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In Luce Tua

Essays on Current Issues by the Editor

To Be Continued

Our readers will forgive us if we turn inward in this issue, for with it The Cresset is taken up under a new editor. Indeed, for the first time in its history The Cresset finds itself older than its new editor. Let that doubtful first we bring to this review merely by our later birth be the occasion to lay some serious and some lighter claims to our tradition.

What is The Cresset? Before we were born, Dr. O. P. Kretzmann, its founding editor, wrote in its first issue in November, 1937, that this review intended "to be a small lamp set on the walls of the Church to find things of value in the surrounding darkness, to throw light upon hidden dangers, and to put into constant and immediate use the words of the royal apostle: 'Whatsoever things are true... honest... just... pure... lovely... of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.' This is our charter." Further through the same manifesto, "The Cresset: Its Purpose and Function," he wrote that this review would devote itself to "the Christian life in relation to the world of human thought and aspiration" and "attempt to reach especially those who have become conscious of the deep pulsations that throb through our time and... the cataclysmic changes of the world." Dr. Kretzmann, then in the service of the Walther League where The Cresset was born, committed this review to issues Christian, critical, and contemporary. His early commitment is now ours, too, in times we can only guess can be sensed equally as pulsating and cataclysmic as that time upon the eve of the Second World War and the end of Christendom in America.

Many years later in times of quieter surfaces and in the September, 1956, issue that the University was then undertaking the bulk of the support of The Cresset "to help maintain a publication, which in its own way and in its own sphere, is attempting to do the same job that the University is engaged in doing on its own campus: the job of relating the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the... men and women of our generation, particularly in the areas of the arts, letters, and public affairs." Under Dr. Strietelmeier's long and formative editorship, The Cresset and Valparaiso University were integrated so creatively that the University at this writing so closely identifies the future of The Cresset with its own future that it beholds this review as part of itself as a good university. As Dr. Strietelmeier put it to us in that first issue of this review we read in our freshman year, "A University is, by definition, an arena for the testing of ideas. The mark of a good university is its willingness to give a hearing to ideas which may be new and even unpopular. The Cresset, as the publication of a good university, claims this same ancient and basic right... And so we propose to run an honest arena and hope that public relations will look out for themselves." Dr. Strietelmeier's commitment of The Cresset to the essential work of Valparaiso University as one of its open "forums for scholarly writing and informed opinion" is now ours, too, and this review intends to remain only as biased editorially as the University is academically. We are grateful to the new president of the University and our new publisher, Dr. Albert Huegli, for renewing the financial support and political defense of this freedom for The Cresset in times when the pressures upon its commitments may be greater than they were when they were first undertaken.

This, briefly, is our inheritance – a review which is integrated into the work of a good university and committed to issues Christian, intellectual, critical, and contemporary. Such commitments, if we are to keep them even in part, will mean continual change.
in The Cresset in order to keep the faith. Few faith­ful to that inheritance further assume that our past assumptions about the church, contemporary culture, private and church-related higher education, scholarly writing and informed opinion, and even printed media will remain unchanged. We cannot decide which Dr. Kretzmann and Dr. Strietelmeier do best, live or understand life, but as men and editors they invite imitation in innovation as the sincerest forms of gratitude and praise. We are cheered that they both have agreed to continue to write for The Cresset. Their columns will no doubt remain wise counsels to which many, ourselves ardently included, will repair for their seasoned judgments and visions for the future. We are not unaware, it should be admitted, that their columns also preserve us personally from the charge that “The Cresset isn’t as good as it used to be!”

The Grease Pan?

In addition to our former editors and our regular writers — who happily for us and their readers have also agreed to continue their columns — our readers will find two new writers we wish to welcome in this issue. A new departmental editor in a new departmental editorship for political affairs is Dr. Albert Trost. When it was no longer our good fortune to have Dr. Victor Hoffman writing for us regularly, we turned with the same good fortune to one of his former students and colleagues in political science. It will be Dr. Trost’s unenviable task to embrace the tensions obtaining in the political affairs The Cresset reviews and interpret them to us and to our readers. Changes in political affairs and the politicizing of so many current issues — it is a cliche to comment — are now so rapid that it surely requires someone of Dr. Trost’s special academic preparation and ongoing attention to the emergent to help this review remain politically current and achieve balance at the same time. Nor do we expect his writing to be descriptive only, but normative, too, from his own point of view. We shall rarely comment on political affairs ourselves, and we are grateful to Dr. Trost for bringing his considerable strength in this area to help meet our considerable deficiencies.

The second new writer we welcome is Dr. Charles Vandersee. When Dean Alfred Looman chose to abandon his light, whimsical writing for us, bringing to an end we should guess the longest ad lib of all times, we had one man able to succeed him in mind. Happily, Dr. Vandersee was of the same mind, and characteristically he undertook to research his assignment straightway. He has already reported that he has discovered a real cresset in an English folk museum in Kirkstall Abbey near the University of Leeds. There in a glass case is an old, gray, nondescript entity against which the following card leans without further comment.

We have no doubt Dr. Vandersee will make much of his discovery in his column, and we welcome his dipping his split reed into the grease pan with ours and, from time to time, his flicking some of the fat into the fire.

Finally, “The New Editor Welcomes Himself,” for our tenure as editor is no longer than the tenures of the new writers we have just welcomed. As we observed earlier, we are, like Al and Chuck, younger than The Cresset which was defined before we all were born and further defined before we all were educated at Valparaiso University. Whatever warning is due in the fact that it was issued before we were has been taken. We in particular have also taken note of some irony in our new position as editor. Ten years ago to this month we were beginning to edit the student magazine at Valparaiso University. Before our senior year was lived to its end, we were nearly suspended from the University, and only pity and mercy, we then believed, interceded to grant us our degree. It could now appear, however, that a more highly refined and delicious discipline was to be fitted us for our fledgling editorial misdeeds. Perhaps we were to be stricken with The Cresset to edit instead of a mere suspension?

If so, we must now make the degree we were granted worth holding by serving well the University which gave it — by the very same task of editing which made it doubtful we should have been granted the degree in the first place. In one decade we have learned that whatever retribution there is within history grinds slowly — but it grinds exceedingly fine. At least within this moment of our history we hear the sound of laughter as well as trumpets on the other side.

The Middle Men

In recent years it was the gift of our predecessor well to reflect on the different generations of our country, particularly upon his own take-over generation in its late forties. Turning further inward we should like to try to reflect upon our own generation. We who are thirty or early over are by all odds an odd lot. In the generational war raging in our country, we fall, at least chronologically, between the lines. We are too old for Jimi Hendrix, Janis Joplin, and the Canned Heat and too young for Kate Smith, Lawrence Welk, and the Marine Corps Band. We are too
old for hallucinogens and too young for tranquilizers, too old for sturm und drang and too young for apoplexy, too old for ahistoricism and too young for hardening of the categories. We are too old for surfing and the bugaloo and too young for shuffleboard and bocce, too old for incense, beads, and transcendental meditation and too young for a good cigar, gold watches, and nostalgia.

Falling between the lines in the generational war, however, is not a matter of living in the life style of a demilitarized zone. Rather, we often find ourselves in actual battle on issues on two fronts. We are already held accountable for everything distressingly anti­disestablishmentarian by our juniors at the same time our seniors are still asking us what we want to do when we grow up, and we all know what that means. Our juniors see us across the line on issues with our seniors, and our seniors see us across the line on issues with our juniors.

We in particular remember one remarkable day last March when the generational war was more hot than cold where we learn and sometimes teach. Within the duration and duress of that day we had been in a group of our juniors and in a group of our seniors. In the first we were, in effect, assured that we could not possibly understand what was then at issue, so supported was it by a new historical experience. And in the second group we were assured that we could not possibly understand what was then at issue until, in effect, we were older and had more historical experience. At the time we used languages meet, right, and salutary in each group to say “Nonsense!” to them both for their assurances, but it was also the kind of experience which sends one home to his own self-reflection to see what, if anything, is there. For if those immediately over thirty believe they understand both of the generational languages spoken in this country today and are ready for anything, they can sustain that beleaguered belief only after the most searching reflection upon what their own generation brings to the issues under discussion should they ever be widely discerned.

What did we see in our generational self-reflection? No man, we are happy to say, has made us our generational spokesman. Generalities about generations are not too illuminating and often diversionary of the real issues under what is passed off as generational warfare. Yet we did see some things in our generational reflection which pertain to the issues, too.

We saw the particulars, of course, in that parts of us are like parts of all the generations. In us, too, are parts which are sixteen, twenty-three, thirty-one, forty-five, fifty-two, and sixty-nine. Parts of us we suspected were already dead and parts we hoped and feared were yet to be born. But when we focussed on that part of us which is soon over thirty we were sobered by our surprise. We saw no culture of our own making, few heroes of our own age, no great faith, hope, or fraternity, no great trial and therefore no great triumphs or tragedies, and the silence was resounding. Those of us who went to high school during the late President Eisenhower's first term and to college during his second term were not the silent generation because we were diffident, much less deferent. We had nothing to say, and we are still at something of a loss for the right words when we now must speak for ourselves between more outspoken generations before us and behind.

The right words, of course! How precious and fastidious we were in our youth. We would then far rather read literary criticism than poetry or sing our own song if we ever composed one. We sought out bad films, for which we then never had far to reach, and sniggered at them rather than shoot our own films, good or bad. We debated our moral issue, something like “how far we could go on a date” and “be Christian” and rarely, really, acted on either opportunity to find out in the flesh how badly we had put both parts of the question. We were nearly antiquarians in our piety, treasuring especially anything irrelevant. Sometimes we whipped ourselves fashionably grim enough to be Week End Beats or cool enough to be Ivy Leaguers West, for any generation without a great faith can easily deliver either on call. When we were not in some sly, unspoken competition with our peers to out-same them, our appreciation of genuine people was often limited to how much they reminded us of characters in books. We were so conscious of our being, in so many cases, the first generation in our families to go to college (and sometimes high school) that we wanted to do everything just right, the way it had always been done. The fact that we were yet alive and bloody under all our fastidiousness explains much of the precarious cynicism we achieved.

Where Lies Hope

We were lied to by our seniors, too, but we cannot even yet get as angry at them for that as now can our juniors. Was it really mendacity, we wondered, or mostly their mythology speaking to us? So many times our seniors believed the lies themselves, and sometimes they were only trying to sustain their own hopes in the midst of their quiet desperation. They should now prefer the anger of our juniors to our condescension, their candor to our pitiful best construction on everything, but strangely they do not. We are, we suppose, essentially pragmatists between two ideological generations — neither, of course, thinks it is ideological, although each thinks the other is certainly. Therefore when our elders spoke to us of this “Christian century,” “the university family,” “the Free World,” “all deliberate speed,” “the affluent society,” and “the end of ideology,” we supposed that at best they were trying to speak self-fulfilling prophecies. We suppose the same when our juniors sing.
“all you need is love” and “we are not afraid” or chant “this is the dawning of the age of Aquarius” and “The Revolution is here!” In our view from the middle, none of these words of our juniors or seniors sustain demonstration, and they surely ought not to be assumed to be referring to the realities of our present situation.

It was very easy for our generation to get a bad political education in the Eisenhower era, nor was it very hard for us to get a poor theological education. In our early teens, when to be a teenager was to be a nothing, politics was a grandfatherly “Peace, Prosperity, and Progress,” and religion was soporifying Positive Thinking and Peace of Mind. Theologically and politically we did not so much do our earliest growing up absurd as we did it asleep. If our generation is now awake — and the present political and religious situation is not some terrible nightmare — we were roused gradually by many small, incremental alarms if at all.

We were and remain a privatized generation. We were millions of little time capsules even in our awakening. We shared no one great, common rite of passage, neither the Depression of the thirties, the War of the forties, or the “Movement” of the sixties. In the fifties we lived on borrowed experiences and individually imported initiations. Some of our generation in the middle fifties read Camus, Salinger, Kerouac, Ferlinghetti, Thomas, Kierkegaard, Auden, Eliot before Ash Wednesday, and maybe even grasped a play in the European Theatre of the Absurd or something of Sartre. A start. Others less literarily inclined began to take a long look at Sputnik (our high school graduation gift), at no-trespassing, private-property bomb shelters, at that CND semiphor newly arrived from England, at the HUAC water hose in San Francisco, and to Adlai Stevenson, unhappy man and best president our country never had. A start. Others began listening to the words in folk songs, unheard of songs of labor unions, hillbillies, and black America and made the embarrassing comparison of their words with those we in the white middle class were saying in our stupid “sick jokes.” Startling.

The Christians in our generation took up the liturgical revival in the churches and were driven through it toward social and economic issues when koinonia, diaconia, latria, and leiturgia were taken seriously, and so found their politics through their early aesthetics and fascination for words. Others began to reality-test positively the early critical studies of the acculturated churches by Niebuhr, Marty, Herberg, and Underwood. We were probably the first generation to be taught the church principally as a sociological phenomenon, and to this day we cannot capitalize the word for it or discern its reality transcendentally. (For example, we in particular had to work an extra shift to recover the deep meaning in our founding editor’s setting of The Cresset “on the walls of the Church...to throw light upon hidden dangers,” so movable and permeable has our generation found those walls and with so much light on the other side to illuminate the hidden dangers in the churches.)

We also sense we were probably the first generation in the churches to be reared more on apologetics and theologies of correlation than dogmatics. Somehow we were assumed to be cultured despisers of the faith from the day of our confirmations, and ministries to us thereafter were often of the “First-fill-in-the-blank-with-anything-cultural-good-and-then-add-faith” formation. “College with Christ.” “Sex in Discipleship.” “Drama and the Church.” While this approach to the faith was surely to be preferred to the fundamentalism or anecdotal trivialism of many of the churches in which we were reared, we suspect that our seniors were excessive in acting out on us some compensations for the deficiencies of their own theological educations. We must remember to avoid this reaction with our juniors should they ever ask a theological question consciously. At any rate and for whatever reason, our generation, when awakened, moved through several lifetimes in search of the right words for the substance of the faith. To move from fundamentalism to culture Protestantism to neo-orthodoxy to neo-liberalism to religionless Christianity to Death-of-God to secular humanism to the present pass of radical reconstruction was a more theologically proten youth for many of us than full lives were for our fathers.

It would be difficult to express the feeling many in our generation felt when we discovered that we had invested the end of our youths in what was the end of an era. When we now begin taking our minimum daily adult requirement of self-pity, we cannot imagine a more shortly and lately prepared generation to help pick up the pieces of a ruptured republic and our schizophrenic churches which yet have to get their head straight.

**Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed, Something Due**

On the other hand we did see in our reflection a small task for our generation temporarily between the young who see visions and the old who dream dreams. That is the task of the interpretation of dreams and visions. That is the task of those who seek out the meanings both of prophecies, and moods, proposals and vibrations, and mark well what is common in the old and the new. That is the task of those who are neither disdainful of what is past and present nor paranoid about what is appearing and of those who try to bring dreamers and visionaries to the issues in which together they can take common action in whatever may be their different styles, stages along life’s way, or gifts of the Spirit.

Many in our generation only barely glimpse what
this temporary task might mean nor what virtue, if any, we bring to this necessity. It is clear that we are not equal to such a task, but then who is? Who easily finds the real dangers in paranoia, the reality in rhetoric, the disease in symptoms, the politics in aesthetics, the tactics in teleologies, or even the will of God in history? And who can bring the now heightened generational consciousness further up to the consciousness of issues like racism, militarism, technologism, economic oppression and political repression, the rape of the earth and the befouling of the air, channeling education, and the totalism of the control of our very sensibilities by our machines, merchandising, and media from which all generations suffer?

For the generation gap is now with us permanently. No secularizing, urbanizing, cybernating, totalizing, and profoundly educating society can be without one. Our juniors do not bring change into such a society as much as they reflect and respond to deep changes already taking place in that society. The generation gap will remain and deepen even as it will decrease in importance for understanding the issues before us as a people. The issues already upon us will be decided not between the generations but between those who grasp what is happening in such a society and those who do not.

Such a belief in the decisiveness of consciousness, we are aware, is weak and possibly sentimental in comparison to the beliefs in the decisiveness of age, race, sex, education, geography, religion, nationality, or economic order. Our generation is already too old not to suppose that our beliefs will be part of our problems as a people even as we believe them to be part of their solutions. But if one were to ask whether our generation ever made any promising and perilous choices in life, we should answer that we have chosen consciousness of processes over all other human relations as decisive for understanding the whole. We were not for nothing called “the generation of the third eye” in our youth, and it apparently remains our indelible caste mark in the middle of our foreheads.

That is why we now find ourselves in the middle saying outrageous things to our juniors in behalf of our seniors. For we can remember what our seniors told us in their better moments long ago, even if many of them are doing differently and many of us are doing it poorly. To the young, for example, we find ourselves saying, yes, you can love our country. Indeed, it seems to us the only unreserved attitude in action one can take toward the United States is love. It cannot now be respected or praised, nor always be obeyed. We are not unaware that many good men are now alienated, expatriated, deserted, or jailed, and that many more good men will follow of all ages. But love of our country, the suffering search for the prodigal until he is home, is possible. And love, the saving of any innocent stones we may have for the seducers instead of for the prostituted, is possible.

As for churches in our present situation we find ourselves saying to the young, yes, you can enter them as they are and make them your own for others. Even our churches as they are now are more voluntary and vulnerable to you than any other institution in our society. Their real power for you and others is not in their lands, bonds, and buildings, although you will have to decide in what ways they can be subverted to better serve the least of men, our brothers, than they do now. Rather, the true power of churches is in their creation by an answered call to generation upon generation. The call arrives asking you to leave the land of your fathers and take a land which will be shown you, or it appears asking you to enter into a new realm of existence in history which is already among you. Upon some seizing such promises — and upon their doing of justice, their loving of kindness, and their running humbly with God — whole generations and many nations have been known to be blessed with light.

**Videmus Lucem**

The essays of the editor of *The Cresset* are written under the words *In Luce Tua*. These are the first words in the inscription on the seal of Valparaiso University — *In Luce Tua Videmus Lucem*, In Your Light We See Light — taken from the thirty-sixth Psalm. We do not yet, nor likely soon will, feel at ease writing our essays under that inscription any more than we have felt at ease studying and teaching under it in the past. It might appear by that inscription that we intend to shed the divine light on human lights when in fact, as has been speedily disclosed, our lights on the divine light are all too human. So misunderstood, the only thing we should then need to fear more than the pride and presumption of saying too much in our essays under such an inscription is the blaspheming and belittling of it in not saying enough.

Happily, however, the inscription on the Valparaiso University seal is not a motto nor is it over our essays as a manifesto. It is not another one of those lofty and unforgiving ideals inviting both the aspiration of the better side of our nature and the despair of ourself when the worse side will not likewise arise. Rather, the inscription appears to us as a confession of faith in God, *In Luce Tua* — and of hope for men, *Videmus Lucem*. Therefore, while we could well wish that God had created in us a greater faith than he has elected to do to date, we are believing that he has not yet left us bereft of any or all of the theological virtues. Some faith, hope, and love abide, enabling us to see that the only sin against the Spirit that damns is not to act upon such light, divine or human, as one has been given. These essays then, as Dylan Thomas said of his *Collected Poems*, “with all their crudities, doubts, and confusions, are written for the love of man and in praise of God, and I'd be a damn fool if they weren't.”
Dear Editor:

After reading Dr. Harold Gram's "The Christian in the World of Business" in the May, 1969, Cresset, I was struck by a curious coincidence. On the same page that Gram's essay ended, another began: "On Second Thought...In the reciprocal mouthing of cultic cliches, we are all inclined to stand on habit alone."

This unintended postlude appeared to articulate some nagging doubts about the relevance of Gram's fundamental premises and the adequacy of his "tension ethic" for our revolutionary time. Similarly, Gram seemed unresponsive to a provocative "Letter to a Businessman" appearing in the April Cresset. Like a prelude, this editorial "Letter" had suggested that it might be the businessman's turn next to be confronted by the new breed coming through the colleges these days.

But in the interest of communication, rather than confrontation, let me point out that the cited "Second Thought" notes that "...we are all inclined..." It would indict me as well as Gram. And in the interest of a mutual agonizing reappraisal, let me confess that I am numbered with the business people cited in the "Letter" who have "reconciled themselves to lives of quiet desperation", and so may need rehabilitation more than Gram or The Cresset.

With Gram, I lament the church's false dichotomy between what is secular and what is spiritual; but I wonder whether what he goes on to say serves to break down or build up that dichotomy. For example, he seems to conclude that the Sermon on the Mount is largely irrelevant for "business relationships in a fallen world". Agreed, the Sermon proclaims "the ethics of the Kingdom", but is not this precisely a point of tension ethics for a man who is baptized into the Kingdom of God, and who rules in the kingdom of business?

Similarly, Gram fits Luther's doctrine of two kingdoms to a separation of church and business — or "The New Industrial State", as Galbraith has christened it. Thus Gram is able to divide the "Divine Economy" into three responsibilities, assigning only God's creative function to business, but excusing the Christian businessman from any meaningful involvement in God's redemptive and sanctifying functions. But can we so dogmatically write up job descriptions for God at work in the world through His business agents? Do we wonder, then, why secular youth considers the church irrelevant?

Gram's way out is the Reformer's "simul justus et peccator — a tension ethics". But the tension seems anesthetized by easy acceptance of the sanctity of property rights, corporate law and order, the "need" for profit, due process-preserved status quo and fear of revolution. Few businessmen, Wasp or otherwise, would not subscribe to all that.

True, Gram accuses the businessman, along with others, of abuse of power, unconcern for justice, and of destroying community and political, social and human institutions. But explicitly absent from his tension ethics is the model of the cross, which ought to be the peculiar way of the saint/sinner in the world of business — in deed, not only creed. If Gram does not intend a kind of Sunday-saint/business-week-sinner dichotomy, then taking up the cross should be explicitly present in his ethics of "competence, community and justice."

In this way of the cross Gram's tension ethic could recover the intention of "simul justus et peccator" — that of liberating the faithful from a monastic celibacy to put a cruciform life to work in a "fallen" business world.

What might such a cruciform tension ethic — a pathos ethos — call a business man of faith to be and do? It would call him to live in community not only with but extraordinarily for his fellowman in any business relationship. A cruciform style may not need to sacrifice "goods, fame, child and wife" on the altar of business reform; but it could call the secular priest to some self-sacrifice in promoting causes larger than himself — in going the extra mile, in doing the unrewarded. Further, such a discipline may not need to renounce property rights and states rights; but it could call the "suffering servant" to employ these rights to advance, not sacrifice, human rights.

Moreover, such a pathos ethos need not so desperately fear revolution, given the history of the birth of this nation and the history of the life and death of the church which ever needs reformation around the Gospel. Granted, the "obedient rebel" would not shove every law and order businessman "up against the wall." Nor would he nihilistically overthrow due process to break the status quo. But a man who put his security in faith instead of his faith in securities might work overtime to rehumanize computerized management information systems and automated assembly lines. And he might work doubletime to escalate feet-dragging due process so that the status quo becomes obsolete as rapidly as machines and men.

If all that sounds like "I have a dream," so be it. It seems preferable to the nightmare of the current collision course. For we dare no longer "stand on habit alone" when it may be "our turn next". I only hope a secularized cruciform reorientation is radical enough.

Harry F. Succop
Princeton, New Jersey

The Cresset
This is the first in a series of monthly pages by yet another know-it-all professor: over thirty, under forty, nurtured in the Calumet Region, professionalized in California (unframed Ph.D.), a teacher of literature in Virginia. Increasingly convinced, however, that teaching is impossible — though learning is not. By temperament and metabolism, conservative to reactionary, from overlong exposure to the New Leftism of the New Testament, incipient radical. Desire drastic changes in Western political and economic structures, but hope the incendiaries spare libraries and all Saarinen buildings. Otherwise apathetic and cynical toward politics, owing to upbringings in the German Lutheran heresy.

Would listen to Ramsey Lewis all day, except that students bring poems in for surgery and a fair housing campaign in town needs a publicist. Apt to be discovered humming “My Spirit, Be Joyful,” especially over chocolate whipped cream pie or New England clam chowder. Regard as the most legible signature of our times Simon and Garfunkel trying to shore up “Silent Night” against the battering of the Seven O’Clock news. Frequently mix metaphors. Possess a countenance designed in the increasingly acceptable Apocalyptic Style, which may or may not bear any resemblance to the actual inner self, living or dead.

The reason we are all frightened of the Revolution is that we have something to lose.

Our daughters will be raped in the streets, our checking accounts cancelled, our Reader’s Digest will stop coming. The air conditioner will rasp to a halt, and the phone won’t work when we try to call the repairman.

We will have to start growing our own lettuce and carrots, because the A & P has been robbed. Probably we will have to go out into the country to look for seeds, and go on foot, since the refineries are shut down. There will be no meat to eat, and no gin and vermouth. The hospital will be unmanned, and we will have to deliver the baby ourselves, getting blood on our hands and feeling like throwing up.

There will be a black flag on the courthouse, and the mayor will be swinging stiffly between the Ionic columns. Main Street will be littered with IBM cards, carbon paper, paper clips, and manhole covers.

The newspaper will be badly printed and consist of only eight pages, with no ads. Information and instructions will contradict what is coming over the radio. The fine print in the back will not be the stock market, but instead, bulletins about the revolution in other places. In New York, for example, Wall Street has been renamed Lost Hope Canyon.

All the while there will be a lot of noise. People will be shooting off rifles and pistols, sometimes shelling random dogs who will yelp and bleed. Sirens will blow. It will be impossible to tell whether the sirens and guns and dogs are friends or enemies. The crackling noise will be churches and ranch houses burning to their foundations.

We will feel angry and depressed and be out of Excedrin. We will wake up cursing and go to bed trying to pray. Not only our children will be asking questions, but we ourselves. What is this chaos all about? Why is it happening to us? How did it start? Why didn’t somebody do something? Why are the revolutionaries so impatient? Why are there so many of them?

Probably after the first week there will be other questions. How long can they expect us to go on living like this? How long are we supposed to put up with fear, hunger, pain, shame, neglect, insult, confusion, and tension? How long, O Lord, how long?
Just minutes after midnight (Moscow time) on October 16, 1964, the TASS international service relayed a short message which stunned the rest of the world. The news release was in English, but despite its awkward sentence structure, its meaning was clear. Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev (the crafty, sharp-witted, and peppery Russian Premier) had been toppled from his pinnacle of power. In essence, the TASS release disclosed that Khrushchev had been relieved of his duties as First Secretary of the CPSU (Communist Party of the Soviet Union), that he no longer chaired the Council of Ministers, that Leonid I. Brezhnev had been elected to succeed Khrushchev as First Secretary of the CPSU, and that Alexei N. Kosygin had been appointed as the new chairman of the Council of Ministers.

Although for several days rumors — alleging that Khrushchev was dead or had been deposed — had circulated abroad, most sophisticated observers and international experts ignored them. Similar stories in the past, which later proved to be untrue, had conditioned the world community against placing too much faith in such narrations. But now, TASS left little doubt that the little, rotund leader had been arrested.

Diplomats, particularly in the West, had to wonder who would emerge triumphant in what was expected to be an inevitable struggle for power among several possible contenders. The two most important Russian holidays are May Day and November 7, the anniversary of the Revolution. Several Kremlin observers felt that no serious bid for absolute power would be made on the eve of these festive dates, particularly prior to November 7-8, for to do so, would mar the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Revolution. But the post-holiday political fireworks expected by some did not come, and one could seriously wonder: Is Russian autocracy passe? Five years have passed since Khrushchev's ouster, a long time to await the coming of a new Russian political "Messiah."

Vladimir I. Lenin and Josef V. Stalin, despite their high-sounding phrases calling for the economic betterment and social emancipation of the masses, were in the tradition of Old Russia, i.e., practitioners of the stern and harsh despotism which had characterized Russia since the rule of Ivan the Terrible. Like the Germans — although at a different point in the timetable of history — the Russian ruling classes and the intellectuals had been caught between the jaws of an ideological vise, the ideals of the Libertarian West and the authoritarianism of the East. Although ill-conceived in plan and poorly executed, the abortive Decembrist Revolt (1825) well typifies the emerging conflict between Western liberalism and the long-established Eastern Despotism. Russian officers, who had returned from the Napoleonic campaigns with liberal ideas stuffed in their duffel bags, were active participants in the Decembrist revolt.

The roots of Russian autocracy are found in early Russian history, as early as the thirteenth century when the Mongols swept into Russia from the Transcaucasian region. The Mongols, or Tatars, ruled in a ruthless, totalitarian manner for 250 years, and not until the reign of Ivan III (1462-1505) was Mongol suzerainty broken. By then, autocracy as a way of political rule had become deeply ingrained in Russian political processes, as attested to by the annals of history from Ivan III (the first proclaimed czar) to Nicholas II (the last of the czars).

To view Nicholas II as the last of the Russian czars is not completely correct. One can well argue that more appropriately only absolutism by royal blood had terminated with the overthrow of Nicholas. Discounting the short-lived Provisional Government, first under Prince Georgi Lvov and then Alexander F. Kerensky, the loss of political leadership by Nicholas to the Bolsheviks might be described as the supplanting of czarism in royal dress by czarism in street clothing. In short, traditional Russian autocracy did not die with the execution of the czar, nor should one have expected it to — least of all the Bolsheviks. Autocracy was too deeply rooted in the basic structure of Russian society to yield to an ideology championed by a vanguard of political extremists, nor did the Bolsheviks themselves want this to happen. A continuance of absolutism, stripped of any claims by divine right, ideally suited the Bolsheviks, as nebulous and ill-defined as their plans were after their seizure of power.

Clearly, Russia has undergone drastic transformation since November, 1917, but with or without the help of the Bolsheviks, the economic and social metamorphosis of Russia would have been inevitable — probably different in an indeterminate number of ways, but nevertheless inevitable. Despite the economic, political, and social mutations which Russia has undergone during the last half century, much of Old Russia remains unscathed and intact. For not
Unlike other peoples, there is a living continuity in Russian society, and for better or for worse, many ways, traditions, practices, and institutions of the past clearly manifest themselves in Russian life today.1

During the years immediately following the Revolution, Lenin was unable to assume for himself the traditional autocratic powers of his predecessors. To seize power was one thing; to consolidate and maintain power was another matter, and the latter would prove to be a difficult and painstaking task. World War I and the Civil War had left the nation in a state of economic prostration, social chaos and demoralization.

In this setting, the Bolsheviks, at the outset, endeavored to build effective instruments of power in an effort to gain greater control over the nation. As a means of control, Lenin placed ever-increasing reliance on centralization, an administrative practice which had endured since Mongol Russia. But despite these labors, a voluminous power vacuum existed, for the Bolsheviks were unable to bring about a smooth and speedy transition in government rule. After having seized power, the Bolsheviks were quite at a loss as to what to do with their newly won authority, and among their ranks were only a few capable and experienced administrators, as Lenin himself was well aware.

Mass support for the new government was conspicuously lacking, for the class basis for the Revolution, as oppressed proletariat, was practically non-existent. The countryside was not committed; if anything, peasant uprisings gave the new government every reason to be apprehensive of the peasantry. And although centralization insured the Bolsheviks' control in the urban areas, the extent of their control progressively diminished as the distance increased away from the urban centers. Finally, the cultural, national, and racial heterogeneity of the Russian people made it difficult to subjugate localism and provincialism.2

Although a brilliant theoretician, Lenin was a pragmatist and a realist as well.3 In 1921, in the light of the economic and social plight of the nation (and the threat which it posed to the survival of the New Order), Lenin decided to compromise with capitalism. The New Economic Policy was introduced in March, 1921. In the main, NEP abandoned forced tax collections in kind from the peasant and allowed him to freely market his produce. Moreover, the new policy restored a considerable measure of capitalism. But NEP was a temporary measure, a strategic retreat which would give the regime a breathing spell and serve as a means to rehabilitate the nation economically. With incentives restored in the cities and the countryside — as had been anticipated — NEP proved to be a realistic formula to revive the economy. By 1928 (when NEP was abandoned), most sectors of the economy had sufficiently recovered to match pre-war production levels.4

Lenin, who had died in January, 1924, was unable to witness the full fruition of his strategy, which would have undoubtedly given him a great measure of satisfaction. The political benefits of NEP were to be reaped by another, for with the nation's economy uprighted and with social order considerable restored, the nation could again be harnessed to the traditional Russian totalitarianism.

The Struggle for Supremacy after Lenin

Lenin had not designated a successor prior to his death in early 1924, nor had he left behind any carefully drawn blue print to guide his successor(s) in the management of the Communist state. Sharp differences in economic and political thought and a zest for power among several Party leaders precipitated a power struggle in the Kremlin. The contest for national leadership had its earliest beginnings in 1922 (when Lenin suffered a stroke), but his death signaled the time for the various power contenders to begin battle in earnest.

As was to be the pattern of the future, the struggle for power took place behind the facade of collective leadership, a troika consisting of Leo Kramenev, Leon Trotsky, and Gregory Zinoviev. However, in the light of their power capabilities, the principal contenders were Josef Stalin and Leon Trotsky. Intellectually and as an organizer, Stalin was inferior to Trotsky, but what Stalin lacked in intellectual dynamism, he more than compensated in cunning and "political savvy." With masterful skill, he played his principal rivals against one another. As Secretary of the Party, he was able to purge the Party of his opponents, real and imagined, and he replaced them with men who were unquestionably loyal to him. By 1927, Stalin had crushed and neutralized those individuals who could have effectively challenged his claim to absolute leadership.5 The ruthlessness, subterfuge, and violence employed by Stalin to win power (and later consolidate and maintain it) is reminiscent of intrapalace intrigue which transpired in the days of czars and czarinas. Whereas in the past, the court aristocrats and the streltzi were the main determinants in the historic struggles for power, now Party dignitaries and the OGUP (secret police) had become the principal factors in the calculus of political supremacy. In short, with the rise of Stalin, Russian absolutism was clearly restored, only the actors and the stage setting had changed.

A detailed discourse on the atrocities of the paranoid dictator would serve little or no purpose here; the brute totalitarianism of Stalin is common knowledge. Pertinent are the means employed by Stalin to transform Russia, in thought and as a society. The savage persecution of the peasants which began in the fall of 1929, his devious use of the secret police, the strict censorship, the forced labor camps, the si-
lencing of the intellectuals, and the isolation of Russia from the West were all redolent of the Autocracy of the pre-Bolshevik Russia.

As harsh as Stalin's methods were, the autocrat did stabilize Russian society, and notwithstanding the periodic bloody purges ordered by Stalin, Russian leadership was characterized by continuity from the late 1930's until Stalin's death in 1953. Vyacheslav M. Molotov served Stalin faithfully by helping to maintain a firm grip on the Party organization, first as Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars (1990-1941) and then in foreign affairs.

Despite the lip-service paid to Marxist ideology, Stalin's autocratic rule, as indicated earlier, did not transform all of Russian society; however, the dictator's principal aim of converting a predominately backward peasant society into a modern industrial state was accomplished. But the coercive metamorphosis of Russian society put into motion a new set of forces and created new social classes which would compel future Soviet leadership to react differently.

Similar to the situation which prevailed after Lenin's death in 1924, the demise of Stalin in 1953 set the stage for another power struggle in the Kremlin. Because of the inability of any one contender to muster enough backing to safely make claim to absolute rule, the various competitors, not unlike those who aspired to power after Lenin passed away, agreed to rule as a triumvirate. The troika was composed of: Police Chief Lavrenti P. Beria, Georgi M. Malenkov (who was designated Premier), and Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov. Each person participating in this collective leadership was well aware that it was but a temporary measure, a perturbing compromise with an inherent subtle implication that eventually only one of them would walk away with all of the marbles.

Prior to his death, Stalin had indicated that Malenkov should succeed him, but Malenkov's rivals were not to be swayed by the wish of a man who was not dead. Beria, by virtue of his powerful position, posed the greatest threat to all the others who aspired to sole supremacy. Consequently, a conspiracy to eliminate the dangerous Police Chief required only few words of persuasion among Beria's adversaries. In June, 1953, Beria was arrested; within six months, he was shot. Thus, in keeping with old established patterns, the struggle for autocratic rule was well underway. In 1955, Malenkov was driven out of contention, and Nikolai A. Bulganin replaced him as Premier. Moreover, Molotov was rendered politically ineffective by ousting him as the nation's Foreign Minister. And to the surprise of Russians and foreign observers, Nikita Khrushchev, who had never been considered as a possible successor to Stalin, managed to walk away with the prize trophy from the field of deadly Kremlin politics. Certainly, Khrushchev's success was attributable to his acumen in setting up his opponents against one another and to his playing a waiting game as his adversaries set up one another, an invaluable lesson which he had well learned from Stalin. Shortly after Stalin's death, Khrushchev won for himself the Secretariat of the Party which gave him a free hand to line up support from below. Although Khrushchev's rivals attempted to depose him in June, 1957, their coup was not successful, for Khrushchev had made his Premiership secure by winning the military support of Marshal Georgi I. Zhukov.

Although the struggle for power in the post-Stalin era was marked by many of the characteristics similar to the palace and Kremlin intrigues of the past, the fate of the losers was not as fatal as it once had been. Only Beria paid the ultimate price. Bulganin was assigned as a farm administrator, Malenkov was placed in charge of a power station in remote Ust-Kamenogorsk, Molotov was appointed Ambassador to Mongolia (a practical political precaution but a pitiful waste of his experience and talents in foreign affairs), and Zhukov was placed in retirement.

The Khrushchev Era

Once at the political helm, Khrushchev lost little time in taking steps to maintain power. In accordance with established tradition, he had every intention to rule with an iron fist. For above all, he wanted power, and Zhukov had helped him get it. But Khrushchev was cognizant that a military man powerful enough to be his benefactor could also be his malefactor, thus, as stated above, the Premier wasted no time in driving the Marshal into retirement. Yet, forcing Zhukov into retirement may have been Khrushchev's own eventual undoing, for when he himself was victimized, he stood alone.

By 1956, some drastic changes had taken place since the Bolsheviks had seized power. The country was now undergoing rapid economic and social transition. Khrushchev, being a pragmatist like Lenin, clearly perceived that mid-twentieth century Russia called for a leader who would be more sensitive and responsive to the new needs of the people.

Economic development and exposure to foreign products, places, and people made acute the hunger of the Russian citizenry for a higher standard of living. In the past, only the extreme human and material sacrifices by the people had made it possible for economic planners to achieve a fantastically high rate of investment, as much as 30 per cent of the Gross National Product. Earlier concessions by Malenkov to allow modest increases in consumer goods now had to be bettered. Furthermore, the drive for mass education had created new classes, among them the technocrats, whose demands could not be ignored by Khrushchev. An array of bureaucratic chiefs, Party leaders, technocrats, professionals, etc., constituted
a new hierarchy in social stratification, and each class endeavored to make felt its relative measure of power. Khrushchev found that the intellectuals, who had long been cowered into a state of muteness, were becoming uncomfortably testy toward the regime. And although he did not hesitate to restrain them (by subjecting them to a vicious tongue-lashing or outright censorship as the occasion seemed to require), on the whole, they were allowed a greater measure of free expression.

In addition, certain forces outside Russian borders could not be disregarded by Khrushchev, e.g., the restiveness in the satellite nations, the threat of nuclear warfare, and the responsibility of being a holder of "the bomb." Furthermore, oppression at home made the sales-pitch for Communism less convincing abroad, particularly among the underdeveloped countries, which were being passionately wooed by the West and the East. Finally, the growing schism between China and the U.S.S.R. was becoming increasingly apparent in international circles. These and other factors must have weighed heavily on Khrushchev's mind, demanding of him new methods and fresh approaches in the shaping of domestic and international policies in the administration of a nation which had not only undergone numerous drastic internal changes in forty years, but meanwhile had also become the world's strongest military power, next to the United States.

Thus, when speaking behind closed doors at the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956, he denounced Josef Stalin and the "personality cult." Not too long after, Khrushchev openly denounced Stalin at home and then ordered the release and pardon of thousands of prisoners from Russian Labor camps. Also, Russian courts became more equitable in judgment and more humane in meting out punishment.

Other surprises came out of the Congress. Most important, in an open session (partly because of China's militancy and in part realizing Russia's international responsibilities as a "bomb-holder"), Khrushchev countermanded Marxist-Leninist dogma by (1) denying the inevitability of war with the West and (2) jetisoning the hypothesis that violent revolution was a prerequisite to the overthrow of capitalism.

Thus, in response to the environmental forces at home and abroad, Khrushchev's tenure was characterized by various reform measures. Russian labor benefitted by improved working conditions, shorter hours, and higher wages. In addition, restrictions on job-transfers were significantly lifted which allowed increased mobility of the labor force. For the first time since the 1920's, labor unions were given greater latitude of self-expression and behavior, although it would be incorrect to assume that they exercise any economic power comparable to the unions in the West.

The economic status of the peasant on the collective farm was somewhat improved by revamping the system of wage payments and by providing fringe benefits. And as an additional gesture repudiating the harsh oppression of the Stalinist regime, Khrushchev significantly reduced the activities of the dreaded secret police. Furthermore, although less successful than he hoped, Khrushchev relentlessly strove to overhaul the inefficient, outdated, and patronage-afflicted government bureaucracy.

Consumer goods became more available, qualitatively and quantitatively, and price reductions were made on some goods. In housing, he was able to only scratch the surface, for housing had been too long neglected by his predecessors.

The liberalization which Khrushchev set into motion permeated the ideological structure of the economic system so that impetus was given to "Libermanism." Yevsey G. Liberman had strongly recommended that cost-price be utilized as a measurement of firm efficiency and that supply-demand (in a free market) be utilized to overcome the surplus problem of unwanted goods. Khrushchev did not give Libermanism much attention, for he thought the problems of the Soviet economy could be solved through other means.

But everal months prior to his ouster, Khrushchev did experiment with the market mechanism in a few industries.

In essence then, under Khrushchev, Russian autocracy persisted, but it had now taken on new tones. Rule of the people had become more humane, and government had become more sensitive to the various needs of a changed people. Russian society gave clear evidence of social stratification, notwithstanding the social canons set down by Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin. Each class wanted to be heard and some possessed respectable measures of power capability. Like a geological sample cut deep from the surface of the earth, the Russian society of the 1950's consisted of several layers. Each layer represented a period of history, and although each new crust had resulted in certain changes in the social and political image of the nation, nevertheless, the outer mass still retained the general outline of the original layer. Each succeeding layer bore its weight downward but the deepest strata, though strained, did not snap.

By and large, arbitrary decrees continued to be rendered, as they had been in the past, but Khrushchev—caught in a social whirlpool of economic change at home and economic and political influences abroad—was compelled to refashion Russian autocracy. Brusskneckled tactics became less frequently relied upon to achieve ends at home. Instead, increased reliance was placed on subtle means. Khrushchev's approach to achieve his aims might appropriately be described—in a number of instances—as the implementation of subtle autocracy.

At home and abroad, Khrushchev has often been a target of bitter criticism, and not without good reason. But undoubtedly, history will be kinder to the
man, for as illustrated above, a number of his accomplishments, particularly at home, are noteworthy. In foreign affairs, his policy of peaceful coexistence and his willingness to successfully effect a nuclear test ban treaty cannot be ignored.

The Fall of Khrushchev

Prior to his ouster Khrushchev managed to weather a number of storms. No single miscalculation accounted for his deposition, but in the aggregate and to varying degrees, several events brought his political demise. Certainly, several personal traits (his complacency, over-confidence, and stubbornness) were contributing factors. But several other events which lead to his political demise are far more worthy of mention, among them the 1962 Cuban missile crisis which caused him political embarrassment at home as well as abroad. Also, the ruthless manner by which he dealt with the 1956 uprisings in Eastern Europe was politically damaging to him — clearly an indication that where subtle persuasion and veiled threats proved inadequate, he would resort to violence. One cannot ignore the bitter trials with Red China, the subsequent division it brought in the family of Communist nations, and the alignment of the Socialist nations behind either the U.S.S.R. or China. Polycentrism, vehemently denounced by Stalin when first introduced by Marshal Tito, became a frequent subject of discussion among the Communist countries of Eastern Europe, France, and Italy. Polycentrism offered itself as a real alternative to ideological alignment, a clear departure from the monolithic past.

But it was Khrushchev's economic policies which proved most damaging to him. His policies were open­ly described as "hare-brained" in conception and in­feasible in execution. His abortive, grandiose scheme to cultivate the Virgin Lands of the south came under bitter attack, and when in 1963 the nation was forced to import 230 million bushels of Australian, Cana­dian, and North American wheat, his political props showed signs of imminent collapse. As the Soviet economy continued to expand in the years following World War II, the task of central planning became increasingly difficult, and notwithstanding the assistance offered by computers, input-output analysis, and mathematical techniques, the economy — in growing — had exceeded the manageable limits of centralization. Certain reforms taken by Khrush­chev, such as his plan of decentralization, did not suf­fice to solve the nation's greatest single economic prob­lem: coordination within the economic system.

To unseat Khrushchev, his opponents employed the now familiar clandestine techniques. And after the removal of Khrushchev, a triumvirate rule was established in accordance with the precedent set. The now troika consisted of: Leonid I. Brezhnev; First Secretary of the Party, Alexei N. Kosygin; Premier, and Nikolai V. Podgorny; President. These three are still in command today. Of them, the least influ­ential is Podgorny.

From all outside appearances, collective leadership has worked reasonably well and harmoniously since Khrushchev's ouster in 1964. Upon taking the reins of government, the troika was confronted with a host of economic problems inherited from Khrush­chev and his predecessors. Despite Khrushchev's con­centrated efforts, the chronic problem of agriculture remained as big as ever. In industry, however, things have continued to improve, especially since the in­creased application of Libermanism, which had been accepted lukewarmly during Khrushchev's last six months of rule. The Soviet version of free enterprise has worked some economic wonders since it was first introduced as a trial experiment in 1964, and today, some 10,000 firms operate under the plan. The favor­able results have convinced the Soviets of the plan's merits.

The profit motive has spurred greater efficiency as attested by certain economic indicators. Russian sources claim that in 1967 labor productivity rose by 6 per cent and industrial output climbed by 9.3 per cent. The consumer finds certain desirable goods more abundant in supply (Libermanism is principally prac­ticed by the consumer goods industries). Meat output in 1967 increased by 70,000 tons, cloth became ample in supply, and some 175,000 additional television sets were sold. It would be presumptuous to credit Libermanism alone for the increased availability of Russian consumer goods, but the same kind of objectivity makes it difficult to discount Liberman­ism as a major factor in making consumer goods more available.

Despite the economic progress made by the present ruling troika and notwithstanding the ostensible domestic political tranquility prevailing in the U.S.S.R. today, one must bear in mind that Russian tradition contradicts "power-sharing" as a means of long term rule. Past experience has proven collective leadership to be precisely what its participants have always intended it to be, a makeshift instrument of temporary leadership enjoined by the nation's principal power contenders until one individual — and not necessarily a party to the collective leadership — can make a power play to win the sole mastery of the Party and government. In no small way, the employment of this kind of stopgap leadership in the U.S.S.R. is due to the absence of any kind of clearly defined procedure for the transfer of power when a leader dies or is ousted.

The interested observer of Soviet affairs cannot help but wonder: Why has there not been a bid for power by one of the contenders? When will the collective leadership fall apart? And when it does, will autocracy return in its usual form?
Conclusion

A variety of factors makes it difficult to present precise answers to the preceding questions; nevertheless, some conjectures can be made with a reasonable measure of confidence. The surprising endurance of the troika rule since 1964 prompts the first two questions which are, of course, related. The triumvirate has probably survived because of the inability of any one power contender to rally the support necessary to make a bid for sole supremacy. In the past, the secret police, the military, and Party leaders — severally or jointly — have played a key role in swinging the pendulum of power in favor of a particular aspirant. But since the liquidation of Beria, the political influence and power of the secret police have been adequately curbed, making the agency a far less potent force in Soviet politics. And since Zhukov’s bitter experience, the military officers, not wishing to risk their careers, appear reluctant to overtly declare Support (and possibly military) to make, with reasonable certainty of success, a bid for sole Soviet political power, he will make his move. From the masses, popular approval would be desirable, but at least indifference would do. And with a decisive takeover by an aspirant, collective leadership will naturally fall to the wayside, for it will have then served its purpose. By its very nature and in the light of past experience, the troika is only a convenient improvisation of leadership. Moreover, it is inconsistent with traditional Russian rule.

The maintenance of Russian autocracy is in keeping with Party ideology. The existence of the one-party system insures the perpetuation of Russian absolutism, for to the undisputed Party leader go also the reins of government. And although the Party has reconciled itself to a mild liberal movement in the Soviet Union, the movement is given only that latitude which the Party feels it can afford without placing itself in detriment.

But whomever wins mastery of Russia, he, like Khrushchev, will find it necessary to knead his role as the leader of the Party and the nation, as may befit the temper of modern Russia. The iron fist will be there but gloved in velvet. Khrushchev ascended to supremacy in a time of social transition; his autocratic successor will be doing likewise. Consequently, the next Russian dictator will indeed find his high office challenging, for he will not only inherit a host of economic problems from past regimes, but he will also be confronted with the new social dimensions of a changing society, a total situation he will find politically burdensome and demanding.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a popular account which well illustrates the perenniality of those things normally identified with Russia of the past, see Harrison Salisbury, Russia (New York: Atheneum, 1965), pp. 3-24.
This week we are remembering again the Reformation of the church in the sixteenth century. Today we recall a companion renewal which we know as humanism, a literary flowering based on the recovery of the great classics of Greece and Rome, with their humane spirit and critical methods of inquiry. The young poet, Ulrich von Hutten, caught the exuberant spirit of his age when he exclaimed: "Oh century! Oh letters! It is a joy to be alive. It is not yet time to lapse into repose. Studies thrive and minds flourish. Woe to you, barbarism. Accept the noose, look forward to exile!"

Two volcanic forces had erupted and both converged at that strategic center, the university. For it was at the University of Wittenberg that Martin Luther had formulated the Gospel as God's creative Word of forgiveness which placed a man into free service to his neighbor. Luther was himself no quiet scholar. In addition to his rich literary activity, he entered fully into cultural life. Under his direction the university curriculum was reorganized, reflecting the new place given biblical and humanistic studies. He fully joined the battle against barbarism, addressing municipalities all over Germany with proposals for sweeping school reforms. Thus Wittenberg became a seedbed of both humanism and the Reformation. A little bushleague university by comparison with the great universities of its day, it soon attracted leading scholars, and restless young humanists flocked to it in great numbers. It was a young man's university. Luther was only thirty-four in 1517 and most of his colleagues were younger. And now, under the impact of the Reformation Gospel, many a young humanist changed professions and forsook a quiet life to enter the parish and princely courts and schools. For the Reformation Gospel was able to give meaning and purpose to many a humanist's life. Humanism had been around some time before the Reformation, yet it was not the biting satires of Erasmus or the poems of a von Hutten that touched men at their depths and changed the world. It was rather the Gospel that touched the deep springs of life and moved many a humanist to offer his gifts and training for the rebuilding of culture. Luther called humanism a "John the Baptist," because it helped prepare the way for the renewal of the Gospel, and the Reformation is hard to think of apart from the heroic labors of the humanists. But while culture itself could lead men deep into the mystery of man, it could not of itself create great faith. Yet faith, once created by the Gospel, could lead men to build a higher culture. That is what happened then and can happen today.

If the Gospel won many humanists it put off others. Like Erasmus, the greatest European intellectual when Luther became prominent, some men — so concerned for beauty and morality — could not see the demonic and ugly side of man's inhumanity to man. Therefore they could not see how this led to God's radical act of sending His Beloved Son not simply for moral instruction, but to stand before men in his winsome free humanity, a judgment on our passion for security, drawing us to follow him through the mystery of the cross into a new future, a new humanity where nothing truly human is lost or alien, but where all that is inhumane is daily purged away.

Luther was one of those rare prophetic figures who could squarely face man — that strange mixture of animal, demon, and angel — and speak of his grandeur and his misery. And he could face the God question in its perplexity, terror, and splendor, and tell what he saw. Not so Erasmus, unable to face the full implications of either the kingdom of darkness or the kingdom of grace.

But at a university it is not enough to have a prophet. You need the quiet scholar as well. Philip Melanchthon was everything that Luther was not. A genius like Luther, this man embodied the tensions between the Reformer and the humanist. Devoted to Erasmus and to Luther, he tried to reconcile faith and culture. Our celebration today would not be complete without a remembrance of Philip. A child prodigy, he was refused the master's degree at Heidelberg at the age of seventeen because he looked too young. His extant works are of astonishing breadth, covering every conceivable area of thought. As many as two thousand students crammed his lecture hall to hear him lecture on Homer. He taught at Wittenberg in both the philosophical and theological faculties, and resisted Luther's efforts to have him go into theology full time. When he lectured in theology he would have eight hundred students when Luther had four hundred. The stormy but affectionate relationship between Luther (violent and explosive), and Melan-
tion (quiet and pensive), is one of the most fascinating in history. Today their mortal remains lie together beneath the pulpit of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. Coming to the Gospel from humanism, Melanchthon enabled many to sacrifice a high but incomplete view of man for the renewed humanity of the forgiveness of man in Christ.

If there was an Erasmus, a Luther, and a Melanchthon, there was also a Carlstadt. Enthused by the Reformation, this professor became the iconoclast, breaking the statues and windows in the churches, denying art and culture. In the name of the Bible he argued against the university granting degrees, quoting Christ's statement: "Call no man master." One evening with some friends Luther wrote on the table in his house: "Erasmus — words, but no substance. Luther — substance, but no words. Philip — substance and words. Carlstadt — neither substance nor words." The great Christian enterprise to build culture through men of faith has always been plagued by the Erasmuses and the Carlstadts. Today we still have them and pay a heavy price for them. For when any of us becomes closed to the whole truth as it emerges in the relentless change of history — disaster is at hand.

We may take Germany as our example, but the story of Germany is the story of Western civilization. In the nineteenth century much of the German church went the way of the Carlstadts, — and in the middle decades of that century, thousands and thousands of workers turned their backs on both church and state to join the Marxist movement, and have never returned. And the great German universities — true heirs of Erasmus — fought the scientific-technological revolution as unworthy of the humanistic tradition, so that nearly all the great scientific discoveries were made not in the universities, but in separate academies and institutes that had to be set up for new truth. Not surprisingly, the universities were among the first institutions to capitulate to Hitler. For when prophets and scholars, faith and learning fall apart into self-sufficient systems, the demons take over, and there is no power in a gentle humanism to throw them out.

Today we dedicate buildings that bring together symbolically the humanities, the ancient liberal art of mathematics, and those movers and shakers of our technological culture, the engineers. This is a curious juxtaposition rather much like the lion and the lamb lying down together. And I think we know which is the lion. For nothing is more certain than that we live in a technological revolution which dominates our culture, shapes our values, our imagination, and the conditions of our living. Today the humanities must beg for the crumbs which fall from the table of government and commerce, for the prestige and the money are with the technological enterprise. We live in the age of the technical organization in which our lives are increasingly dominated by various kinds of engineers presiding over systems of technicians, computer programmers, suppliers, and distributors, whose values must of necessity be efficiency, calculability, and specialization. Nothing is untouched. Even the university, once an island of quiet and contemplation, now seems to have taken on the ethos of machine technology with its impersonality and defiance of human dignity. How have Christians and humanists reacted? *The End of Intimacy* is the title of one outraged book. People in the humanities more often than not have reacted with scorn at the alleged new barbarism, affecting superiority or sulking at their loss of status. And students — some regard the university as part of the whole dehumanizing system and adopt the policy of keeping their distance, taking the university's money, doing enough to get by, but putting their real time into certain preferred activities where true salvation lies. Others uncritically accept the whole process like sheep, eager only to have access to the system of exchange of goods and services with its affluence and rewards for those who accept the rules of the corporation. Some rebel — and in their unconventional dress and life style cry out that you can't standardize human beings, you can't reduce them to cogs in the machine, interchangeable parts of a great system. So Walter Schirra becomes a folk hero because, whirling through space in that beautifully co-ordinated effort, he got angry and gave a piece of his mind to the engineers below. In philosophy and literature we prefer writers who deal with alienation and emphasize the "I — thou" relationship and deep, personal encounter isolated from society. A whole theology has even been built on the notion that God is really to be found only in meaningful personal relationships. And the faculty member who is instantly accessible for heart-to-heart talks will find plenty of students to comfort. With it all goes a longing for the good old days of the small campus when intimacy and one-to-one relationships abounded, and there is the suspicion that this was more human and more Christian. For Christians and humanists have so tied human values to personalistic love and meaning that they have trouble relating at all to the doings of technology. The whole truth is that there are other significant relationships we must learn today as part of precisely Christian education. In the parable of the Good Samaritan there is no evidence of an eye-ball to eye-ball conversation in depth between the Samaritan and the victim. He put him on his horse, got him efficiently to the nearest inn, paid out his money, and went on his way. Today, if we wish to live for others and meet human need — which is our Christian vocation — we have no choice but to learn to work carefully and patiently within various organizations, teams, volunteer groups, and political systems. We need to learn from the great technical and mathematical teams that some of our richest human experiences can come from sharing a corpor-
ate enterprise, joining special skills to achieve particular ends. In such enterprises it is competence, self-discipline, human sensitivity, objective knowledge that count. This has gotten technology where it is today, and these are eminently human qualities.

Consider the world opening up before us because of the technological revolution. We can see the world as a whole again, and with it the interdependence of the human race. We suddenly have access to the great varieties and wealth of human culture, and may soon have the leisure to become citizens of the planet. If we can no longer escape distant human misery, whether in Vietnam or Biafra, because we have become neighbors to each other through technology, technology also allows us to imagine that hunger and poverty can be managed if we marshal compassion and technical skill. So technology enhances human aspirations and enlarges our freedom of choice. But not for a moment shall we abandon our attempt to understand and control the dehumanizing factors of our technological culture or diminish our concern for intimacy and personal integrity, beginning at this university. Human dignity has been abused and this must cease. Yet God the Creator Lord of History is in this new world opening before us. He addresses us and claims us not only in the abrasive life of the dorms, or the intense private relationships of our lives, or when in our trouble we have no other One to whom to turn. He is also addressing and claiming us now in our strength and affluence, calling us in our competence, teamwork, imagination, and technical skill to subdue the earth and to engage in the struggle — for man. Surely this university is ready to organize — and reorganize — for such a task as this. Surely in this task we need each other: our mathematics and our technology; our sense of comedy, tragedy, and history; our care for words, ideas, and beauty; our search to define human need; our Christian fellowship in which we have the power to say “no” to the idols and “yes” to what matters for man; our sense of living in the divine forgiveness so that we may be open to God’s future; our sense of unity in Christ which encourages us all to be very human and very different. In the name of Him in whom all things in heaven and earth hold together, even Christ Our Lord. Amen.

**Political Affairs**

*Liberals and the Reform of the Electoral College*

By ALBERT R. TROST

Lost amid news of the astounding voyage of Apollo 11, the globe-trotting of President Nixon, the Vietnam war, the ABM controversy, and the problems of Senator Edward Kennedy was the report of Congressional action on a rather important institutional change in American government. The Rules Committee of the House of Representatives cleared for floor action a report of the House Judiciary Committee which proposes a reform of the electoral college. A similar proposal in the Senate awaits final committee action.

This action is not only of crucial significance for the election of future Presidents in the United States, but it is also somewhat surprising. The Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has been holding hearings on electoral college reform since 1961. Despite this record of consideration and the endorsement of electoral reform by the last three presidential candidates of the Democratic Party there was really little chance that Congress would find the time or the will to act on the reform. This year committee action thus far has been thorough, decisive, and almost radical.

Up until this year the reform that was given the most attention was the most innocuous, the so-called “district plan.” It would have had most of a state’s presidential electors selected by the winners in congressional districts rather than state-wide pluralities. Each state would still have two electors who would be determined by the results of the state-wide vote. This plan also contemplated a small change in the procedure that is followed when no candidate gets 50% of the electoral vote. Instead of the present procedure of each state casting one vote in the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative would cast his vote as an individual. Even these minor changes, while probably mildly supported by a majority, could not elbow their way onto the floor of the House or Senate for consideration.

A more far-reaching reform was contained in a proposed proportional method of determining electors. The number of electors each candidate would receive in a given state was to be in the same proportion as the popular vote in that state. This plan had less support through 1968.

Both the concerned subcommittee in the Senate and the committee in the House have surprisingly by-passed both of these proposals and favorably reported a plan that would eliminate the electoral college and have the President determined by a national direct popular election. The man with the most votes wins. The only qualification is that the winner must get at least 40% of the vote (50% is needed now in the electoral college) or a run-off election is to be held. Of course, this kind of reform has to be in the form of an amendment to the Constitution, so even...
if passed by the required two-thirds majority in Congress it faces the hurdle of approval in three-fourths of the states. Final approval or ratification may be doubtful; things have happened so quickly and in an unexpected direction that consequences for various groups are still to be weighed and opposition formed.

One group that should take time to weigh its position are the proponents of political liberalism. So far, in Congressional action, their support for direct election has been very prominent. Liberals of undoubted credentials have appeared to testify before the committees in support of direct election. Included among these are Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Representative James G. O'Hara of Michigan, Representative William F. Ryan of New York, Representative Allard Lowenstein of New York, and Lewis Speiser of the American Civil Liberties Union.

The support of liberals for this most radical of electoral college reforms is not surprising. The threat of George C. Wallace in the last election was, of course, an immediate spur to action for both liberals and moderates. Wallace could not have won under the arrangements of the electoral college, but he promised to use its provisions to magnify his popular support. However, there is also an ideological aspect to the liberals' support. This is their present identification with the principle of popular rule expressed by simple majorities. Roughly this is the Jeffersonian view of democratic government. Senator Muskie illustrated its application in his testimony before the Senate subcommittee on February 6, 1969. The direct vote system would "ensure that all votes count equally, and that each citizen can cast his ballot without questioning its effectiveness." The President "derives his support from the nation as a whole, not from several selected states or parts of states."

American liberals have been tied to the principles of majority popular rule since the Depression. The mass majority and the liberal wanted the same things in this period. Neither found much desirable in the economic and political status quo. Together they achieved the Roosevelt administration and the New Deal. The liberals have continued to support policies that favor majority participation and direct popular rule. However, over the last forty years, the majority has changed. The combined Nixon and Wallace votes in 1968 are one indication of a different mood among the majority. Recent victories for candidates advocating law and order and preservation of the status quo in Los Angeles, Minneapolis, and New York City are another.

The only indication that liberals have been thinking about the proposed reform of the electoral college in anything but ideological terms came in a recent article in The New Republic (May 10, 1969). Alexander Bickel, a Yale University law professor, argued against the direct popular election alternative. His basic insight was that the electoral college has forced presidential candidates to think in terms of "swing" states, counties and cities, and specific group appeals are made to their inhabitants. This meant that candidates concentrated on the major population centers and appealed to groups like the poor, the blacks, and the Jews. These were either disadvantaged and alienated groups which have little to lose in departing from the status quo, or groups like the Jews which are traditionally liberal. Mr. Bickel observed that a single, undifferentiated constituency would lead candidates to ignore these groups and appeal to the "average American." In 1969, this stereotyped citizen may be conservative and, while not in the majority in the large cities, may be in the country as a whole. This undifferentiated mass might also be more susceptible to demagoguery.

This hard-headed view of the consequences of electoral reform may be more characteristic of liberalism with its pragmatic intellectual roots than is the ideological rationalization of Senator Muskie. Direct popular election of presidents, while consistent with Jeffersonian majoritarianism, may not necessarily result in presidents the equal of Thomas Jefferson or policies of a liberal nature.

---

Lilac Mood

The plumy lilacs
bend in the eternal arc:
from earth, back to earth —
but, reaching their completion,
they have starred air with fragrance.

We mature less soon,
but as inevitably;
curving back to earth —
Will there be stars or fragrance
in the wake of our being?

BONNIE MCCONNELL
Report From Abroad — I

By WALTER SORELL

Last year’s theatre season in London was neither exciting nor varied enough. Even the last two Pinter Plays, “Landscape” and “Silence,” were disappointing. Once prevented by the censor from being performed because of the repeated occurrence of a variety of four-letter words, these two one-act plays should have been suppressed now that censorship is gone because they are not as interesting as any previous Pinter was and recreate the atmosphere of non-communicativeness in obvious and feeble fashion. Pauses between lines which Pinter could make excitingly vibrant and tense now drag. In an interview before opening night, Pinter said: “People will be glad to get out of the playhouse.” I’m afraid they were.

The London theatre scene is strongly dominated by American imports, by such avant-garde plays as “Hair” or “The Boys in the Band;” by Neil Simon’s stale-champagne boulevard play, “Plaza Suite,” by musicals and the political rites of The Living Theatre whose peripatetic temple God is Hate. The hippie-oriented youth of which there are quite a few here — they are only, as it seemed to me, more civilized than in the New World — is impressed by the new theatre ideas, by a theatre whose patron saint is Artaud and whose most admired prophet the Polish director Grotowski. After all, Peter Brook’s “Marat/Sade” followed this path some of the way and Charles Marowitz’s adaptations of “Hamlet” and “Macbeth” went even further.

Marowitz is an American, who has electrified the progressive wing of the English theatre. He now directs The Open Space Theatre, a small basement establishment in Tottenham Court Road, with great success. Based on the technique — also used in similar fashion by Chaikin’s New York Open Theatre — in which unrelated situations burst out of each other in a series of short, fast takes, he created a sensational “Hamlet” collage which was followed by his adaptation of “Macbeth.” I came too late for the Dane but saw “Macbeth.”

The word adaptation is misleading. He used the basic idea of the play, lines and short passages arbitrarily as well as the key characters, reducing the cast to six figures and the three witches which dominate the scene. Macbeth is psychologically divided into three different Macbeths who are most of the time together onstage, and Lady Macbeth appears in her climactic scene in a transparent nightgown. The play is staged as a ritual, with emphasis on circular movements. It is Macbeth sliced into psycho-political bits, pasted together as colorful collage of a murder story, condemning ambition, power struggle, and man per se. It may not be your cup of Macbeth, but when you empty it to the bitter end, you do not come away from it with too many misgivings.

In exchange for the many American plays in London’s West End an interesting concoction of eight short one-actors under the title of “Mixed Doubles” was slated for Broadway when I saw it in June. They are written by eight different dramatists, among them Harold Pinter and James Saunders, and are different in tone and quality, but held together by the ever-new theme of woman and man from their wedding day to their resting place. Although all of these playlets show a rather impressive insight into the problem of living together, or rather living together apart, and are extremely well acted, the evening is not totally satisfying.

This has probably to do with the fact that many short one-actors strung like pearls on a thin thread convey a cabaret feeling. They quickly establish a mood or situation leading to a climax, mostly a sarcastic point, which usually is the curtain line. The playlets are connected through a kind of one-man conference, presented as a scene, which further underlines the cabaret impression. It must be said that these playlets are not as superficially and flippantly written as the last two sketches of Neil Simon’s successful “Plaza Suite.” On the contrary, most of them have a touch of dramatic poetry. And yet, the total does not quite amount to a whole.

The strongest histrionic trend of our days veers toward a ritualistic theatre on an open stage on which movement and gesture triumph over the word. It is no longer a theatre which you frequent well-dressed, after a good dinner or before a delicious supper. The bourgeois Sunday mood, as it was established last century and lingered on in ours, is somehow gone from the faces of the new audience. To the ritual which the theatre once was belongs a heightened participation of the audience. Such excesses as practiced by The Living Theatre will disappear. What will remain is an intensified interest created through a more theatricalized theatre. Nudity, which is now employed as one of the many signs of protest against a world-embracing hypocrisy, will be reduced to give dramatically valid accents to a dramatic action. The ritualistic theatre of the future is inimical to the prosenium stage, a vestige of a feudal society, and is closest to a social-minded or socialistic theatre.
These thoughts were prompted by Tony Richardson, the famed director, who opened a “free” theatre in London. He turned an old, useless railway depot in Chalk Farm into “The Round House,” a theatre for the people who must pay a nominal fee of about thirty cents for a ticket. The public sits on simple chairs or benches, but there are thirty-six upholstered seats for the critics who must pay for a seat up to twenty-four dollars.

Richardson thinks that the traditional theatre is not free. It creates picture images fit to be put into a frame, and the audience sits and stares at them. The people are separated from the actors in the traditional theatre, which is symbolic, in Richardson’s eyes, of the class distinctions in our society. “The free theatre,” he explained, “wants to awake drama and comedy to new life. It wants to create an immediacy which does not exist now, even though some playwrights and directors have started to revolutionize the theatre. It must be freed from the tyranny of form. Each production must have its own form and its own audience.”

That so many people are estranged from the theatre, he thinks, is due to the fact that it is not a part of our social life. In the same way in which the government takes care of hospitals and museums, of streets and public transportation, it must also take care of the theatre. Tony Richardson, no doubt, feels that he has made a decisive step in the right direction. For years nobody had looked at this forgotten railway depot. Now, as “The Round House,” everyone thinks it looks like the Pantheon. It may be a good omen for Tony Richardson’s dream.

Books of the Month

The Quest of the Historical Jesus

By Albert Schweitzer. Translated by F.C. Burkitt, with a new Introduction by James M. Robinson. (Macmillan. $2.95)

Another edition of Schweitzer? So what? Who reads that old thing any more? Alas, too few. At least, that’s what seems to be behind a colleague’s recent complaint about the inability or unwillingness of his undergraduate students to think historically. “I tried to introduce them to some aspects of the New Quest of the Historical Jesus, but they didn’t even know that the old one had failed!”

Schweitzer’s study may have demonstrated to the theologians who read him the inevitably inconclusive nature of attempts to write the Life of Jesus; however, two generations later, many are still unaware of the implications of this book, in which the Doctor of Lambarene put the scalpel to the life-of-Jesus research of the nineteenth century.

There is thus good cause for the present reissue of Burkitt’s 1910 translation, though the publisher felt it necessary to outfit it with a new introduction by James M. Robinson. of The New Quest of the Historical Jesus fame. Robinson’s minimal introduction is at least indicative of the great distance between the Quest that Schweitzer dissected and the New Quest that Robinson presented to English readers ten years ago. That distance, no doubt, is also the reason for Robinson’s suggestion that Schweitzer simply prepared the way for the “new hermeneutic” is simply Robinson’s label for the position of Gerhard Ebeling and Ernst Fuchs, a label intended mainly to signal the shift in emphasis from the “old” focus on the interpretation done to the text to the “new” focus on the interpretation done by the text to man’s present understanding of his existence coram Deo. Lutherans, at least, should recognize that there is nothing “new” in that; it is as old as Luther’s emphasis on the Law-Gospel polarity of the Word of God.

Schweitzer’s book deserves this new edition, the fifth since the paperback first appeared in 1961. And, as long as we continue in the belief that “what really happened” is a problem capable of a purely historical solution, the need, if not the desire, for the book will be with us.

DAVID G. TRUEMPER

Let Children Be Children

By Freda S. Kehm and Joe L. Mini. (Association Press, $4.95)

The book Let Children Be Children, covering questions asked by parents, teachers, ministers, and adolescents on Dr. Kehm’s radio program, took considerable time to write since hundreds of questions asked on the program had to be reviewed, evaluated, and only the most frequently asked questions were used. When there are two different viewpoints concerning a problem or situation both viewpoints are discussed, giving the thinking of authorities on both sides of the problem.

Parents, ministers, teachers, beginning social workers, and home economists can gain a great deal of knowledge and information from this book, which covers questions and answers concerning child rearing from infancy through the pre-teen years. There are many questions answered in regard to serious family problems such as sex, divorce, death, separation, and desertion to which it would be difficult to find answers without considerable time and inquiry.

I found the entire book to be of interest to me but there were four chapters which I considered very superior: Chapters 6, 7, 8, and 10. Chapter 6 covers “The Importance of Members of the Family.” Husband-wife relationships are discussed as well as parent-child relationships, grandparents, and other relatives.

Chapter 7 concerns “The One Parent Family.” I was particularly impressed with the way death in the family was handled and how to explain death to a young child.

Chapter 8 “The Working Mother” was of special interest to me because I serve on the Governor’s Commission on the Status of Women in Indiana and some of our Commission’s work has concerned “The Working Mother.”

Chapter 10 on “Sex Education and Sexual Problems in the Home” has material which would be most helpful to all parents and beginning social workers. Questions about sex and sexuality have been answered in greater detail because of many parents’ inability to answer their child’s questions and also to help parents become aware of what children should be told about sex at the different age levels.

The book concludes with “Ten Commandments for Parents” by Dr. Kehm which every parent and social worker should read.

I am hoping that this practical down-to-earth book will soon be coming out in a paperback issue so more ministers, teachers, students and parents will be able to buy a copy.

MARGARETTA TANGERMAN
An essential part of the music curriculum used to be a course called Form and Analysis. Some few schools may still have such a course; most will restore it to their programs of study sometime not too distant. Now the analytical study of musical masterpieces is done by teachers of courses whose subject matter necessarily though somewhat tangentially touches on the process. While engaged in such surreptitious activities last semester, I was dumbfounded at the results of two analyses. The works were familiar to the point of being commonplace. Yet the two composers' reputations (not in any case endangered) were reaffirmed and the class was reassured of the enduring qualities in such music. The analysis did not establish their rank, but it did prove again the inexhaustible resources for experience in the great treasures of musical art.

Mozart's D minor piano concerto (K. 466) is a beautiful example of the composer's passionate spirit balanced by instinctive control. Few of his works are so brooding and introspective. Few of his works are so profligate in their display of thematic invention as that first movement. The number of melodic ideas is dazzling; the composer seems to scatter them about freely like one intoxicated. The orchestral exposition presents us with nine or ten even before the piano introduces the two main themes it has kept for itself. After the solo entrance the second exposition sounds like it is to follow the first closely. Abruptly, though, the piano jumps ahead, omitting three motives heard earlier. It hurries to the statement of its second theme, the first time a truly second key area has been established. The long awaited subordinate theme is shared by the piano with the orchestra and the closing of the second exposition promises to be in accord with our expectations. Suddenly, however, the three ideas slighted earlier appear now to effect closing rather than transition; the second exposition complements the first. The development section uncovers the essential contrast between solo instrument and orchestra. The piano insists on its first theme, the orchestra demands its first. The drama of the concerto form is here most apparent. It remains for the recapitulation to resolve the conflict. The two forces must be balanced. The reestablished tonic area is like that of the first exposition. The piano is subordinate to the orchestra. At the second area the music is like that in the second exposition. The piano leads. After the cadenza the orchestra closes the movement with an exact repetition of the first exposition closing. The materials of the recapitulation are gathered from both expositions, a remarkable achievement of cooperation without surrender of individuality. The seeming intoxication of Mozart is in reality a balancing of the heart and head.

The Credo of Bach's great Mass is a monument in itself. At its exact center stands a movement which attracts our attention by its virtuosity and which evidences its importance in the composer's thought by its stunning construction. The section that begins "et resurrexit..." is organized like a large da capo aria. One hundred thirty one measures are divided into three fairly equal segments. The first and third are similar; the second represents a digression, though the entire movement grows from a single thematic idea. The variations worked upon this theme are exhaustive. The performers, singers, and instrumentalists are deployed in ever new combinations. At the close of the work no possible interplay of voice and instrument has been overlooked. Bach proceeds in clearly delineated phrases from five to ten measures in length. Each phrase is a new development of the theme stated boldly at the beginning: fugal solos, paired instruments, melodic extensions, difficult counterpoints. The first section balances the tonic D against its dominant A. The middle section is almost entirely in the relative minor, B. Here the separation of the vocal and instrumental forces is extreme. A solo bass voice with chamber size accompaniment expands upon the theme after the manner of a cadenza which signals the da capo-like return of the opening statement. The third section is not an exact repetition of the first, though. Now the D tonic remains in effect to the end. There is much about the movement to establish Bach's reputation as a prophet of the later sonata form. Variety from unity and separable parts fit neatly into the whole are here more than musical devices. Who can doubt that Bach means to impress upon the listener the Christian confidence that the Resurrection, Ascension, Second Coming, and Endless Reign of Christ are inseparably joined in God's plan of salvation?

Neither of these analyses proved the worth of the music. Neither explained how the composer created the works. Analysis is not even a guide to appreciation or experience of the pieces. They did, however, give intellectual support to the instinctive recognition of great artistic expression. It is given to few minds to act with immediate synthesis. For most of us the skills of analysis are a prerequisite to the skills of synthesis. The pleasures of the former may encourage perseverance to the achievements of the latter.
Moon Summer is over. The Astronauts were launched, injected, separated, put down, sent around, lifted off, reunited, shot back, picked up, caged, examined, lauded, paraded, decorated, and entered into the pages of new editions of the old history books. We, for our part, watched, waited, anticipated, worried, rejoiced, gaped, hoped, relaxed, cheered, read, listened, and finally went about our business. It was a good week in an otherwise humdrum summer.

The moon mission was both mind-blowing and unsurprising. It was unsurprising because the mass media had done their job well beforehand, and in the event performed their work flawlessly. We had all read many accounts of what was supposed to happen on this mission, and we were well-reminded by Cronkite of the successive stages of the operation, and shown in simulation what each of them would involve. So there were no surprises. The media, in turn, had gotten their information from the colonies of scientists and engineers working at NASA's direction to execute the project. These space-thinkers had thought through every detail of the project countless times, until their computer-creations assured them that the answers were all in. So there was no mystery in the flight for the space-thinkers; and the media men saw to it that there was no mystery in the flight for the rest of us either. The resulting mission was no bore, but it was no big revelation. Whatever revelation there was to the operation was disclosed when the time-line of the flight-plan was made public.

Thus, for the first time in man's experience, we witnessed exploration without discovery. Until now, with billions of dollars spent on scientists, instruments, simulations, and technicians, the space-explorers had only to verify that everything did indeed go exactly according to the flight-plan set up months before their departure. It wasn't so for Columbus, Byrd, or even Lindberg. (But then, where can you find the lonely explorer nowadays? Perhaps only in the man who explores the recesses of his own thought.) In the age of technology, the word to couple with "exploration" is "verification," not "discovery." Discoveries these days are made by reading graphs produced by instruments or by scanning computer read-outs. First-hand experience comes later, when you already know what you're looking for.

Still, the mission was mind-blowing. It got to you, but only when you stopped to think about it. The fact that man had now done something which people had thought about for thousands of years; the complexity of the machinery and calculations required to perform the mission; the breadth of technology — from food packaging to telemetry — involved; the sense of presence one felt at the instantaneous end of an epoch and the dawn of a new age: feeding on these things, the mind boggles. To what can one compare this venture into space? Perhaps to the first step onto dry land made by the first creature to emerge permanently from the sea. Perhaps to the first ethical thought. The mind boggles.

And 600 million people saw it happen. What does that mean? What does it mean when a quarter of the earth's population actually saw a foot planted on lunar soil? Does it mean anything at all for half of mankind to see pictures of how our small planet appears from 150,000 miles away? Will it mean that our President is less anxious to deploy a multi-billion-dollar anti-ballistic-missile system? Will it mean that Honduras and El Salvador, North and South Vietnam, China and Russia, the U.S. and Cuba will recognize that more can be gained from peace than from war? Will the people of this earth ever care as much for the well-being of their brothers as they did for the safety of the astronauts?

Probably not. The mind's eye, no less than the body's, can see no further than the closest obstruction. Yet for a few minutes this summer it could see as far as the moon, and could pick out the figures of men leaping on lunar lava. And it could see back to earth, could see ourselves as we must look to beings in other galaxies: creatures at home together on a blue, blue planet. Perhaps something of that vision will remain with enough people to keep alive the dream of unity, of celebrating and exploiting our togetherness.

Moon landings will soon become routine. We may soon lose the sense of community we got from knowing that hundreds of millions of people were seeing just what we were seeing. We may forget the chastening frustration of struggling unsuccessfully to make out our own face, country, or even continent on an earth-pictuirre taken from a spaceship. We can become as uncaring as we like, and eventually even crawl back into the sea to escape a radioactive cloud. But there is a more perfect way...and some little moon-men may lead us. For they have looked on us from afar, and may help us to see what we saw but are slow to learn. Watchers of the cosmic night — tell us of the morning's light...
Large Scale Sculpture

By RICHARD H. W. BRAUER

We suffer, or rather sculpture suffers from museum sickness... Raymond Duchamp-Villon
There's no there there when you get there. Gertrude Stein
Americans can have little sense of what a setting can mean in terms of daily delight, or as a continuous anchor for their lives, or as an extension of the meaningfulness and richness of the world. Kevin Lynch

Anonymous neighborhoods in anonymous districts in an anonymous regional urban sprawl not much different from other regional urban sprawls can nightmarishly diminish and dull our lives. To escape, vacationing Americans often go on elaborate searches for places of strong character and identity. But the problem, of course, can't be avoided; still waiting for most of us when we get home is the need to find greater identity and expressiveness for the urban spaces we share with our neighbors.

In this search the use of good architecture and urban planning is crucial, but the expressions of these two arts usually are strongly shaped by and hidden in the practical, social functions they must serve. On the other hand, large scale sculpture placed in public urban settings can bring to our daily routine moments of sheer poetry. As solo voices of great variety seen in the ever changing outdoors and within the orchestrations of architects and planners, large scale sculpture can, with single-minded abandon, bring to our consciousness various qualities of order and relationships. It can gather us together in the expression of aspirations and feelings, and perhaps even reveal and challenge our conventional attitudes and actions. (Think particularly of the shock value that contains strong overtones of daring and abstract, with no concession to representing a real or the rough organic variations of nature than the impulsive vitality of the individual human hand or the rough organic variations of nature than the measured order of architectural geometry. Also, in contrast to the previous sculptures discussed, its symbolic connotations lead towards such human exper-


Spirited sculpture such as this can help inform the daily life of the community of which it is a part, immeasurably helping to create an environment highly charged with character and meaning.

Fred Frey, UNTITLED SCULPTURE, 1969, 20' high, Cor-Ten Steel, Valparaiso University.
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Editor-At-Large

By JOHN STRIETELMEIER

On Looking for God “Out There”

Vic Hoffmann and I are founding members of a mutual admiration society. So, as I take over the column which he made one of the most widely-read and controversial pages of The Cresset, I am tempted to do a piece about Vic under some such title as “The Prophet without Honor.” But one does not write easily or well about one’s family and intimate friends so I shall say only the one thing which I think might please Vic most: that if I have it in me to carry on as a worthy successor in this assignment I shall retain both his friends and his enemies.

Dr. Lee, my successor in the editorship (a man whose many fine qualities are flawed only by a tendency to treat his predecessor with the delicacy which should be reserved for the aged and the infirm), has given me carte blanche – so blanche, in fact, that I could, if I were minded to do so, comment on even so tender a subject as the schizophrenia which The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod displayed at its convention in Denver last July. But the intramural quarrels of religious denominations and sects are things which are too wonderful for me; I cannot attain unto them. And I must say – or rather, perhaps, confess to my discredit – that after two decades of some involvement in these quarrels, I find them increasingly boring. No doubt our God is up to some very interesting and significant things within the Church. Those who are inclined to dismiss the Church, even in its institutional form, as “irrelevant” need to be reminded that its Lord once made wine out of water and can, presumably, do so again. But, as the man said, “better nobly to fail than meanly to succeed.” The signs are there. The challenge is to read them rightly.

For years I wrote anonymously, and perhaps presumptuously, “in luce tua” – “in Thy light.” I feel much more comfortable writing what is clearly the opinion of one man who is an editor quite literally at large in the world. I hope that my writing will, indeed, be illumined by a lux clearer than my own. But this is no time to claim or even anticipate such illumination. It is no discredit to a writer if he brings to his work only those gifts which, like the rain, fall indifferently upon the just and the unjust - gifts of industry, reason, common sense, empathy, and cultivated competence in some one limited field.

My field is geography – the study, as Isaiah Bowman put it, of “what is where, why, and what of it.” This concern will necessarily involve expressing value judgments, and these judgments will reflect my commitment to the Christian world view as I have been given to understand it in the Lutheran tradition with some few but significant modifications from Anglicanism. Those who prefer to read “prejudice” for “commitment” are free to do so. By the time a man reaches fifty he should know which questions are, for him, no longer open questions. Revelation and experience do, after all, give us an occasional clear answer. And as they say in the airline commercial, “if you’ve got it, flaunt it.”

The Cresset
Dusk was falling beyond my window yesterday afternoon and I turned from the printed page toward the north. . . . A leaf was falling from the soft maple near the fence and I suddenly realized that I was once more face to face with September and the beginning of another academic year. . . .

I thought again of the motto of the University — In Thy Light We See Light — and its meaning for our troubled time. . . . Certainly an institution must live by the ideas and ideals which are set forth in its objectives. . . . There must be some continuing light by which we may hope to find our way through the dark irrationality of our times. . . . There must be some profound convictions which determine our attitudes over against the fundamental issues of life and death. . . .

In our day there is considerable underbrush which must be removed before we can clearly see the light which governs our days and years. . . . We must also guard against the fatal heresy that there is a contradiction between spiritual objectives and intellectual ideals. . . . the life of the spirit and the life of the mind. . . . the delusion that we cannot be intellectually responsible men and women and at the same time spiritually responsible children of God. . . .

This basic dichotomy appears regularly in times of transition and decay. . . . when we confuse the permanent and the impermanent. . . . when men cling to the changing and lose the light of the unchanging. . . .

Basically there are three groups who fall into this latter day confusion. . . . There is the theologian who fears the life of the mind because it has so often gone so far beyond its proper boundaries into fields where it does not belong. . . . History demonstrates that this is particularly true of colleges and universities. . . . There must be a constant fusion of the intellectual and the spiritual. . . . Paris in the time of Abelard. . . . Naples and Cologne at the time of Aquinas. . . . Wittenberg with Luther and Melanchthon. . . . the Scandinavian universities in our own time. . . . all of these and many more united the highest spiritual loyalties with the free critical operation of the mind. . . .

Then there is the materialistic scientist today who fears the life of the spirit and denies it because he cannot find it in the test tube or laboratory. . . . He had his day during the first six decades of the twentieth century and is no longer an immediate danger to our life. . . .

In the third place there is the pseudo-sophisticated intellectual who dislikes and fears anything old just because it is old. . . . who wanders around under the wings of God not quite liking this or approving that in the arrangement of the universe until he reaches man's ultimate impertinence — man criticizing God because he does not like some of the things God does. . . .

From all these heresies the University must separate itself completely. . . . It must affirm that in the light of God and His Word we can see light. . . . light in the past, the present and the future. . . . light in every field of human endeavor, in every corner of the universe, and in every activity of the mind and the soul of man. . . .

H. G. Wells said at the end of the last war: "The immediate future will be a race between education and catastrophe." Now catastrophe has almost won, and it may be later than we think. . . . It is a great task therefore to stand in one of the midnight hours of the world and say to God: "In Thy Light We See Light."

This is the conclusion of the matter: The more passionately we believe in God the more critical and skeptical we should become of all human achievement. . . . The more we see of His perfection the more impatient we shall be with all imperfection. . . . The more we see of His light the more we shall be discontented with all shadows. . . .

It has been said that history is a struggle between the paralytic and the epileptic. . . . between no change and change without a purpose. . . . It is our task in our time to join neither, to have our inherent tendency toward paralysis or epilepsy touched by the healing hands of the living God. . . . changed by the light of Heaven so that we shall know and cling to "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue and if there be any praise, think on these things." This is the ultimate meaning of all intellectual and spiritual endeavor. . . .

Finally the light of God comes to us through Him who once was here with us in the dark ways of time. . . . who said He was the Light of the world. . . . who walked where we must walk. . . . suffered where we must suffer. . . . died where we must die. . . . and that in Him we would know the truth and the truth would make us free. . . .

Having said that He went to a cross and proved the truth of what He had said by redeeming us from the first and last darkness. . . . the darkness of sin and shame and unbelief. . . . giving us the incredible power to live with Him, the Light of Lights, our bright and shining morning star. . . .
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