age just beginning? Surely not with misgivings but with anticipation. Our destiny will require a great stretching of the muscles of our minds and spirits. We shall have to rely on our Board members, our alumni, our Guild. We shall need the support of the church and friends and supporters in intangible as well as material ways. We shall have to look to our community, to our national constituency of congregations

November, 1978
Let us reaffirm our dependence on the promises of God which bring us hope and courage to move forward with joy. Let us embrace the calling of this University under the Cross to be what it is.

and individuals, for strength and encouragement. We on the campus shall need each other—teachers and learners and everyone who helps them do their vital work together. Above all, we need faith, 'Putting our confidence in the things we hope for, being certain of things we cannot see.'

And at the last, the words of "The Pilgrim," spoken thirty-eight years ago, are peculiarly appropriate now, "I am deeply grateful for the privilege of joining the company of men and women who have prayed and worked for Valparaiso University these many years. I know that our task is great. Our time is short. It is later than we think. We can not wait for another time and another generation. Clearly aware of the magnitude of our problems, deeply committed to the importance of our work, humbly certain of our destiny, we may hope, under God, to prepare a growing number of men and women who will go out of this community into the world as living embodiments of this University."

Let us reaffirm our dependence on the promises of God which bring us hope and courage to move forward with joy. Let us embrace the calling of this University under the Cross to be what it is. Let us rededicate ourselves to its purposes and advance with renewed commitment toward our challenges and opportunities, with the University motto in our hearts and on our lips: "In Thy light we shall see light." To that end we implore the benediction of Almighty God.

Robert V. Schnabel is the publisher of the Cresset and was inaugurated as president of Valparaiso University on October 7, 1978. Dr. Schnabel brings to his new office a rich academic background, including studies in the humanities, music, philosophy, education, and theology, and broad administrative experience.

Born September 28, 1922, in Scarsdale, New York, he received his preparatory education in the Scarsdale Public School system. He was graduated from Concordia College, Bronxville, New York, in 1942 and completed his undergraduate education cum laude at Bowdoin College in 1943. He studied for two years at Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri. In 1951 Fordham University awarded him the degree of Master of Science in Education and four years later conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. During the 1965-1966 academic year, he was a post-doctoral fellow at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan.

Dr. Schnabel has served as teacher and principal in the parochial schools of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod and has taught philosophy at the former Concordia Senior College, Saint Francis College, and Purdue University Extension, all located in Fort Wayne, Indiana. He has also taught at Concordia College, Bronxville, New York, and Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa.

His experiences as an administrator include the positions of Associate Superintendent of Education for the former Central District of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (1952-1957), Academic Dean of the former Concordia Senior College (1966-1971), President of Concordia College, Bronxville (1971-1976), and Vice-President of Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty at Wartburg College (1976-1978).

Active in the affairs of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, he has served that denomination as a member of the Board of Directors of the Lutheran Deaconess Association; a member of the Administrative Survey Commission; a member of the Curriculum Commission of the Board for Higher Education; and as a delegate and councilor to the Lutheran Council of the U.S.A. and member of its Task Force on Theological Education.

Dr. Schnabel is married to Ellen Foelber of Fort Wayne, and they are the parents of two sons, Mark and Phillip.
The History Department of Valparaiso University is sponsoring a year long lecture series entitled "Influential Women in History." International in scope, this series attempts to present clear and probing accounts of women whose lives were both interesting and significant. The article on Countess Markievicz which appears below is the second of the series to be published in The Cresset.

The Unknown Irish Revolutionary

Constance de Markievicz, 1868-1927

James D. Startt

One of the most engaging aspects in all history is the manner in which significant people of one generation are lost to the imagination of later generations. Such is the case of Constance Gore-Booth, better remembered in history as Countess Markievicz. In life she was many things: a countess, an artist, a field commander of insurrectionist forces, the first woman elected to the British House of Commons, the first woman cabinet member in western Europe, and one of the most loved of all Irish rebels. Yet this remarkable woman is today little remembered by many people, particularly among Americans, who are fond of observing the Irish nation and its history. This brief biographical sketch, therefore, will attempt to profile the basic facts of her political life and then to select from that profile certain elements that help to place her work in a responsible perspective.

Her political life falls into the most turbulent chapter of modern Ireland's restless history, that which corresponds to the years around the First World War. At that time the centuries old struggle for Irish independence was reaching its crescendo. Since 1800 Ireland had existed as part of Great Britain, but as World War I opened the Union of Ireland and Great Britain was tottering on the verge of disintegration. For forty years most Irish nationalists had championed Home Rule for Ireland, and after the general elections of 1910 when the Irish Parliamentary Party emerged to hold the balance of power in British politics, the achievement of Home Rule seemed imminent. Then, in 1912, a Home Rule Bill was introduced in parliament and all parties of the struggle, including the northern Irish Unionists of Ulster, who were satisfied with the existing constitutional order and who rejected Home Rule, accelerated their efforts. Two years later, as war began to engulf Europe, the Government of Ireland Act, which gave Ireland Home Rule, was placed on the statute book, but it was agreed that Home Rule would not be implemented until the war ended and that parliament would then have the right to make provision for Ulster by means of amending legislation. The Home Rulers, it would seem, had won a great victory, yet the war spurred on other political forces in Ireland. As these more militant and extreme forces captured the nationalist movement, any prospect of an independent and united Ireland vanished from sight.

The fundamental question for Irishmen was: how could the outdated Union with Britain be changed? Militant revolutionaries provided an answer by their insurrection of Easter week 1916 and by the Anglo-Irish War of 1919-1921. Countess Markievicz played a central role in these events as she did in the entire Irish militant revolutionary movement that surrounded them.

Constance Gore-Booth was born in 1868 into one of the prominent families of the Protestant Anglo-Irish Ascendancy. She was raised at the family home of Lissadell in County Sligo on Ireland's West Coast. As she grew older she became a lovely, gay, robust, and much admired young lady whose future, it would seem, lay in the comfort and calling of her own class. There was, however, another side to Constance, a side that pointed to a different future.

James D. Startt is Professor of History and Chairman of the History Department at Valparaiso University. He teaches Modern European History and History of the British Empire and Commonwealth, wherein resides his special interest in Irish history. Recently he completed Journalism's Unofficial Ambassador: A Biography of Edward Price Bell, to be published by Ohio University Press in 1979. Presently he is engaged in a study of eminent British journalists who were advocates of Empire in the early twentieth century.
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She craved the independence needed to free herself of her family. To lead an active life of her own became her goal.

That goal she achieved gradually. At first she was attracted to and participated in the suffragette movement. Then she turned to art, and it was through art that she entered a world far removed from that of her youth. In 1897 her parents consented to allow Constance to study art first in London and then in Paris. In Paris she met the tall, handsome, and gregarious Casimir Markievicz. Like Constance this romantic Polish count was there studying the arts. He and Constance fell in love and returned to Dublin where they were married in 1900. For the next ten years, Count and Countess Markievicz were active in Dublin's aristocratic Castle society and also in a number of artistic groups. The Count wrote plays and Constance performed on the stage. Once she even appeared as Joan of Arc, not an insignificant role for one who became the leading woman militant of revolutionary Ireland's field forces. Of her acting it can be said that it never lacked enthusiasm but that it was mediocre at first and failed to improve with practice. This stage of her life need not detain us long, for in time it gave way to another interest that became the passion of her life.

Once she even appeared as Joan of Arc, not an insignificant role for one who became the leading woman militant of revolutionary Ireland's field forces.

Based on what little is known of her life to this point, any account of the conversion of Constance to the cause of Irish independence is incomplete at best. Constance herself claimed that she was converted in 1908 as a result of a chance reading of an article about Robert Emmet, the romantic and martyred Irish rebel whose execution by the British in 1803 was hallowed in the pages of Irish nationalist literature. Although her account of her conversion seems superficial and from an historical perspective is far from convincing, the fact remains that her involvement in serious national politics began in 1908 when she was in her fortieth year.

In her new role Constance gained the reputation of being the Rebel Countess or, if one preferred, Ireland's Joan of Arc. No one would question that in gaining such a reputation she vitalized the Irish revolutionary movement with her boundless energy. In that organization-laden Irish political society of pre-World War I days, she appears to have been everywhere. She joined the Daughters of Erin, a patriotic Gaelic organization formed by the famous actress Maud Gonne. Constance became active in the Irish labor movement and was vice president of the Irish Women Worker's Union. She also joined the Sinn Fein, one of the most important Irish national groups of the time. Most of all, she fell under the influence of James Connolly, the founder of Ireland's Socialist Republican Party and the country's most important labor leader. Connolly championed a new Ireland that would combine the themes of socialism, democracy, and nationalism. Constance accepted his program and worked tirelessly for it.

Her energy for the cause of Irish nationalism as well as her militancy knew little restraint. Shortly before World War I she became one of the first recruits in the Irish Citizen Army, the newly formed protective arm of labor. She was on close terms with the Irish Volunteers, a militant nationalist militia, and she helped to form and serve as president of the women's counterpart to the Irish Volunteers known as the Cumann na mBan. All of this was reason enough for her notoriety, but in pre-war Ireland, Constance was known for two things in particular. First, in 1909 she organized the Fianna na hEireann, a boys' organization named after the ancient order of Irish warriors, to train boys to take arms to force the British from Ireland. Constance herself arranged nationalistic lectures for the boys, led them on camping trips, and instructed them in the use of weapons, an art at which she was an expert.

Her second unique accomplishment dealt with feeding Dublin's poor in 1913, a year of a strike, of bitter strife, and of a long lockdown. It was Constance's greatest moment. She organized a food collection and distribution that literally rescued thousands of the city's poorest souls from starvation. It was then that the bond between the most wretched of Dublin's poor and Madame, as they called Constance, was formed. Only death broke that bond.

No one welcomed the Irish Uprising of Easter Week 1916 more than she. Appearing ready to "shoot or be shot at," she was placed second in command of the rebel forces at St. Stephen's Green, one of the major battlefields of the Uprising. During the fight she remained fearless, fought with abandon, and bravely surrendered when defeat came. Indeed, her theatrical surrender was an act well publicized on both sides of the Atlantic. Afterwards she accepted the death sentence for her involvement in the rebellion without remorse. Famously, the British did execute most of the leaders of the rebellion, including Constance's great friend James Connolly. She was spared, but not by choice. "I wish you had the decency to shoot me," was the comment she made to the young British officer who told her of her reprieve. Sentenced to life imprisonment, she was, in fact, released from prison in 1917, and returned to Ireland more popular than ever.

4 Dublin Castle was the physical and symbolic center of Ireland's ruling class, the Anglo Irish Ascendancy.

5 According to press accounts of the surrender, the Countess marched at the head of a column of rebels to the British force there assembled, "saluted the officer in command, kissed her revolver before surrendering it... and then said 'I am ready!'" This particular account is taken from the New York Times (May 2, 1916, p.1). In fact, between 1913 and 1927 the Countess was a familiar figure in the columns of The Times.

During the post Rising years events moved quickly and the extreme nationalist movement gained momentum. That movement gravitated around two clusters, the Sinn Fein and the Irish Volunteers, and in both Constance was prominent. After the Rising the Sinn Fein, that previously moderate nationalist group of the political fringe, became a magnet that attracted a new breed of men. Its old founder and leader Arthur Griffith found himself out of step with the organization's new swollen ranks. The day of the moderates had passed and the men who now attached themselves to the organization demanded a new adamancy from its leaders. Such a mood produced a new Sinn Fein president, Eamon De Valera. This tall, lean, and single-minded mathematics professor turned revolutionary and leader of the Rising whose life like that of Constance the British had spared, in time would become the partiahrch of modern Ireland. As for Constance, whose adamancy like her militancy was first rate, she was elected to the Sinn Fein's Executive Board. Since she was also president of the Cumann na mBan, the women's sister organization to the Irish Volunteers, she was at the center of both major clusters of the Irish revolutionary movement.

_In what one historian calls "her heady mixture of feminism, socialism, and nationalism," there is reason enough to reflect on her life._

Constance gave herself utterly to the political causes she championed. Her role as enthusiast, organizer, and promoter of these causes, however, troubled the British, who were locked in a desperate life and death struggle with Germany and who knew all too well the reality of the old Irish revolutionary maxim that Britain's troubles were Ireland's opportunities. Consequently, in 1918 they arrested and imprisoned Constance on suspicion of being involved in a "German Plot." Ironically, in that same year women over thirty received the right to sit in the parliament. Notwithstanding the fact of her imprisonment, Constance stood for office in the general election held at the end of that year and was elected. Thus she gained the distinction of being the first woman elected to the British parliament.

*The Sinn Fein (Ourselves Alone) was founded in 1905 by Arthur Griffith who rejected the politics of Home Rule. Griffith claimed that the Irish M. P.s who sat in the parliament at Westminster did so illegally because he believed that the Act of Union of 1800 was illegal. He proposed that the Irish representatives should withdraw from Westminster and set up a government in Dublin. Contrary to the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the most militant of all the separatist groups, the Sinn Fein advocated passive resistance and aimed at the establishment of a broadly based dual monarchy. Moreover, Sinn Fein did not participate in the Easter Week Rebellion of 1916. In 1917, however, Sinn Fein changed. It extended and strengthened its organization and in general became the political wing of the advanced nationalist revolutionary movement. As such Sinn Fein grew in appeal and in the election of 1918, which practically wiped out the Irish Parliamentary Party, it received seventy-three seats.

Nevertheless, the mother of parliaments held no attraction for her. Like the other Sinn Feiners, she refused to go to Westminster. Instead, these duly elected delegates gathered in Dublin and convened the Dail Eireann (the Assembly of Ireland) in January 1919. At a second meeting held a few months later the Dail Eireann formed a government for its self-proclaimed Irish Republic. De Valera was named president and Constance, who once again was released from prison, was named minister for labor, thus becoming the first woman in western Europe to hold a cabinet position. The self-proclaimed government, however, could not build its new Ireland unfettered.

For Ireland the next four years, which correspond to Constance's remaining politically active years, were filled with controversy and battle. The first two of these years (1919-1921) were marked by the Anglo-Irish War and the last two (1922-1923), by a bitter civil war fought among Irishmen themselves over whether or not they should accept the treaty that concluded the recent war with the British. Throughout these years Constance never lost the vigor that had for a decade characterized her tempestuous advocacy of Irish independence. Even though the British declared both the Sinn Fein and the Dail illegal, she was little deterred. So long as Constance could avoid arrest, she was everywhere working to put the labor ministry on its feet. In 1920, however, she once again was arrested and this time sentenced to four years of hard labor. Yet in 1921 the British released her for a third time. She arrived back in Dublin in time to participate in the violent treaty fight. The treaty divided Ireland by granting the southern twenty-six counties, which would now be known as the Irish Free State, dominion status and by giving the counties of northern Ireland the option to remain out, which they did. Constance still wanted a free, united, and republican Ireland, and her denunciation of the treaty was total. The anti-treaty forces were finally defeated and Constance, who had fought against the treaty in the assembly hall, on a lecture tour of the United States, and in the streets of Dublin, was defeated too.

She spent the last three years of her life out of public service but very much in the service of the poor. All through her active years she had been at one with the poor, and during her last lonely years when so much for which she had fought remained unborn, she never deserted the most forlorn souls of Dublin's slums. Her's was a personal commitment. She literally lugged heavy boxes of food and coal to the poor and aged who otherwise would have been forgotten. When she died in 1927, great crowds of Dublin's poorest people poured into the streets. She was their idol and they loved her till the end of her years.

*Dominion status is a difficult term to define since it has changed in meaning so often in the last seventy years. In 1921, it is safe to say that it involved national autonomy well in advance of Home Rule. Dominion nationhood was an evolving thing and the treaty offered what was referred to at the time as the freedom to achieve freedom. That was more than most Irishmen could have expected to receive.*
How is one to view this interesting and influential woman? Her own contemporaries disagreed about her. At her death, for instance, De Valera said of her: "The world knew her only as a soldier of Ireland, be we knew her as a colleague and comrade. We knew the kindliness, the great woman's heart of her, the great Irish soul of her, and we know the loss we have suffered is not to be repaired." But the famous Irish writer W. B. Yeats, who had known her since her childhood, penned these well-known lines about her:

That woman's days were spent
In ignorant good-will
Her nights in argument
Until her voice grew shrill.10

Then there was the Irish dramatist Sean O'Casey, whom Constance had bettered in a quarrel that left him outside and her inside the Citizen Army. He claimed that she was irresponsible and that "no part of her melted into the cause of Ireland, nor did she set foot on the threshold of Socialism. She looked at the names over the doors, and thought she was one of the family."11

Accordingly, one wonders if so abbreviated a biographical sketch as is presented in this article can present an acceptable perspective of her life. Perhaps it can. Such a perspective, imperfect though it may be, might emerge from a consideration of the contribution she made to each of the major movements with which she associated herself: feminism, labor, and nationalism.

Over the years, "a free Ireland with no sex discrimination in her constitution" had been the banner of her advice to Irish women.12

Regarding her attachment to feminism, it would be a mistake to say that Constance was interested in rights for women above all else. However, it would be a far greater mistake to overlook her contribution to the movement. The women's movement in Ireland was more than a decade old when she first became an active suffragette in 1896. Over the years she served that cause with voice and pen. More important, however, when the Irish feminist movement is viewed in long perspective, Constance's contribution to it seems particular. Up until 1913 the women's movement in Ireland grew in activity, but after that year, as the pace of political activity quickened, the women became less important to Irish forward movements. In a sense women were reassigned to roles of support and service. But Constance refused to be relegated to the background. As we have seen, she claimed and held a position in the Easter Rising of 1916, the reorganized Sinn Fein, and in the Irish government that fought for its existence in 1919. During the Anglo-Irish War of 1919-1921 and in the treaty struggle that followed, many women fought for Ireland. But throughout the lean years for women that preceded 1919, it was Constance, who by her actions demonstrated how bold a role a woman might play in revolutionary circumstances. Over the years, "a free Ireland with no sex discrimination in her constitution" had been the banner of her advice to Irish women. Obviously, she linked the cause of women to that of Irish independence. Whether or not that was sound advice to give the women of a developing nation such as Ireland is, of course, an open question. Her advice, however, was honestly given and it was matched by her own spirited work in behalf of the new nation struggling to be born.

The case of Constance's attachment to labor is a more tangled story. Labor roots in Ireland stretch back to the nineteenth century, yet it remained a small movement. Despite its size labor witnessed vigorous times in the years before the First World War when it was led by James Connelly, Ireland's leading socialist theorist, and James Larkin, the fiery union organizer whose agitations kept Irish labor astir after 1907. However, Larkin was absent from Ireland from 1914 to 1923 and the British executed Connelly for his involvement in the Easter Rebellion. Ironically, Constance, who survived the Rising as perhaps the most popular figure associated with labor, was not deeply involved in trade unionism nor was she in a leadership position in the labor movement. Moreover, her attachment to the labor movement was at its core emotional, and there is nothing to suggest that she understood either the finer aspects of Connelly's ideas nor the nature of the dilemma that cost him his life. Throughout the years in which he waged his uphill fight for social and economic changes in Ireland, Connelly was haunted by the problem of how to reconcile his socialist reform schemes with Irish nationalism. He believed that the two causes could be complementary, yet in the end he turned to physical force in the hope that the revolution thus launched would not be devoid of social and economic content. The formula of labor reform through revolution to which Connelly had resorted with such reluctance, remained the course the Countess chose to pursue. Perhaps she did not perceive the deeper aspects of labor's predicament.

Labor's problems in the post Rising years were formidable. With Connelly's death it lost its greatest leader; its organization soon fell behind that of Sinn Fein; and it was left outside the important election of 1918 when the allegiances of a generation were formed. In 1919 labor had a reform program in hand, but the nascent government of Ireland between 1919 and 1921 was powerless to implement it and the Free State government after 1922
felt no responsibility to it. Most serious of all, as Sinn Fein gained control of the nationalist movement in Ireland, it made national independence its top priority. In a word, “Sinn Fein’s argument that independence out of necessity must precede socio-economic reforms overwhelmed Labor’s plea that reform was required immediately, independence or not.”13 One is left to ponder one of those alluring ifs of history. What would have been Ireland’s fate if reform had preceded independence? Nevertheless, Constance’s belief in labor’s cause is beyond question. She worked for a reformed Ireland to be built after independence. To Connelly and his dreams she remained true. During one of her imprisonments she wrote of him: On your murdered body I’ll pledge my life With its passionate love and hate To secret plotting and open strife For vengeance early and late To Ireland and you I have pledged my life Revenge for your memory’s sake!14 Like Connelly she too wanted an independent worker’s republic. She attempted to popularize the idea of a cooperative movement and urged the republicans to adopt it as their program for the new Ireland. Moreover, considering the circumstances under which she worked, her achievement as minister of labor was impressive.15 But she remained a nationalist first and foremost, and for her to fight for an independent Ireland remained the surest way to achieve social and economic reforms.

Moreover, Constance failed to realize that advanced Irish nationalism was far from a progressive force, that it was, in fact, conservative to the point that it could militate against the cause of women and of labor.

As for her nationalism, the third area of Constance’s involvement during her public life, there is little reason to doubt that it became the directing force of her active political life. Militant nationalism fitted her precisely, but militant nationalism only can be comprehended when it is placed in the broader setting of the Irish national movement that permeated her days. From time to time the militants may have touched the Irish nerve, but the moderate nationalists were far more numerous and for years had occupied the center of the Irish political stage. For years the Home Rule program of their Parliamentary Party had embodied the hopes of most Irish nationalists. That party had been mainly responsible for every major Irish reform since the 1880s, and there had been many. Under its guidance, Ireland was evolving towards achieving Home Rule and with it a political posture within the British Empire similar to that of Canada. At the outbreak of the First World War it was a strong and well served party, but it suffered the fate of an established political institution caught in the midst of revolutionary upheaval. Between 1916 and 1918 it disintegrated. Accordingly, it can be argued that the real revolution in Ireland after the Rising occurred when Irish Republican separatism replaced Home Rule as the basic goal of Irish nationalism. For that revolution Constance worked with all her strength.

In retrospect, Constance appears as a romantic revolutionary par excellence. Her aggressive and impulsive nature made it easy for her to turn to all out action against the British and, when her own countrymen accepted the treaty of 1921, to denounce that action as a betrayal of Irish freedom. In her own words she was “pledged to the death for the freedom of Ireland.”16 There is, however, no evidence, not even in accounts of her life by her two most recent biographers, to suggest that she questioned the idea of British tyranny, the justification for revolution in 1916, or the correctness of an uncompromising negative response to pro-treaty arguments, even when made by some of her own comrades, in 1921. The rejection of compromise in the making of an independent Ireland, despite the diverse and divided loyalties that characterize the Irish people, is part of the disruptive revolutionary legacy that has survived into our own day. Moreover, Constance failed to realize that advanced Irish nationalism was far from a progressive force, that it was, in fact, conservative to the point that it could militate against the cause of women and of labor. Such considerations little bothered romantic revolutionaries.

From the distance of a half a century, however, Constance remains a fascinating woman to contemplate. In her integrity, in her selfless devotion to high ideals as she saw them, in her spontaneous sympathy for the poor, and in what one historian calls “her heady mixture of feminism, socialism and nationalism,”17 there is reason enough to reflect on her life. In her spirited quest for an independent Ireland, Constance was a flamboyant exponent of a fixed line of argument and action. That too compels our attention. A united and independent Irish republic established by force if necessary was the cause that became her passion. Such a line, however, fettered reasonable hopes for peace in Ireland by substituting extreme national goals achieved by revolution for moderate ones achieved by political evolution. So one is reminded of what Constance had such difficulty in grasping: that in life, particularly in public life, there are times for determined action, times for compromise and times for critical retrospection. To distinguish between such times is an act of wisdom. In politics, however, Constance chose to be faithful rather than wise.

15 Under her direction the department arbitrated a number of labor disputes, established Conciliation Boards and produced guidelines for wages and food prices.
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The Cresset
"When Christ calls a man, he bids him come and die."

Those words are from Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who met a martyr's death in a Nazi concentration camp, but the bidding belongs to every believer just as surely as Christ calls to each person, "follow me." He bids that person come and die!

At the onset of the semester we heard how important this time can be for all of us, this time of beginnings. Our patterns of living are still being formed, before we settle into unresponsive or even irresponsible ruts. But one pattern needs above all to emerge as the constant model at work in every experience. What we need most, in order to live—in order to live well—is to die. The one pattern which will identify and define our lives as Christian is that of death and resurrection. Jesus, the risen Christ, tells each of us, "Whoever does not bear his own cross and come after me cannot be my disciple." And he means it. We must die to live!

Spaniards have an old proverb: "There are two things at which no one can look directly—the sun and his own death." And ancient wisdom is confirmed by modern science. Depth psychology tells us that the small child, which each of us once was and which continues to live on in each of us, already as an infant feels the early experiences of separation as an occasion of nearly overwhelming terror. We had a terrifying sense of our own weakness and helplessness, of our absolute dependence on a reality we couldn't begin to comprehend or control. Then we felt a primal anxiety that simply could not be endured. Repression—the blotting out from awareness—of that anxiety was the only defense. But the anxiety persists; it's still there, buried beneath the level of conscious awareness. And the lifelong project of repressing that primal anxiety continues to engage our psychic energies, mostly in disguised and unconscious ways.

And from those early experiences of separation—from which even the best parenting in the world could not save us, but which poor parenting might have intensified—each of us came to the deepest and most fatal conviction by which his personality is instituted. The conviction is that we must be our own defenders and protectors and that ultimately we have only ourselves to trust.

Depth psychology continues to accumulate clinical evidence that this dynamic is at the core of all adult selfhood, a dynamic of primal anxiety, repression, and the unconscious belief that I must be my own final source of security. This dynamic colors every experience we have, every perception, every thought, every feeling. It colors life gray, a stained and dingy gray, and makes deep and lasting joy all but impossible. We are driven restlessly from one experience to another, trying by various paths to gain pleasure or power, success or wealth—or oblivion. But it all comes up gray, dingy and stained. Real joy and true peace elude us.

No wonder no one can look directly at his own death. Death is the total and absolute threat. Dr. Ernst Becker, a modern psychoanalytic thinker, has written: "The idea of death, the fear of it, haunts the human animal like nothing else; it is the mainspring of human activity, activity designed largely to avoid awareness of the finality of death, to overcome it by denying in some way that it is the final destiny of man."

The fear of death is something far more pervasive than simply a conscious fear of the approaching hour of biological death. We are really afraid to face all of the limitations upon our powers to secure and establish our lives. In that sense, fear of death really does shape and dominate the life every person leads. It is, finally, fear of death that shows itself in my urge to assert myself at all costs, even at someone else's expense.

It is a fear of death which shows itself in my unwillingness to be disturbed by any but my own problems, in my demand to be left in peace by other people and to be spared from unforeseen events and adverse circumstances.

It is a fear of death that triggers my desperate need to cling to the feeling that I can handle, I can cope, with whatever problems come my way.

It is a fear of death that shows itself in my drive to demonstrate that I am as good or better than another—or in the despair and anxiety I feel when I wonder, "Can I really measure up; will I be able to make it in life?"

We feel threatened by life—its bursting energies, its surprises, its wonders and excitements—together with its dangers and risks, and that threatened feeling is a form of the fear of death.

We desperately want to be masters of our lives, and over and over again we are forced to discover that we are not.

We want everything to run our way, and little ever does. Everything we do is done on the brink of defeat.

No One Can Look Directly at the Sun
—And His Own Death

The reality of death doesn't just stand at the end of life. It is with us every moment of our lives—and not just in the simple sense that something could happen to us at any moment (an accident, a terminal illness, a natural calamity), although that too is true. Something far deeper is at stake. We want to save our own lives and be our own source of security and trust, but at best we can do so only to a very limited extent and for a very limited time. And finally none of us can withstand the reality of biological death, against which each of us stands absolutely and utterly helpless.

Can we live like that? Not very well! It is no wonder that no one looks directly at his own death. Better to repress and deny the truth, in order to continue living—even if it means living with the illusion of our own self-sufficiency and clinging desperately to the frail security
of trusting only in ourselves.

"Whoever does not bear his own cross and come after me cannot be my disciple. Whoever of you does not renounce all that he has cannot be my disciple."

Jesus understood that all of our experiences of separation and estrangement are symptoms of a deeper separation and estrangement from God. Jesus also understood that our deepest human impulse—to live just for our own sakes, trusting in our own powers to secure and establish our lives—is rebellion against God. Our lives were meant to have their center of trust and devotion in God, not in self. The death that stalks us all our lives is God's own absolute "NO!" to lives curved in upon ourselves.

But Jesus came not just to inform us about the ultimate truth about our living and our dying. He came to deliver us from death into victorious living. Jesus knew that you and I would never find authentic life simply by clever advice or penetrating insights, or even by a shining example, only by the conquest of death. Only when you and I have been delivered from the bondage of the fear of death, only then can we begin to find authentic life. And that deliverance has to come from beyond ourselves.

His cross is our deliverance, and his resurrection is our source of new and authentic life. In his cross God's "NO!" against our self-trusting, self-protecting lives has been spoken once-for-all. And that death has destroyed death! In Jesus' resurrection God shouts "YES!" an absolute victorious "YES!" to us, an affirmation which frees us altogether from the fear of death.

We Do Everything on the Brink of Defeat—Let Go and Let God

Now, right now, you and I are offered the gift of a new relationship with God, and the gift of a living, personal fellowship with the risen Christ. Now, right now, you and I are invited to surrender ourselves to his presence, trusting ourselves to what his cross has won for us. That means, quite simply, no longer trying to be self-sufficient, but letting go! We can let go our desperate attempts to secure our own lives by our own resources and instead let his presence with us and for us be the center of meaning and trust for our lives. And this "letting go" and "letting God" lead us to the humility of the Christian life.

For years I thought that humility meant my getting down on myself. I thought I should strive to be modest (an attitude altogether appropriate in someone of modest talent, but like Voltaire I believed that in my case it would have been dishonest). I would tell myself and others that I was dumb (or at least not as smart as I really thought) and dull (or not quite as incredibly charming as I thought was actually the case). Humility meant that I would make myself out as lackluster—and, of course, God would see my bright and pure humility shining through! But getting down on one's self has nothing to do with humility. There can actually be a great deal of self-will in that. Real humility is finding a source of trust and courage from beyond ourselves. That means a kind of death for us—death to the impulse to live curved in upon ourselves.

But when I take his invitation and surrender myself to the living presence of the crucified and risen Christ with me and for me, I experience the incredibly liberating fact: I don't have to save myself. At the very point where I really let myself go, I discover that I am being held by a power beyond myself. He frees me from all my self-chosen anxieties and fear. I don't have to prove my worth or secure my life. The one who has conquered death is with me and for me—no matter what may happen. He tells me, "Let me help you do your best, and whether you succeed or fail in the eyes of others, it really doesn't matter." Tomorrow's worries can belong to tomorrow. Today I am free to trust God as my Father.

I don't have to pretend that I'm bigger or stronger or tougher than I am. I can admit how tiny, weak, frail, and vulnerable I am because I have a resource of strength and courage beyond myself.

I am free to see through all of the threatening limitations of my life to the stronger than death love with which the Father holds me now.

I am free to love my neighbor. I don't have to defend myself against others, prove my worth to them, impress them or exploit them, or use them to establish my right to a place in the sun. I don't have to play self-exalting games or hide behind whatever defensive masks other people use to make themselves feel secure.

I am free to love and give myself away, to be with and for the other, honestly and openly. I am secure in a love not even the gates of hell can destroy!

Once I wanted to live for my own sake, but I could not—fear and death stopped me. Now, by surrendering my life to him, I die to the attempt to live just for my own sake—and I discover that for the first time I'm really living!

That venture of faith, that pattern of dying and rising, needs to be made and remade each day. This experience of dying and rising with Christ is a real and present possibility for each of us at every moment. But it is not yet, for any of us, a permanent possession. Often we find ourselves back in the old life of relying only on ourselves, and fear and death are with us again. And then we are confronted again with the invitation: "Come and die, into new life!" And somehow we take the risk again, and again we discover what it means really to live.

As this pattern of dying and rising is established more and more firmly in our lives—with the help of a deliberate discipline of prayer and regular worship around Word and Sacraments—we discover one day either suddenly or slowly that we are on the path through this present life that leads to eternal life, authentic living now and forever.
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Beauty and the Beast: An Authoritative Fairy-Tale

In Jean Cocteau's film Beauty and the Beast (1946), a merchant rides off to a port town, to meet a ship which has come in after being given up for lost. He asks his three daughters what he can bring them; the two selfish ones demand expensive presents, while the third—a Cinderella heroine—asks only for a rose. This request creates a story.

The merchant becomes lost and is forced to spend the night in a castle full of cinematic enchantments. Arms swing out of the darkness, bearing chandeliers; sooty faces, sculpted into a fireplace, follow him with melancholy eyes; disembodied hands serve dinner at a table piled with food. The merchant falls asleep amid all this sinister but strangely benign animism. In the morning he prepares to leave. Almost as an afterthought, he picks a rose for Beauty, whereupon Beast steps forth from behind a trellis and says in an authoritative, carefully modulated voice: “You may eat my food, you may sleep in my house—but my roses are the thing most precious to me, and if you pick them you must die.”

Why does the plucking of the rose offend Beast so mightily? We could invent answers but they would be irrelevant. The question “why” is not allowed to arise. Instead we have the calm assurance of Beast (played by Jean Marais) and the sense that the story must happen this way, simply because it could happen no other. Just as the merchant is forced to accept Beast's logic, so is the audience, until it has entered fully into the mimetic-logic of the fairy-tale world.

The authority which compels us to believe in the fairy-tale (rather than, in Coleridge’s phrase, to suspend our disbelief) is not very easy to pin down. The fact remains that an arbitrary narrative can be quite as compelling as a narrative which attempts to explain itself, to proceed by way of coherent psychological motive or graspable philosophical import. Cocteau, as he worked on his film, came to feel the peculiar integrity of fairy-tale storytelling. Perhaps the most striking point about his cinematic realization of the tale is that he found ways to preserve its authoritativeness: to translate fantasy of this specific sort into cinematic form.

Everyone who has seen Beauty and the Beast will recall its great set-pieces: Beauty running up the stairs of Beast's mansion, when she has first arrived, to die in her father's place; Beast drinking at the waterhole, like an animal rather than a human being; Beauty and Beast, reconciled after the latter's transformation into a handsome prince, whirling off into a night sky.

The first thing to notice about these scenes is that in none of them does the technology call much attention to itself. The slow-motion sequence on the staircase works because Josette Day, who played Beauty, has been trained as a dancer; slow-motion, which reveals the least ungainliness in a person's movements, is for once an appropriate technique, just because it can show us something we might otherwise miss.

As for Marais, lapping up the water—a scene filmed as matter-of-factly as possible—Cocteau writes that "he thrust his muzzle into [it], snorted, spat; he actually drank that disgusting water—I know no other actor who would have done that." Even the moment when "The Prince and Beauty depart, flying up into the clouds" is approached with a surprising amount of modesty; this is one of Cocteau's "tricks, but direct tricks, the only kind I like, tricks which I invent and over which I slave"—the upshot being that such marvels should seem effortless.

The authority of Beauty and the Beast grows initially from the artfulness of individual scenes. Cocteau is trading on an essential strength of all cinema, that "the truth of moving images [can prevail] over everything else." This principle mastered, he succeeds in moving beyond it, in giving to the succession of scenes a carefully-designed character. Cocteau understood that Beauty's journeys back and forth between the castle and her home could give his movie, even more than the original tale, a rhythm of its own. The rhythm comes through best when we remember the two most elaborate of the scenes at the merchant's home.

In an opening sequence, Beauty's two sisters, dressed fit to kill, attempt to visit the local aristocracy. The sedan chairs are full of chickens. The carriers are drunk. The duchess will not see the sisters. Cocteau takes as much trouble with his chickens as he does with his magic chandeliers, so that the alternation between everyday and fantastic, frustration and wish-fulfillment, becomes all the more powerful.

This alternation, furthermore, acquires a wonderful complexity. When Beauty returns after her sojourn in
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the castle, the whole family (father excepted) is out on the lawn doing laundry. The characters, in fact, are lost in a real labyrinth of laundry. Cocteau never allowing us to survey the whole extent of this world of billowing sheets. At the climax of the scene, the bickering washermen (and women) observe a magnificent person coming across the lawn with their father. Cocteau notes "Josette's arrival in her princess's gown in the theatre of sheets devised by Marais [aside from his role as Beast, Marais also plays a good-for-nothing who is courting Beauty], who tucks up the first sheet like an Italian curtain and reveals the perspectives behind the bench." So the hidden metaphor of the scene comes suddenly clear. The labyrinth of wash is a theater. The absurd dis­
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struggle going on, between the fairy tale's inherent
tendency to resist allegory — to remain
its inexplicable self — and the director's
desire to tell a story with personal
reverberations. This conflict affords
a final due to the perfect equilibrium
of the completed film.

Cocteau, a spoiled and clever man,
wants his art to reflect his life. He
writes that when he was looking for a
suitable location to film the scenes at
the merchant's home, he happened
upon "a small hillside manor" which
turned out to be perfect, down to the
last detail. "The man who lives in it
looks like the merchant of our fairy
tale, and his son told me, 'If you had
come yesterday, you would have heard
your own voice: I was playing my
father some of your recordings of your
poems.'" Retelling this anecdote a few
years later, Cocteau improves upon it:
now he discovers the manor by
following the sound of his own voice,
which turns out to be the recording.
Cocteau wants to feel that he has
created the location, much as he could
have a poem or a novel. The writer
used to exercising power over words
wants the same omnipotence in reality.
He would command the sun if he
could.

The desire for the film, in all its
aspects, to echo his personality is a
constant theme in Cocteau's journal.
He develops a habit of writing about a
sequence in Beauty and the Beast and
then transforming it to an allegory of
his own condition. This is particularly
true when some scene in the movie
recalls the skin disease from which
he suffered at the time. One of the
bad sisters looks in a mirror and sees
a monkey. "The monkey was delight­
ful," Cocteau notes, but he adds a few
days later: "I look at myself in the
mirror. Hideous. Which doesn't bother
me at all. The physical, the material,
no longer matter. . . . The true mirror
is the screen, on which I can see the
physical nature of my dream." His
face and his dream remain closely
connected nonetheless. Marais had to
be made up four to five hours a day
to play Beast, and "the removal of his
makeup" — predictably — "resembles
the torment of my bandages."

Cocteau is trading on
an essential strength of all cinema,
that "the truth of moving images
[can prevail]
over everything else."

It pleases Cocteau to make over his
illness, until it becomes a metaphor
of artistic endeavor. The dangers in
doing so are only too clear. The fairy­
tale is not only the most mysteriously
arbitrary but the most impersonal of
literary forms. Its teller is an anony­

mous shaper of tradition rather than
an artist in the romantic sense. Cocteau's
image of himself as a lonely, suffering
creator is thus in conflict with the
aesthetic needs of the fairy-tale form.
Some people have found such conflicts
a conspicuous flaw in Cocteau's films —
an objection the director often coun­
tered by pointing to the faithfulness
with which he treated his sources (i.e.,
"it's someone else's story so how can it
have me in it?")

With Beauty and the Beast, luckily,
there is no need for this specious
argument: the film really does take
on the genuine impersonality of the
fairy tale. This happens, in part,
because even while he exploited his
suffering, Cocteau never neglected
craftsmanship. He discovered, more­
over, that he could have his cake and
eat it too; the fairy tale can transform
artistic narcissism into a different
impluse entirely. Halfway through the
film, Cocteau observes that "I seem
to be hidden behind the screen, saying:
first this happened, and then this
happened. The characters don't seem
to live—they seem to be living a
narrated life. Perhaps this was neces­
sary." Which is to say: the film's
authority turns ultimately on our sense
of a narrator, and not a sensitive or a
suffering narrator, either, but a voice
telling us what happened, controlling
the movements of heroes and villains
alike. When he watched the finished
film, Cocteau acknowledged that "it
rejected me and lived its own life. In
it I found only the memories attached
to each piece of footage and the
suffering it had cost me. I did not
dream that others could be following
the story it told—I believed them all
plunged into my own imaginings." But
he knows that the film exists apart
from him.

One of Cocteau's favorite tales was
"the King of the Cats"— a tale he
attributed to Keats. Keats is walking
in a forest when he sees four white
cats and four black ones bearing a
tiny coffin on their shoulders. Later
he wants to communicate this expe­
xience to someone but is afraid he
will not be believed. A friend swears to
believe whatever Keats will tell him
and so he finally relates the story —
whereupon the cat dozing before the
fireplace shoots up into the air and
screams, "Then I am King of the Cats."
Telling the story, it seems, creates in
the most unexpected way the sense of
authority and the possibility of belief.
It is this effect that Beauty and the
Beast, perhaps more vividly than any
other film, conveys.
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American urban architecture as it grew up in Chicago embraced two distinct historical periods and encompassed a myriad of technical, social, economic and philosophical factors. Yet as is often the case with complex developments, the two periods have come to be symbolized by two slogans. The First Chicago School of Architecture (c. 1880-1905) produced the first great skyscrapers and featured the genius of men like Louis Sullivan, Dankmar Adler, William Le Baron Jenny, John Wellborn Root, and Henry Hobson Richardson. Much of that era's complexity and richness has been reduced to the popularized notion that "form follows function." That is, if a building is to function as a bank, then let it look like a bank—not a Greek Temple.

Similarly, the Second Chicago School (c. 1930s-50s), built around the vision of Ludwig Mies Van der Rohe and his Bauhaus-trained colleagues and pupils, has also been sloganized. The phrase "less is more" attempts to capture the architectural sensibility which emphasizes sparceness and simplicity, and which exposes the building's structural framework in all of its unadorned strength.

Each Chicago School contributed monumentally to today's urban landscape. Each tackled first and foremost the problems of huge public spaces—whether corporate, high-rise residential, or governmental in use. It is this concern for the public space which triggered a few tentative reflections about the links between these architectural slogans and our current debate about the extent and role of government.

What are we saying these days about public space in a civic sense, about those places in our lives as citizens where we address public issues and responsibilities together? Is "less" really "more"? Does "form" follow "function"?

Certainly Californians have forced the issue with Proposition 13. Their argument seems to embrace wholeheartedly the spirit of the Second Chicago School: less government benefits more people. Down with the frills and ornaments, back to the bare-bones framework.

At the same time, however, back in the world of urban architecture, we are witnessing a significant wave of rebellion against the maxim of the Second School. New structures appear which attempt to rehumanize and democratize their still magnificent sense of scale. Ornamentation and frills reappear, surprising shapes conceal structural realities. It seems, in fact, that both architects and their clients are becoming much more concerned with making the interactions between buildings and people as humane and pleasant as possible. For the time being, in building at least, more is more.

So perhaps what Californians were really telling us about government, if it is attuned to the present mood, has more to do with the slogan of the First Chicago School. Perhaps they have sensed, with many of the rest of us, that the "form" of government no longer follows the "function" for which it was established. Public bureaucracies take on a formal life of their own, no longer related to their original purposes. Do school bureaucracies educate? Does the criminal justice system have anything to do with "justice"? Are welfare systems more beneficial to clients or to servers? Do defense systems defend?

If formal governmental operations have indeed lost touch with their functions, as many suspect, then this is cause enough for revolt, by taxpayers and by everybody else. But all of us who feel the urge to rebel ought to be very clear about just what the problem is. Certainly the scale of government, like the scale of buildings, can be overwhelming. But the issue may be much more complex than simply one of scale. "Less" cannot possibly be "more" if it means that we have decided to shrink our precious civic public space. And form will only follow function when we demand that it will.