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Campaign Resume

The following account of the 1956 presidential campaign was written exclusively for The Cresset by Lalter Wippmann, interplanetary correspondent for The Martian Chronicle.

Among the Earthmen, no other single person is so powerful as is the High Chief of the large and powerful nation which is called the United States of America. This High Chief, who is called “The President,” is elected by his fellow-countrymen for a term of four years, and this is one of those years in which a High Chief is to be elected.

I have before attempted to explain the process by which two men are designated to contest for the office of High Chief. I find now that my explanation was wholly erroneous but none of the Earthmen appears to be able to explain the process in a manner intelligible to us Martians, so I shall not attempt to correct my previous account. Suffice it to say that the theory of the procedure is that God speaks through the voice of the people and that the people, in turn, speak through the voices of what the Earthmen call “special interest” or “pressure” groups, terms for which there are no Martian equivalents although the word “mimi” (roughly, selfishness) comes reasonably close to expressing it.

The two men who were designated to contest the office this year are a former general named Eisenhower whose supporters claim that he is responsible for the peace, progress, and prosperity which the nation has enjoyed during the past four years. His opponent is a scholarly gentleman farmer named Stevenson who insists that the nation is not at peace, is not progressing, and is not truly prosperous. Both men claim to have a very high regard for each other although each doubts that the nation could survive four years of the other’s administration.

It is the custom of one of the nation’s great newspapers to print, in full, the texts of the speeches which each of the candidates delivers in justification of his candidacy. Certain persons in the universities of the nation win much respect as profound thinkers by reading these speeches. The citizenry at large, however, does not read the speeches nor does it, ordinarily, listen to the candidates when they deliver the speeches. For while the candidates talk about such things as prices for agricultural products and the enforcement of certain laws respecting “civil rights,” the citizenry is chiefly concerned with the health of the candidates.

The man named Eisenhower is known to have suffered a heart attack last year and to have undergone an operation for some intestinal trouble. His supporters contend that, as a result of these afflictions, he is in better physical condition than ever before in his life and have prevailed upon him to travel about making speeches in order to demonstrate his vigor. The candidate named Stevenson is alleged to be short of one kidney and to be oversupplied with brain and has been prevailed upon to travel about making speeches which will prove that one kidney is adequate for his needs and that he has learned to compensate for his oversupply of brains by using only a portion of them.

It is not possible, at this time, to predict which man will be elected to the office of the High Chief. Almost every newspaper employs a seer who attempts, by one means or another, to anticipate the results of the election, but the seers this year will venture little more in the way of a prediction than the judgment that it will be “a close race.” Much will apparently depend upon whether the supporters of the two candidates will be able to get a sufficiently large number of their fellow-supporters to the places called polling booths where the citizens register their preference.

I have attempted to gather from my journalistic colleagues their opinion as to whether the customs of these “campaigns” ensure any degree of intelligent judgment in the choice of the High Chief and I have asked a number of clergymen whether they believe that any
legitimate authority can be conveyed by a process which appears to involve so great a measure of slander, deception, double-dealing, and frank appeals to the selfishness of the citizenry. In every case I was advised that my questions implied a lack of sympathy for what they call democratic processes and that if I did not like the way things are done here I should go back to the planet I came from.

I am inclined to accept their advice.

The Senate

Although the presidential race has attracted the lion's share of the interest in this year's campaign, there are quite a number of senatorial contests which deserve careful consideration either because of the personalities involved or because of the issues at stake. We single out eight of these races for special notice because on their results will depend much of the tone of the Senate in the years immediately ahead.

Perhaps the most interesting of all the races is in New York where Mayor Robert Wagner seeks to hold retiring Democratic Senator Herbert Lehman's seat against a formidable Republican opponent, Attorney-General Jacob Javits. In our judgment, Mayor Wagner is the ablest man, but his election would move a political cipher, Council President Abe Stark, into the mayoralty of the nation's largest city. Mr. Javits is also an able man and, in view of these circumstances, seems to us the preferable candidate.

Almost equally interesting is the contest in Oregon between Senator Wayne Morse and former Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. Mr. McKay has not, to the best of our knowledge, demonstrated any traits of statesmanship. Senator Morse, despite his occasionally erratic behavior, is a man of courage and principle. We can always use such men in the Senate.

Another very close race is the contest in Washington between Senator Warren Magnuson and Governor Arthur Langlie. Both are good men but we consider Governor Langlie an unusually good man and potential presidential material.

In Ohio, the race is between two conservative Republicans—incumbent Senator George Bender and Governor Frank Lausche who, for reasons best known to himself, keeps calling himself a Democrat. Senator Bender is no Robert Taft, but he can be expected to support the party whose label he bears. What Mr. Lausche will do only Mr. Lausche knows.

California voters have a choice between a little-known Senator and a little-known contender. In view of the strategic political situation which California occupies, it seems strange that the voters should be offered such an unexciting choice. Perhaps this is one of those instances where it is legitimate to choose the man on the basis of the coat-tails he is riding.

Finally, we have three specimens whose disappearance from the national scene would be all to the good, irrespective of the personalities or capabilities of their opponents. The voters have an opportunity, this month, to return to private life Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, the prairie Chrysostom; Senator Herman Welker, the last of the dinosaurs; and Senator John Marshall Butler, who should not have been seated six years ago in view of the unsatisfactory explanation he gave of a forged picture of his opponent which was circulated by his supporters.

Thanksgiving Day

Hidden away in the litany is a curious petition which could do with a bit of re-emphasizing in these golden days of peace, progress, and prosperity: "In all time of our prosperity, help us, good Lord." Help us? Help us what?

Perhaps the simplest answer to the question is one word: "Remember." Help us remember that even in these prosperous days most of the human family remains ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed. Help us remember that in our own country there are men, women, and children who go to bed hungry at night. Help us remember that in our large cities there are districts where whole families live in single rooms. Help us remember that there are old folks who have been hidden away in insane asylums because their children didn't want to be bothered with them at home.

Help us remember that our prosperity derives ultimately from resources which we did not create but which our forefathers stumbled upon in such abundance that even our wastefulness has not yet depleted them. Help us remember that most of what we have we inherited from fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers who practised the virtues which we find amusing or old-fashioned: industry, sobriety, self-discipline, independence, thrift.

Help us finally to remember that the things for which we profess gratitude are as much our masters as our servants and that for everything we acquire we have paid, or will pay, a price. And help us to recognize when the price is more than we can afford.

Thanksgiving is a great time for thumping our chests and congratulating God on His good judgment in choosing His friends. This is not, we think, the spirit in which the day was first celebrated but the spirit in which we would choose to celebrate it this year if we actually sat down and thought the matter through. But then far more suffering, far more pain, far more injustice results from mere thoughtlessness than from deliberate intent.

This year, more than ever before, we ought, as a people, to take time to think before we thank. We might be surprised to discover how much we really have to be grateful for.
Almost everyone, at one time or another, has had the experience of standing in or going through a receiving line. And almost everyone who has, has wished that he were almost anywhere else doing something far different. For the benefit of our readers in Outer Mongolia and the Fiji Islands who may not be familiar with a receiving line, it consists of from three to thirty persons standing in a row. Everyone else present—and the number is usually from a hundred up—goes through the line shaking the hand of each person and saying something pleasant. The first person in line asks your name and passes it along to the next person, and so on until you’ve met everyone in line.

For the uninitiated there are a few rules. Don’t be surprised, after you’ve passed the second or third person, to find your name is slowly being changed. Let it go; it isn’t likely that anyone will remember either your right name or the facsimile you end up with. Also don’t be surprised that you almost never catch the name of the person you are meeting. The room is noisy and the person on his left is getting tired and is prone to mumble. Don’t worry about what to say, because, outside of a “pleased to meet you,” not much has to be said and nothing you say will be remembered.

The reason for having a receiving line is to enable more people to meet more people in a shorter period of time. But this economy produces some disadvantages in the system. Everyone knows he is supposed to keep moving, and, consequently, he is not going to ask if he misses a name here and there. The time is too short to get acquainted, but that should be saved until later anyway. However, the real culprit is the person who insists on having a long conversation with every patient soul in line.

This person may feel he is honor-bound to make every one of the strangers feel right at home. Fine, but he may be someone with a burning tale to tell—usually the story of his life—and can never get anyone else to stop and hear it, except this man he has just met who is forced to stand and listen. The receiving line is no place to deliver one’s life story, tell a long anecdote, or outline the strange genealogical path which makes you and him 32nd cousins.

This type of person makes those standing in line feel they’ve been there forever and may be taking root. For those going through the line, it produces some awkward situations. You move along smoothly when suddenly you hit the backlog piled up behind the long talker. You stop and return to the person you just met whose name and occupation you never knew and you are supposed to make conversation. Unfortunately, you have delivered your final punch line and anything more will sound redundant.

But the receiving line need not be unpleasant. I have been in, and gone through, a number of very satisfactory lines and the reasons they were successful could be spotted. Either the person in line was identified by a sign or else he wore a name tag. In some cases those going through also wore tags. The guests had something comfortable to stand on and, consequently, were not as tired. And the most successful lines were held before the event, and not after, so that everyone had something to look forward to and so moved faster.

When General Motors opened its “Powerama” in Chicago, President Curtice and a couple of vice presidents met all comers. A red carpet covered the area and ushers kept the line moving. Mr. Curtice and the others had a knack of turning as they shook hands so that one moved quickly to the next person. While we didn’t end up on a “Harlowe” and “Al” basis, it was, generally, a comfortable and pleasant experience.

A friend of mine sometimes goes to absurd lengths to show the futility of the receiving line. He will start through, giving his name as “Schnickelgruber,” just to give everyone something to chew on. He reports that, invariably, by the end of the line, his name comes out as “Smith.” On longer lines, when he gives his correct name, he will go through a second time to see if anyone remembers him. According to him, to date no one has. In one line, after a rather important business dinner, he gave his occupation as “grave digger,” and no one was startled. But he had not gone far before his occupation had been changed to “excavator.”

The idea behind the receiving line is good. It’s the ideal, and almost only, way of getting to meet the honored guests. It has its weaknesses as a system, and I’m afraid it always will, since it must, of necessity, consist of people.
The Case For Mr. Eisenhower

By John Strietelmeyer
Managing Editor
The CRESSET

The title of this article was to have been, “I Like Ike.” But when I got to sorting out my reasons for preferring Mr. Eisenhower to Mr. Stevenson for the presidency I came more and more to realize a) that they had nothing in particular to do with any of the President’s many likeable qualities and b) that, as a matter of fact, I like Mr. Stevenson better than I like Mr. Eisenhower.

I think that I can explain my preference for Mr. Eisenhower most simply and most clearly by setting down five propositions which I consider pertinent to the question of who ought to be entrusted with the executive power during the next four years:

1. The two-party system is essential to the healthy functioning of the particular type of government we have established in our country.

2. An effective two-party system requires that the two parties be in close enough agreement on major issues that they can both appeal to an electorate which is not widely divided on basic issues.

3. The critical issues which confront our country at this moment are issues which transcend party loyalties and which cut across party boundaries.

4. Except in cases where the party in power has manifestly failed to demonstrate its capacity to govern, the incumbent ought to be given preference over his opponent.

5. Mr. Eisenhower has made certain specific contributions to the structure of government and the orientation of his party which he ought to be permitted additional time to carry through.

My remarks from here on will be chiefly in the nature of an elaboration upon these points.

1. The Two-Party System

It is one of the many happy accidents of our national history that the extreme diversities of our ethnic backgrounds, our religious differences, our economic interests, our sectional peculiarities, and our social levels have been offset, in the political area, by a pattern of two national political parties, each of which harbors within it a cross-section of our diversities. A one-party system would have meant corruption, then tyranny, then political upheaval. A multi-party system would have meant uneasy coalition government with the balance of power in the hands of the most opportunistic politicians. As it is, we actually do have coalition government of a sort, under either Republican or Democratic administration. The great difference between our sort of coalition government and that which obtains in, let us say, France is that our coalitions are forced to pull themselves together every two or four years and present the citizenry with some statements of minimal agreement (the party platform).

Now I consider it a matter of proper concern that the balance between the two parties has been seriously upset by two decades of Democratic administration which followed upon a Republican administration which had the misfortune to run afoul of a world economic depression. I do not believe that Mr. Hoover was any more responsible for the Collapse of 1929 than I believe that Mr. Roosevelt was responsible for the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor. The point is that a great many Americans apparently still consider the Republican party the depression party and I think it would do the two-party system some good if this untruth could be given the lie once for all. It should be possible for a man to run on the Republican ticket without having to re-fight the battles of 1929-1932.

Of perhaps even greater significance for the vigor of the two-party system is the need for a recovery of confidence, on the part of the Republican party, in its ability to carry the responsibility for national policy. Twenty years of opposition, often enfeebled by disastrous defeats in Congressional elections, have left the Republican party groggy and somewhat unsure of itself. There is a certain pleasant irresponsibility in opposition that, after a while, makes a man or a party reluctant to accept responsibility. Every Monday-morning quarterback can find flaws in the Saturday afternoon coaching. The coach on the bench has the infinitely harder assignment of making on-the-spot decisions and accepting their consequences. During the past four years, the Republican party has shown a gratifying recovery of self-confidence. Defeat this fall might result in a relapse good neither for the party nor for the country.

In order, therefore, to restore some measure of numerical balance between the Republican party and the Democratic party, and in order to allow the Republican party to continue the process of rebuilding its self-confidence, I favor President Eisenhower’s re-election.
2. An Effective Two-Party System

But if there is to be a healthy, functioning two-party system in our country, more is required than that there be two parties which periodically oppose each other at the polls. What is required is that each of the two parties be responsive enough to public opinion that the uncommitted, non-partisan vote might swing one way or the other.

A look at the ballot in most states this year will show that actually we have, on paper, a multi-party system. In addition to the candidates of the two major parties, there will be nominees of the Socialist party, the Greenback Party, the Prohibition party, the Liberal party, the Socialist-Workers party, and the Constitution party. None of these small parties, obviously, has a chance of winning the election. But either of the two major parties conceivably could move so far beyond the area of national consensus that it would cease to offer any real threat at the polls. In our national history, we have already seen two parties (the Federalists and the Whigs) pass from the scene. There were predictions in the late '30s and early '40s that a like fate awaited the Republican party.

There is no point to arguing the question of whether Mr. Eisenhower's brand of Republicanism is or is not GOP orthodoxy. It may well be that Senator Knowland and Senator Bricker and Senator Bridges are the authentic voices of historic Republicanism. Nor is there, at the moment, any point to arguing the philosophical merits or demerits of their brand of Republicanism. What is significant is that the mood and the thinking of the country are not agreeable to this kind of Republican "conservatism." It can not be sold to the electorate. There is a certain virtue, a certain honesty in hewing to the philosophical line, let the ballots fall as they may. But those who would urge such a course of action upon the Republican party must, in all good conscience, urge upon the party the corollary to such a course of action: the role of a permanent minority opposition in what would have become, for all practical purposes, a one-party system.

One of the facts of life with which the Republican party has come to terms during the past four years is the fact that the New Deal has been absorbed into the pattern of our national life. Mr. Eisenhower's critics within the party are quite right when they complain that his domestic policies represent no break with patterns established during twenty previous years of Democratic administration. Had he attempted to carry off any real "conservative revolution," he would be standing now on the brink of certain defeat rather than probable victory.

For the fact of the matter is that in a time of general prosperity people are little disposed toward radical changes in either the theory or the structure of government. Governor Harriman's wistful longing to reconstruct the high-spirited atmosphere of the early days of the New Deal holds no more appeal to the prosperous voter than does Senator Bricker's nostalgia for the happy days of Calvin Coolidge. Perhaps there awaits us in the years to come another time of crisis when the people will look to their leaders for some radical new definition of the nature and purpose of government. But 1956 is not that year.

What we have at the moment, then, is a kind of national consensus to which both parties must appeal. The present leadership of both parties is attuned to that consensus. The pointing with pride and the viewing with alarm which honor the traditions of a presidential campaign do not obscure the fact that for the past four years the two parties have worked together harmoniously, despite the fact that during the past two years one has controlled the executive and the other the Congress. The choice this year is, therefore, between personalities rather than between policies. Under the direction of either Mr. Stevenson or Mr. Eisenhower, our government might have been expected to meet essentially as it did the Suez crisis or the farm problem or any of the other crises which have confronted us during the past four years.

The part which President Eisenhower has played in moving his party toward a position which could enlist the support of the uncommitted voter and which could rally the responsible leadership of the Democratic party to cooperation on critical issues represents, in my judgment, a feat of political statesmanship which merits the applause both of his party and his country.

3. Unpartisan Issues

It is probably not so much dishonesty as a decent respect for our political traditions that prompts the barnstorming politician to see profound differences on issues where the more objective citizen sees only striking similarities. By issues I mean, of course, something more significant for our national future than the question of whether Charley Wilson actually did call working-men "dogs" or whether Mr. Stevenson shares Mr. Truman's doubt about the guilt of Alger Hiss. I mean those questions of policy which will decide the direction in which we shall move as a people.

For the sake of convenience, we may group these issues under two major headings: those concerned with foreign policy, and those concerned with domestic policy.

Ed Lahey, of The Chicago Daily News, did a nice little piece for his paper several weeks ago on "the modern secretary of state." Lahey's point was that both the Democratic and the Republican administrations have had to keep their secretaries of state hidden away during election years for fear of what they might do to the party's chances at the polls. Mr. Acheson is
still, for many Republicans, an ogre who eats American boys. Mr. Dulles has become, for Democrats (and some Republicans), a synonym for ineptness and appeasement.

Fortunately, both Mr. Acheson and Mr. Dulles have been blessed with enough surplus self-confidence to compensate them for the criticisms that have been directed at them. But as one reviews the record, certain things become apparent, among them the following:

1. In any struggle between "authoritarian" systems and "democratic" systems, the advantages of initiative and flexibility lie on the side of the authoritarians.

2. Foreign policy, under either Republican or Democratic administration, is influenced as much by the demands, wishes, hesitations, fears, hopes, ambitions, and self-interest of our allies as by our own. We are not free to do what we want to do. We do what we can do.

3. Quibbling over the tactics of our foreign policy serves merely to obscure the fact that our over-all strategy remains, and must remain, essentially the same under either party.

4. The task of steering our nation and our world through the troubled waters of the present international situation is a trying, exhausting, and frustrating job and the secretary of state, no matter who he may be, is the most convenient scapegoat for our frustrations.

I therefore fail to see how Mr. Stevenson and his secretary of state, whoever he might be, could introduce any bold new direction in our foreign policy. Nor, in the light of his numerous positive accomplishments, can I get excited over the charge that Mr. Dulles has been a heavy-handed bumbler.

In the area of domestic policy, it is my belief that the two most important issues facing the American people are the problem of arriving at a workable, long-term farm policy and the even more pressing problem of finding a satisfactory solution to the civil-rights problem.

I consider it a tragedy that the farm problem should have become a matter of partisan debate, for the problem goes far deeper than the politicians on either side have admitted or would dare to admit. In a recent column, Miss Dorothy Thompson noted, as an editorial in this magazine had suggested some time before, that the problem which we confront on the land today is the problem which faced us many years ago in industry: our farms are undergoing the painful transition from human and animal labor to machine labor. In the process, human beings are becoming what our British cousins call "redundant"; we just don't need as many people on the land as we used to need. The problem before us, then, is what to do: whether to allow surplus farmers to be driven off the land or whether to subsidize the inefficient farmer so that he may stay on the land. In the long run, it would seem most reasonable to me to let the inefficient farmer be pushed off the land at a time such as this when our economy is capable of absorbing him in other pursuits rather than encourage him to stay on the land as an object of public benevolence. The promise of 100% parity is, when you come right down to it, the promise of a handout. Such a handout, when offered in an election year, can be reasonably construed as a bribe.

In the area of civil rights, I find it difficult to support wholeheartedly the platform or the past record of either of the two parties. On the whole, I would be inclined to grant that the Democratic party has more consistently championed the rights of the various minorities than has the Republican. At the same time, I am pleased by the present administration's intelligent and purposeful approach to the problem and by the positive advances that have been made since 1953.

By and large, Mr. Stevenson seems to follow pretty much the same line as does the President on civil rights. Neither is content to sanctify the status quo; neither is irresponsible enough to attempt to force changes which only time and patient education can bring.

At the moment, however, President Eisenhower seems to me to be less handicapped than Mr. Stevenson would be in attempting to bring about, "with all deliberate speed," those reforms which are specifically called for or tacitly implied by the May, 1954, decision of the Supreme Court. Mr. Eisenhower's supporters in the Congress may not have evidenced any crusading zeal for the rights of minorities but neither have they evidenced the intransigence of such key Democratic leaders as Senators Eastland and Thurmond and Senator-elect Talmadge. A Democratic victory which would retain Senator Eastland in his chairmanship of the Senate Judiciary Committee could not, I feel, contribute anything to the solution of the civil-rights problem. And I do not believe that we can afford to mark time for four years on the civil-rights problem while the Democratic party attempts to keep itself from flying apart over the issue.

4. Recognition of Faithful Service

In the heat of a political campaign, no charge is too wild to be levelled against a candidate for office. It is a part of our campaign ritual to charge the party in power with misfeasance, malfeasance, neglect of duty, and subversion of the institutions of the Republic. Mr. Truman has called the Republican leadership "a bunch of racketeers." Mr. Stevenson has hinted darkly that there is hanky-panky going on in Washington. Governor Clement, in his keynote tirade, more than hinted that only divine intervention could save the nation from a fate worse than death.

The federal government is the largest single employer of labor in the United States. It would be a kind of
miracle if it did not number among its employees a certain number of incompetents, a certain number of crooks, a certain number of deviates from accepted moral standards, some of them inherited from previous administrations, some of them appointed by the present administration.

It may be that Mr. Truman's reckless terminology reflects a legitimate and still-smoldering resentment at the grossly exaggerated charges of "the mess in Washington" that were leveled at his administration in 1952. But that is hardly grounds for adopting the same tactics. At most, the record of the Eisenhower administration to date shows a few cases of bad judgment and a few cases of conflict of interest. If there have been any cases of venal misconduct in office, I do not know of them.

It is hardly appropriate, therefore, to raise the cry this year to "throw the rascals out." We have enjoyed almost four years of clean government—dull, perhaps, and a bit sickeningly "pious," but clean nevertheless.

There are those who favor a change in administration every four years simply to keep both parties on their toes and to prevent any incipient rascality from getting itself rooted in. There is something to be said for this point of view, but it leaves little or no room for the practise of a virtue which is seldom mentioned in the context of politics and which has been, unfortunately, too little practised in democratic societies. I mean the virtue of gratitude.

It is no credit to democratic governments that their treatment of their servants is such as to justify the aphorism that "ingratitude is the reward of republics." In every other area of our lives, we feel bound—not only for practical reasons but by moral considerations—to continue faithful servants in their offices. In government, we are often pretty brutal about turning competent and faithful officials out of office.

If there were issues of profound import involved in the current campaign, it would be up to each of the candidates to justify his election on the basis simply of his stand on the issues. But in a situation such as we have this year, when issues are either absent or patently manufactured, it seems to me that the burden of responsibility for showing why he ought to be elected to the Presidency lies upon Mr. Stevenson. Is he a better administrator than President Eisenhower? Is he a more widely accepted symbol of national unity? Or is he simply another very good man who would like to hold an office which is already occupied? In my judgment, he is the sort of man we would be happy to see in the office if it were not already held by a man of at least equivalent competence and prestige. In southern Indiana we do not swap cars unless we expect to get a better one out of the deal. We are still waiting to find out "what's Adlai got that Ike aint got."

5. Eisenhower's Positive Contributions

My final reason for preferring Mr. Eisenhower over Mr. Stevenson derives from my conviction that he has made contributions which may someday be ranked as major contributions to the practical functioning of government.

Democratic critics have alleged that the President has made his office a "part-time" office and that he has delegated too many of his functions to subordinates. What these critics deplore may, I would suggest, be precisely what we have been needing for quite some time: a re-shaping of the executive office which would free the President from as much of the routine work as possible so that he can give more attention to policy.

The ability to choose competent men and to delegate responsibility to them has long been considered one of the distinguishing marks of the capable executive. The delegation of responsibility does not in any way relieve the President of accountability to the people for the acts of his subordinates and, therefore, it involves no diminution of the constitutional role of the President. If Mr. Stevenson is worried about the amount of time the President puts in at his desk, he might, to be consistent, recommend that a time-clock be installed in the President's office.

A significant contribution of the President to administrative practise has been his redefining of the role of the Vice-President, an accomplishment which the Democratic party recognized at its convention by giving to the task of choosing its vice-presidential nominee a dignity and a freedom which neither party had given it in the past.

But What If Ike Dies?

The nominees for president are Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Stevenson. Both are mortal. There is no more assurance that Mr. Stevenson will survive to January 20, 1961, than there is that Mr. Eisenhower will survive. I do not particularly like Mr. Nixon. But I like him about as well as I like Senator Kefauver. I prefer to leave the issues of life and death to the Lord of life and death and to make my choice within the limitations of the situation as it actually is.
This article was originally titled to match the piece on "Why I Like Eisenhower." But people seldom talk about "liking" Stevenson, with those intimations of personal identification that so often accompany such statements about Eisenhower. Those who support Stevenson seem to do so because they approve of his policies, rather than because they appreciate his personality. Indeed, Stevenson's very likable personality has not "come across" to many Americans through radio, television, and mass meetings. They support him in the belief that the President must be a person who first of all satisfies the historic needs of the nation, rather than stimulating pleasant emotions among its citizenry.

It is the psychological performance of Eisenhower, rather than the way he has carried out the fundamental tasks of the Presidency, which continues to keep strong his political appeal. Aided by his public relations experts, Eisenhower has become for some citizens the kindly old uncle, or perhaps the ideal grandfather—always encouraging, sternly moralistic in word but humanly and sometimes humorously compromising in deed, a man who rather nostalgically seeks to apply in the present his own personal version, learned so long ago, of moral truths and principles of action.

We can imagine having such a man for a neighbor—listening to him reminisce, hearing him recite so undoubtingly his own simple philosophy as the proper prescription for the ailments of this complicated world. We would easily learn to avoid direct disagreement with this personable, retired gentleman, who can become sharply angry in his professional soldier's way if his favorite notions are challenged.

Many of us are less certain about having Stevenson as the neighbor across the way, though we cannot point to anything specifically. He maintains a pleasant home, and we are aware that he acquiesced only reluctantly to the divorce his wife sought. He is a man of civic conscience, a highly capable lawyer, a writer of some talent, and probably the best political humorist since Will Rogers. But these pieces do not fit together into that kind of appealing and comforting figure which Eisenhower projects so effectively.

Must A President be Likable?

Stevenson fairly radiates troubled concern over the host of problems we face at home and abroad. It is not that Stevenson lacks faith while Eisenhower has an endless supply of it, but Stevenson makes us ask what any article of faith must mean in relation to those confounding problems that confront us. He seems unable to contemplate his faith detached from the question of its translation into the actualities of domestic and foreign policies. Stevenson's "New America" at least raises the possibility of many alterations in our national life. There is a strong sense of the providential in Stevenson's conception of America; but he writes and speaks in the old tradition of Washington and Jefferson rather than in the more recent conventions of the peace-of-mind cult. He sees this nation's fantastic national resources, its relatively sheltered place in the geographical arrangements of the world's nations, its seed-roots' entplantment in the core-soil of Western liberty, as a challenge and a responsibility to be met in every generation—not as God's promissory note to see us through all our crises regardless of the merit of our own conduct.

It might be very stimulating to have this worrier, this intellectual, this question-posing, value-probing man as a next-door neighbor; but we wonder how likable he would be. And then we wonder: does it really matter? We remind ourselves that come November sixth we are not selecting a neighbor or the presiding officer of a luncheon club. We must choose the man upon whom will focus more of the fateful decisions of these coming years than any other single mortal, the man who must represent us, not only to the other peoples of the world, but also to ourselves. An amazingly likable personality and an old military gentleman's simple philosophy are neither essential nor adequate to this task.

Our greatest presidents have seldom been liked as personalities on the massive scale and with the emotional adulation enjoyed by Eisenhower. George Washington, reserved and aristocratic, was universally respected rather than "liked." Jefferson, an intellectual given to writing long, philosophical letters wrestling with the fine points of political theory, and sometimes almost insufferably righteous, generated as much dislike as affection among a great variety of his contemporaries. Lincoln was mocked and even reviled as a personality by some of his own administration, to say nothing of his political opposition.

It is instructive to compare almost all political cartoonists' careful treatment of Eisenhower over the past four years with the devastating satire heaped upon Lin-
The judgments of history have never confused Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. It helps to remind us of what a great President must be and must inevitably endure. The judgments of history have never confused likability with greatness. We should no do so, now. The ship of state sails through uncharted and dangerous waters. We are not just passengers to be soothed and reassured. As long as this nation remains a democracy, we are the crew of that ship. A good crew wants a good captain, likable or not—one who can set and hold a courageous course, but who does not fear to alter it if change is necessary, and who does not seek to hide from those who sail under him the whole truth about the troubled seas through which they must make their way. I think Stevenson would be such a captain.

Handicaps of the Military Mind

Eisenhower has not been and cannot be. In all frankness, his long military career, which began in his youth and ended only four years ago, has probably contributed much to his failure as President. I am not now thinking of his intellectual inadequacies and his obvious philosophical shallowness; the military services at times have produced men with rich intellectual resources: Douglas MacArthur and Omar Bradley, to mention two who represent respectively the more conservative and the more liberal inclinations. Rather, I have in mind the way Eisenhower defines his office and his responsibilities and those of his subordinates.

Again and again Eisenhower has displayed an almost unbelievable unfamiliarity with American civilian institutions, including the Presidency. The frequent examples turned up at press conferences of his lack of knowledge about American governmental development during the past quarter of a century are leged among the reporters and journalists of the Capital. His desire to enjoy the love of all and to suffer the animosity of none, to stand above party strife as "the President of all the people," is an attitude more fitting for a European constitutional monarch than for the leader of one of the organizations comprising the two-party system on which American democratic government has come to depend so much. Eisenhower does not seem to understand that every president is "president of all the people." To make respect for that office dependent upon the personal affection of the citizenry for its incumbent is subtly subversive of some of our most fundamental constitutional principles. And Eisenhower's lack of understanding of what it means to be the leader of a political party helped produce the situation in which we could never be sure whose voice held the most authority within the Republican organization: Knowland's or Nixon's, McCarthy's or Hall's, Humphrey's or Brownell's—or perhaps Eisenhower's.

Even though he was out of office, Stevenson and his associates did more to reshape and revitalize the Demo-
The Health Issue

The issue of Eisenhower's health cannot, of course, be avoided. I do not view this in terms of his personal survival, as do so many of his admirers. He made his decision knowing the risks, and the electorate has no duty to save him from himself. But we do have the unhappy obligation to weigh the consequences of Eisenhower's death during the next four years, especially since coronaries and ileitis follow such unpredictable patterns in men of his age. We are not privates in an army who must accept blindly the commanding officer's designation of his next-in-command, and so we must consider both Eisenhower and Stevenson in the light of their respective running-mates. I believe the accession of Nixon to the Presidency as a consequence of Eisenhower's death would be disastrous for the national welfare.

Stevenson, Eisenhower and Kefauver all enjoy the respect of a broad spectrum of the American people, and all but the extremes in our various publics could rally around any one of them in time of crisis. But Nixon is opposed by strong elements within his own Party, is utterly unacceptable as a national leader to the vast majority of Democrats, and is deeply distrusted by great numbers of citizens in every walk of life. Like Stevenson, Kefauver has made his position clear on a broad range of issues, domestic and foreign, but Nixon has vacillated with the tides of public temper and with alterations in his place within the Republican Party. He has made expediency his personal policy. Even most of those who "like Eisenhower" must confront the risk of getting Nixon as President with great trepidation.

Just as neither candidate can be considered apart from his own formative past and his present running mate, neither can be separated from the Party with which he runs. It is increasingly clear that many citizens who do not "like" Stevenson in a personal way nevertheless prefer the Party he leads and the direction in which he is leading it. The Democrats under Stevenson offer the nation a more youthful leadership, a national party capable of bringing essential unity out of our desirable diversity, and the opportunity to begin our historic traditions interpreted in the light of present problems and conflicts.

Half the world is now in revolutionary turmoil, and the massive Soviet System with its satellites has been invigorated by a shrewd new leadership with the talents and the inventiveness of younger men. But elderly men predominate in Eisenhower's administration and in the Republican Party's leadership, which are both characterized by tendencies toward rigid thinking toward formulas rather than flexibility, toward moralizing rather than imagining.

Party Versus Party

It is to Stevenson and Kefauver and the Democrats that we must turn for an administration mature in years and experience but still young enough to imagine and to dare. They have already introduced into the campaign more new thinking about national and inter-
national problems than we have had from four years of Eisenhower. To this the Republicans have reacted with anger and scorn born of something akin to panic. For suggesting that we need to reappraise—agonizingly or not—our whole approach to disarmament, to national defense, to problems of schools, health, and old age security, Stevenson and Kefauver are accused of brashness, irresponsibility, even wickedness. Typically, Eisenhower warns that these Democrats might engage in a certain amount of trial-and-error (once an honored American technique!) instead of being loyal to those pat formulas which so often constitute the increasingly rigid mold for the thinking of aging men. Just as the not-yet-retired old soldiers of the Pentagon dominate official thinking about the draft system, so the almost-never-retired guard of big business and high finance seem to have the greatest influence over Republican thinking about disarmament and diplomacy. Eisenhower’s one new suggestion for lessening the arms race, the “open skies” plan, was an advertising man’s dream but a practical diplomat’s nightmare. Like the “Geneva spirit,” it produced nothing in the long run, not even a lasting propaganda victory. Yet when Stevenson reminds us that the testing of hydrogen bombs can be detected without “open skies,” pointing the way to America’s resumption of leadership in the search for world peace, Republican reactions approximate hysteria.

The Republicans have proved appropriately sensitive to charges that big business dominates their national leadership. Seldom in modern times have the various major segments of the nation, other than the big business community, been as unrepresented in the highest counsels of the national administration as under Eisenhower. Unable to deny this fact, the Republicans cry out that the Democrats seek to set class against class. Democrats recognize that we are a nation of diverse groups with differing and sometimes conflicting interests, which must be represented in the national administration if they are to be reconciled there. Stevenson has correctly asserted again and again that the elements of our unity are far greater and more powerful than our differences; but the Republicans would have us believe that all important differences are mysteriously dissolved in the radiance of the Eisenhower smile so that we need not be concerned with the extent to which the members of one group predominate in the policy-making Federal offices.

Such a belief utterly contradicts the governmental philosophy of the Founding Fathers, of practical political theorists such as Madison and Monroe, who held that the diversity of our classes and factions, and the energetic pursuit of its interests by each, provided one of the most essential and fundamental safeguards of our Republican system. The Democratic Party cannot boast of the kind of unity which has been imposed upon the Republicans, for Democrats are a truly national Party with many adherents from every class, every region, every interest group. They reach into the local government of every state. That is why they are the only hope short of force for bringing to bear upon the South the demands for public school integration of the Supreme Court and the rest of the nation. Eisenhower again displayed his inadequacies as a political leader by his failure to take effective advantage of the golden opportunity he had early in his administration to push the two-party system into the deep South. His big business Cabinet and political entourage apparently had no real interest in that historic challenge. Meanwhile, the Democrats under Stevenson have extended their influence even into the ancient Republican heartland of New England.

Because it is truly a national Party, the Democratic leadership is a diverse group who among themselves can work out constructive resolutions of the clashing interests inevitably produced by our democratic national diversity. Partly because of this, it is a Party which has real, not just rhetorical, respect for true individualism, for the right of each person to pursue vigorously his own sincere and honest beliefs. We have seen among the “pro-individualism” Republicans the ridiculous and shameful “Stassen affair,” and the ordeal of Harry Cain with his eventual resignation from the security system. But Stevenson, like Franklin Roosevelt and Truman, has around him many leaders whose personalities and ideas may at times clash; we do not hear demands that these varied representatives of our variegated society submerge their individualistic qualities in order to form a “team.”

It has become increasingly clear that Eisenhower’s conception of “a team” is not that of the average American. It represents the military mentality modified by the thinking of the managerial elite of America’s most gigantic corporations. It would be humorous, were it not so dangerous, to hear leaders of our least democratic institutions—the military and the giant corporation—making propaganda with the rhetoric of individualism, while within the Eisenhower administration the individualists are crushed by the psychological and organizational steamroller of “the team.” Eisenhower and his “team-mates” assert that we are all “equal” as they deride Stevenson and Kefauver’s expressed concern for “the little fellow,” but it is quite clear that the vast majority of us are “little” in terms of economic power and political influence compared with the rulers of commerce and industry who have been carried on the coat-tails of Eisenhower’s popularity into the offices of highest authority in the very government that alone can restrain them. The real meaning of “equality” and “individuality” for these Republican leaders is revealed by their advertising-agency approach to the political campaign, in which the image of the American
citizen is shrunk by the hucksters to the lowest common denominator of the Hooper or Nielsen rating, while the admen turned speechwriters fall back upon the most saccharine kind of platitudes since they can't feed "the public" their usual offering of billowy bosoms in behalf of a Presidential candidate.

Finally, it has been argued that the more liberal Party, the Democrats, had twenty years in office and that the Republicans, as the more conservative group, deserve more than four years' chance at the administration of the nation—even if they haven't done a good job. As a matter of fact, for over a decade we have seen almost no major progress in domestic policy and only one basic reformulation (Truman's) of our role in world affairs. The conservative function already having been fulfilled by a coalition in Congress, which successfully resisted more liberal administrations, the Republican leaders under Eisenhower have only re-validated the major reforms of the New Deal era while attending to that less lofty business, such as Dixon-Yates, dictated by interests which predominate in the upper officialdom of Republicanism.

Paralysis on Dead Center

We realize that for the past four years we have not been traveling down the middle of any road. Instead we have been like some massive engine whose flywheel is hung on dead center. With each new crisis—Israel, Suez, North Africa, the crumbling relations within the Atlantic community—the paralysis grows. It is Stevenson and the Democrats who offer the possibility that the great engine of American democracy can be set to running at full power once again. Stevenson has already gotten Eisenhower out on the road and moving in spite of himself. He would do the same for this nation, but we would not be reluctant. The apathy we see much of today is in part a product of the inertia of the national administration. The nation waits only to get moving once more toward the fulfillment of our best dreams and historic aspirations.

There are a host of specific issues, familiar to anyone who has followed the campaign, to which I might refer in my support for Stevenson against Eisenhower—the further decline of civil liberties, the lack of any real national leadership in the civil rights struggle, the "give-away" of national resources—some of them preserved as part of the national heritage by Theodore Roosevelt, the pro-big-business tax law, the brink-of-war approach to international relations, the Salk vaccine muddle and the educational facilities mess, to mention a few. I have tried instead to get at the roots of Eisenhower's failures in the office of the Presidency and to suggest what would be the roots of Stevenson's success. Future issues, like future crises, are unfortunately not always predictable; but there is a pattern to the way men play their historic roles and it is that pattern we need to keep in mind when we select a person and his party to lead the nation.

Stevenson may not radiate the personal appeal which has made Eisenhower an amazing political phenomenon, but there is something exciting about him. We think of him writing his own speech as the aircraft in which he rides hurtles across half the nation, and the image of an earlier President, who also filled his remarks with humor and biting wit, comes to mind—the image of him jotting down the final version of his forthcoming remarks as a train carried him slowly towards Gettysburg. Those who assert that these speeches Stevenson composes are "above" the ordinary citizen would surely find the words of the Founding Fathers unpalatable and such fundamental documents of the American political past as the Federalist Papers and the Lincoln-Douglas debates undigestible. In both what he says and how he says it Stevenson projects the best of American political traditions. He seeks, as Washington advocated, to "raise a standard to which wise men may repair," instead of producing some pre-packaged, if not pre-digested, platitudes in the approved style of big business advertising techniques.

Eleanor Roosevelt told the Democratic convention that the New Deal is past history, that the time has come to formulate anew in principle and program the meaning of American liberalism. There are many who wonder if the Democratic nominee may not be too cautious, too moderate for this task. Yet it is only through his election that America may move forward once again, that it may determine those new frontiers at home and abroad through whose conquest alone the spirit, the vitality, and even the growth of our democracy can be maintained. To this challenging need and opportunity Adlai E. Stevenson brings the rich resources of his own talents, his excellent training and experience in government, his humor and humility, his respect for the complexity of the problems we face, his decisiveness when the chips are down—and above all his own profound personal dedication to the traditions and aspirations that are the heart and spirit of the American nation.
Music criticism, say some benighted souls, is the art of picking flaws. Besides, more than one commentator on the business of a critic has stated flatly and venomously that those who write professionally about music and musicians actually go out of their way to imagine and even to manufacture shortcomings.

Many brickbats—big and little—have been thrown at me in the course of the years. But I have tried earnestly to let every missile teach me something.

In my opinion, fault-finding is by no means the primary purpose of music criticism. An honest commentator always bears in mind that he is tens of thousands of miles away from that nonexistent virtue which men call infallibility. He knows that he dare not let the big and little imps named Vanity sink their fangs into his brain. Furthermore, he never loses sight of the fact that many of the musicians about whom he writes have knowledge more extensive than his. He goes about his business with respect—often with fear and trembling.

If, for example, I put on paper that I am not in agreement with Arturo Toscanini in the matter of this or that tempo, I am not hurling a brickbat at the great maestro. I am merely expressing my own conviction in all candor. When I make such a statement, I do not mean to imply that I know even one-tenth as much about music as Toscanini. My opinion may be radically wrong. My thinking about this or that tempo may be completely warped. I state it, not for the purpose of pointing to a hole in the maestro's coat but because I hope that if I am in error someone will prove to me just what that error is and why I have fallen into it.

This leads me to set forth a thesis according to which I have striven to conduct myself during my rather long career as a music critic. Here is that thesis:

A music critic should attend concerts and listen to recordings primarily for the purpose of increasing his own knowledge of the art.

If what I am writing today seems strange to you, I shall tell you that I have actually learned much from music that was downright rotten and from performances that smelled to highest heaven.

When a he or a she murders Mozart by failing to sing or play a composition by Mozart with the limpid clarity that is always a hallmark of this great master's way of writing, I learn a little more about the supreme importance of clarity in singing and in playing. When I hear an orchestra or a string quartet deal harshly and unmercifully with Mozart's wonderfully lucid counterpoint, I realize more keenly than ever before that every public performance should be grounded on thoroughgoing knowledge and on painstaking preparation.

When I hear Johann Sebastian Bach's works played or sung as though they had come into being in the twentieth century, I learn a bit more about the truth that musicians should strive in the sweat of their brows to become acquainted with the history of the art to which they devote their attention. When to my ears a symphony by Johannes Brahms is made to sound, in part at least, like something written by an Italian, I am literally driven to restudy Brahms and the characteristics of his music. When I suffer in silence and gnash my teeth while conceited choir directors—their number is legion—place far more emphasis on vocal stunts and acrobatics than on music, I arrive at a sharper understanding of the vile and destructive nature of sham and pretense.

Music critics as well as those who sing and play in public should set their faces like flint against sham; for sham, as baneful as it is disgusting, keeps on cumbering the musical earth in this altogether imperfect world. Sham, you see, has more lives than the toughest tomcat could ever hope to have.

**RECENT RECORDINGS**

Only very rarely do landscape, design and final execution all blend together to make an almost perfect setting. Such a combination is the special treasure of Zion Lutheran Church in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Valparaiso's Chapel Architect, Charles Edward Stade, has been able to achieve a remarkable planning of a Church and a hillside into an inspiring House of God.

The interior view shows a glass wall rising over the altar. This end of the Church is set about sixty-five to seventy feet above the passing roadways below. The entire interior of the Church is flooded with the jewel-like tones of this window which rises from the floor of the chancel to the peak of the roof.

The window itself is not flat but set in the form of a prow on a ship. The window is an excellent example of how building, landscape and design can be "personalized" for a particular Church.

Since the name of the Church is Zion, the two halves of the great window portray the Old and the New Covenant as symbolized in Mount Zion. Reading the window in the proper clockwise fashion we begin at the lower left. Here we see the angel with the flaming sword as a symbol of the expulsion from the Garden of Eden and a reminder of the promise made to our first parents about the Redeemer. In an ascending scale we note the tablets of the Law, the altar of sacrifice, the riven rock in the wilderness, the crowns for the righteous kings, and the increase for the prayers of the faithful.

At the top of this left side is the symbol of God the Father (the eye) with the word "Credo" beside it. This word—"I believe"—is found three times as a symbol of the faith of the Church. In the center it is associated with the Lamb in Glory on the book with the seven seals. In the upper right hand it is associated with the dove of the Spirit and the seven burning lamps significant of the gifts of the Spirit.

The large panel on the left side of the window deals with the Holy Covenant especially on Mount Zion, when King David brought the Ark of the Covenant to the city of Jerusalem. A wide variety of musical instruments is shown in this great procession moving upward toward the peak of the window.

At the very top of the window on either side of the central beam are to be seen, left, the two prophets Zechariah and Isaiah, who issued the Old Testament call "Rejoice, O Daughter of Zion."

On the right side of the center pillar are found the figures of St. Matthew and St. John, who, in the New Testament, applied this directly to Jesus on Palm Sunday as He entered Jerusalem.

Symbolic of the New Testament covenant on Mount Zion is the enchanting panel dedicated to the Lord's Supper as it was instituted on Holy Thursday on Mount Zion.

Continuing down the right side of the window are the symbols for those who proclaimed this new covenant, Peter, James, John and St. Paul. In the lower right hand corner as a contrast with the angel and the sword in the lower left, stands the cross by which the way is now open to paradise again.

The altar was very carefully styled to fit into the window. In a great triangle rising from the floor on both sides are found the words of the "Gloria Patri." The function of the minister, as the messenger of God, is shown within this triangle in the form of four angels. Prayer and praise are depicted by the kneeling angels. The proclamation of Jesus Christ as Alpha and Omega is shown by tall standing angels holding these symbols of our Lord.

The window's prow-like form is reflected in the predella and the chancel rail also so that there is a complete harmony of color, light and use.

Pastor Louis Grother and his congregation are to be congratulated for bringing to this University town this great and striking glass wall made by the expert craftsmen of Giannini and Hilgart of Chicago.

Night is a black skull
Split by importunate stars scanty and vain
Incongruously poised
And by their spikes thrust through wind streaks
The silence with thin whistle like a tapering stain.

I fancy
Thus in black gulleys poverty goes trussed
Hungered
Without God's gold or
Even a tiny scrap of blue.

—Antoni Gronowicz
Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?
Romans 3:5

Each year more and more of our students go to graduate schools to continue their studies. There they hear many things that are in conflict with certain truths that they learned on our campus. Here, for example, are a few of the assumptions that they encounter in the classrooms of secular institutions: everything is subject to change; everything is relative; there is no absolute truth; there is no absolute standard of morality.

In this age of relativism, certainty and positiveness in religious views are looked at askance. People who firmly trust in the verities of the Scriptures are derisively labeled "know-alls." Charles Lamb, who also believed that Church dogma professes to know too much about the unknowable, expressed it this way:

The Economy of Heaven is dark,
And wisest clerks have missed the mark.

One of the most common and most pernicious premises encountered in intellectual circles is the bland assumption that the Jehovah of the Old Testament is an altogether different being from the God of the New Testament. This viewpoint is enunciated, for example, by Professor Edward Wagenknecht in a widely-used college textbook. It appears in his comments on Browning's poem, "Saul." In this magnificent lyric, you will remember, Browning relates the Biblical story of King Saul. Saul is a candidate for suicide; he is interested in nothing. The problem is: What can be done to bring a man such as Saul back to normal? After all physical appeals have failed, David hits upon a message that has come in a kind of revelation: "All's love, yet all's law." In other words, God is not only a powerful God but also a God of love. The great evidence that God is a God of love is that God sent His Son to save us. In the poem, David exclaims:

O Saul, it shall be
A Face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me
Thou shalt love and be loved by, for ever: a Hand like this hand
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee! See the Christ stand!

In his introductory comments on this poem, Professor Wagenknecht remarks:
The ideas expressed in the poem are, of course, much too advanced for David's day. David lived late in the eleventh and early in the tenth century, B.C., Hosea, the first prophet to think of God as love, in the eighth century, B.C. Actually, Browning goes beyond the range of the Old Testament altogether, expressing ... the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation.

Here we have the circumscribed and patronizing assumption that the people of David's day were incapable of doing any reflective thinking above the elementary level. There is, furthermore, the implicit denial of Messianic prophecy. We have here also echoes of the common Modernistic assumption that the Old Testament represents an altogether different philosophy than the New Testament, that the God of the Old Testament is a barbaric tribal deity, a cruel, vengeful, spiteful God, something like Caliban's God Setebos, whereas the God of the New Testament is a God of love, interested in social justice. The underlying idea seems to be that the same God can not be both just and benevolent.

But, as the Bible shows, God is a complex Being. He has numerous attributes: indivisibility, immutability, infinity, intelligence, wisdom, holiness, justice, truth, goodness, and power. Some of these are negative, quiescent attributes. Others are positive, operative attributes. He is a God of love, but He is also a just God. And justice demands that iniquity be punished. Some people think of God in a childishly elementary fashion. They can not conceive of Him as having more than one attribute—something like John Bunyan's characters. This attempt to conceive of the infinite God in limited human terms and according to human standards is like trying to measure the Grand Canyon with a millimeter scale or like trying to gather up Niagara Falls in a teacup. It out-Calibans Caliban.

William Blake, the great English painter, engraver, poet, and mystic, seems to have understood this very well. In his apostrophe to "The Tiger," which every college sophomore has read, Blake asks, "Did He who made the lamb make thee?" Is it possible that the tender, loving Creator who made the meek and gentle lamb also made the fierce tiger? The tiger, a symbol of God's just wrath as the lamb is a symbol of God's love, is not only fearful; he is also beautiful. His marvelous symmetry is something to awaken wonder and admiration. So it is with God's justice.

Although God's justice is dreadful, it is nevertheless...
a divine attribute and as such it must be necessary and
good. God is His own ethical norm.

His work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God
of truth and without iniquity, just and right is He.
The Lord is righteous in all His ways, and holy in all His
works.

From the beginning to the end of the Bible there is
unmistakable evidence both of God’s justice and of His
goodness. St. Paul emphasizes this polarity when he
says to the Romans:

Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on
them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness if thou
continue in his goodness.

God shows his severity through wars and other
calamities. Satan often causes men to harbor the fool­


ish hope that God will not punish sin, that His threats
are mere bugaboos to frighten the timid. Therefore
God must show His severity. Let men but disregard
His threats, and they will pay the dreadful conse­

quences. They that sow the wind must reap the whirl­

wind. “It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of
the living God.”

But this is only one side of the picture. God also re­

veals His goodness. He reveals it in the marvels of
creation, in His daily bounties, and especially in His
gracious work of redemption. Professor Wagenknecht
is certainly wrong when he says that the concept of
divine love was unknown before Hosea’s day. All
through the psalms appear statements such as these:

The Lord is good to all; and His tender mercies are over
all His works.
He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us
according to our iniquities.

... with the Lord there is mercy, and with Him is
plenteous redemption.

And as far back as the Book of Exodus there appears
the passage:

The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long­
suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth.

Regardless of what men of acknowledged intellect
may say, there is nothing inconsistent about a God who
hates sin and yet loves the sinner, and there is nothing
inharmonious about a divine book that pronounces dire
judgments and also offers free, unmerited love. It is
ture that the Bible cleaves into two parts, but, we find
in it nevertheless a marvelous unity of design. As one
writer expresses it:

Grace buds in the Old Testament and blossoms in the
New. As the blossom is hid in the bud, and the bud lies
open in the blossom, so in the Old the New is concealed,
and in the New the Old revealed.

Letter from
Xanadu, Nebr.

By G. G.

Dear Editor:

Say, we’ve got a problem here in the congregation and
I wish you would tell me what you think about it.

Several months ago, this young couple moved to town—a man and his wife and two kids. They started at­
tending our church and when we organized our adult
confirmation class in September they started attending
that and we took it for granted that they would be
taken into membership next Spring.

Well, now it turns out that the woman has been
married before. She ran off with some guy when she
was in high school and it lasted only a year or so and
then she got a divorce on grounds of cruelty and a
couple years later she married her present husband.
But her former husband is still living and he has re­
married.

Now as I understand it, this woman is living in
adultery with her present husband since her first hus­
band is still alive, and the only way she can get out of
her jam is to leave her husband and hope that maybe
one of these days her first husband will die so that she
will be free to go back to her present husband. Only
that sounds a little bit screwy and, of course, it sure
makes it rough on the kids.

Rev. Zeitgeist wants to go ahead and accept her as a
member but I and some of the rest of us in the congre­
gation feel that we would be setting a dangerous prece­
dent. We’ve got some of our own people who would
get a divorce tomorrow if they thought they wouldn’t
be thrown out of the church. It seems to me we have a
responsibility to these folks, too.

My thought was that we could suggest to this woman
that she go and join the Methodist Church or the Pres­
byterian Church. After all, they’re Christian churches,
too, and they already have some divorced people in
them. But some of the men feel that if she went over
there and fell for their false doctrines the responsibility
might be on our consciences.

So—any ideas? And don’t tell me to search the Scrip­
tures because I’ve already done that and I still haven’t
found the answer.
BOOKS OF THE MONTH
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Editor's Note: The review of Essays Philosophical and Theological by Rudolph Bultmann which appeared in the September CRESSET should have noted that it was published by The Macmillan Company.

THE PURPOSE OF THE CHURCH AND ITS MINISTRY

By H. Richard Niebuhr (Harper, $2.50)

Written as one of the outcomes of a very comprehensive study of theological education in the United States and Canada, this volume discusses (1) the church and its purpose, (2) the emerging new conception of the ministry, and (3) the idea of a theological school.

Some of the statements appear strange to Lutheran eyes. This is true especially in the first chapter where, in the context of defining the church, the author speaks of God and His relation to man, Christ and His work, and other points of Biblical doctrine.

It is particularly chapters two and three that everyone interested in understanding the contemporary ministry, especially every incumbent of it and every theological student and seminary professor or administrator, should find stimulating. What is said about "the perplexed profession" and "seminaries in quandary" presents good analyses of well-known problems. The elaboration of the concept of the "pastoral director" (not to be confused with the "big operator") and the treatment of the seminary not only as a school but as a theological community as well, point toward some of the best solutions that have been offered to date.

ALFRED O. FUERBBRINGER

CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY AND SOCIAL THOUGHT

By Ray C. Petry (Abingdon Press, $3.00)

"What is eschatology?" asked a Christian sociologist as he glanced at the title of this new book, Christian Eschatology and Social Thought, by the patristic scholar, Dr. Petry. The incident only supports the author's opinion that the word "eschatology" and its social implications have been lost from much of Christian thought. For this reason, Dr. Petry seeks to examine within the Church's history from the time of Christ until prior to the Reformation the interaction and inseparability of God's ultimate community and the earthly Christian society. He realizes that within the framework of history there is a "society" and a "social thought" which is beyond human experience and truly of the nature of a heavenly phenomenon. The book's historical material would indicate that a primary relation to heavenly realities need in no way weaken the Church's concern for the social sorrows on earth. Throughout the book, the author succeeds well in impressing his reader with the complete corporateness of the Christian community, both here and hereafter.

But as one reads this work, the author must be asked: What is the significance of the death and resurrection of Christ to these two communities, the heavenly and the earthly? According to Petry, Christ is only the revealer of the standard by which men govern their lives and so enter the ultimate community (p. 48). One is led to believe that salvation is secured merely through a selfless surrender to the reality of the ultimate community. The subtitle to the book calls it a study of "some selected aspects in Christian eschatology." The words "selective aspects" may have been well chosen, as the author avoids both the New Testament's emphasis upon Christ's death as expiation for man's guilt and what, this reader believes, is also the emphasis within much of patristic literature. Failing to view eschatology through the centrality of the cross, this book leaves something to be desired. It is, however, stimulating and contains a fine bibliography for additional study.

PAUL GOTTING

THE OLD TESTAMENT SINCE THE REFORMATION

By Emil Kraeling (Harper, $5.00)

The Old Testament has always been something of a problem, if not an embarrassment, to the theologians of the Christian Church. This book is an attempt to describe how the Old Testament has fared in the hands of theologians since the Reformation. The author is not, therefore, interested in the development of Old Testament scholarship from the point of view of exegesis, lower and higher criticism, archeology, Biblical theology etc., but purely from the point of view of the role that the Old Testament has played in theological thought.

This story is told largely in terms of key individuals such as Luther, Calvin, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Harnack, Delitzsch, etc. A part of the story is also related in reference to historical periods such as "The Reformation to Mid-Seventeenth Century," "The Old Testament in Nineteenth-Century Theological Thought before Ritschl," and "Systematic Theology and the Old Testament after 1918." Some attempt is also made to group various individuals together because of some common interest such as "The Apologetic of Biblical Scholars," "The Revival of the New Testament Approach," and "The Existential Question."

Two-hundred and eighty-four pages are hardly enough to deal with so vast a subject. Nevertheless, the position of many important theologians over against the Old Testament is summarized in an interesting and satisfactory way. The omission of any reference to Roman Catholic theology and in particular Roman Catholic Modernism may be explained by the tacit assumption that this book is dealing with Protestant theology. But the failure to deal with American fundamentalism can hardly be defended. It is understandable that the author may be repelled by this movement, but its importance as an historical force in American theology cannot be denied.

Moreover, the author in his introduction refers to the problem of the Old Testament as "the master problem of theology." That the attitude towards the Old Testament is in fact an important key to the understanding of theological positions may be so. But the book almost completely lacks any interpretation of the facts that would support this contention. What is there in the theology of Calvin, Hollazius, J. C. K. von Hofmann, Ritschl, Karl Barth and others that brings them to accept the Old Testament wholeheartedly? What is there in the theology of Harnack, Friedrich Delitzsch and Hirsch that would cause them to join in the total rejection of the Old Testament? Why do Luther, Schleiermacher, Schaeader, Troeltsch and many others approach the Old Testament in varying degrees of both acceptance and rejection? It would seem that there are theological factors of a deeper nature that would bring such diverse figures together.

If the problem of the Old Testament is really "the master problem of theology" or even merely one key to the understanding of the history of systematic thought, that remains to be shown.

WILLIAM SCHOEDEL

THE CHURCH UNDER THE CROSS

By J.B. Phillips (Macmillan, $2.50)

This is a book about missions and mis-
tional, "these outriders of the King, these pioneers of the new humanity; these ambassadors of Christ [who] often work in isolation and obscurity. The true glory and worth of what they do is not yet revealed, and the sign in which they conquer is the sign of sacrifice, the sign of the Cross."

Much of the story of what Christian missionaries are doing in the modern world is told in their own words, which Mr. Phillips has collected from the many letters that were made available to him by the Church of England's Church Missionary Society. Taken together, these letters reveal a courage, a thoughtfulness, a struggle of conscience, and an awareness of the complexity of present-day problems which can hardly fail to strike home to the consciences of those of us who bear the name of Christ as though it were some sort of honorary degree. For what kind of Christian are we by comparison with our brethren out on the frontier where the Cross is still either a stumbling-block or foolishness?

The problems they face are, literally, all of the problems of our century. If we think we have racial problems, we might consider sometime the difficulties of trying to bring the Christian witness into lands which are ethnically fragmented, where tribal structures and caste line separate man from man. If we find it difficult to pinpoint the relevance of the Faith to social problems, we might consider how we would operate in lands where polygamy is interwoven into the whole social structure, where bribery is as much a part of the social system as tipping is in our own, where every "solution" to a problem raises a dozen new problems. And if we imagine that it is difficult to be a real Christian in a nominally Christian country, we might try to imagine the difficulties of remaining a Christian in a setting almost wholly inimical to the Faith and in which there is little help to be gotten from a community of the faithful.

And certainly we ought to remember, in our prayers and in our stewardship, the new Christians who seek to remain faithful in lands where it does not pay to be a Christian. The accounts of the loyalty and endurance of these new brothers of ours in this book.

"... basically and fundamentally the whole Church, and that includes every individual member of it, should be living under the Cross if it is to prove an effective instrument of God's great Purpose. It is not merely my personal conviction but the unanswerable lesson of Church history that where the Church fails to live under the Cross it fails utterly. The facade, the buildings, the ceremony, the tithes, and all the other externals may remain, but if the Cross is not faithfully accepted and borne the life has departed and the Church is no more than a venerable shell of a past glory.

In this country the Cross is easy to dodge. We can forget about faraway battles; we can pretend that they are nothing to do with us; we can become so immersed in the petty successes of our own parish that we never hear the cries of human anguish from the distant battlefield. But if we do this we not only fail our brethren most miserably, we not only hold back in the day of opportunity, but we condemn ourselves to a poor pale shadow of genuine Christian living. The awful price of evading the Cross is the slow death of our own souls."

The whole of Mr. Phillips' earnings on this book will go toward the support of the work of the Church Missionary Society.

FICTION

KING OF PARIS

By Guy Endore (Simon & Schuster, $4.00)

When Alexandre Dumas came to Paris at the age of twenty, a naive country boy, he numbered among his possessions a few francs, a little furniture and a burning ambition to become a great writer. Old friends found him a job as a clerk to the Duke of Orleans. A chance meeting with the author of the first play he ever saw set him on the road to becoming a writer. He devoured the works of the great writers of his own and previous days. When he understood them thoroughly he began to write and did not stop until shortly before his death. By dint of hisbrashness and complete self-confidence, he literally forced his first efforts into the hands of the public. The public loved him, and the rest was easy. He was capable of turning out prodigious amounts of copy. In fact, his critics doubted any one man's ability to write down so much, let alone create it, and they did not hesitate to voice their opinions. But the money rolled in rapidly—and rolled out even more rapidly. Dumas became a self-styled authority on just about everything—food, duelling, art, love—and became the "king of Paris." His escapades gained him notoriety, and his voracious appetites a tremendous girth and a number of illegitimate children. The eldest of these children, born of his first mistress, was Alexandre Dumas, fils, who became a famous author in his own right and who occupies a place of major importance in this story of his father.

Mr. Endore's story opens as Dumas is criticising publicly and with relish the painting "Duel after the Masquerade Ball." A short time later he is seen trying to buy it. The remainder of the long story is ostensibly an explanation of this seemingly contradictory conduct. To fill five hundred pages between the presentation of a riddle and its solution requires a great deal of detail and digression. For a while Mr. Endore reminds the reader periodically that he has not forgotten his purpose, but soon abandons even this pretense at continuity and simply enjoys living vicariously in the Paris of the 19th century. There he listens to the witticisms and earthy jokes, eats the exotic culinary creations prepared with care and affection, and pays the necessary homage to the "king."

The book is called a biographical novel, which means that it is neither fish nor fowl. Like most biographers, the author depicts his subject in a most favorable light. Unfortunately, when the effort is announced as a fictionalized life story, the reader always has the uncomfortable feeling of not knowing when or to what extent the writer has played fast and loose with fact. How guilty Mr. Endore is of imposing his own opinions or wishful thinking I leave to the literary historians. Leave it at this, that the author, through his tinted glasses, sees none of the sins and all of the virtues of his subject. The reader can find an abundance of both in and in between the lines. Through design or accident—I know not which—the book is as disorganized as Dumas' life apparently was. But Mr. Endore is interested not in organization, but in lying with a capital "L." Dumas epitomizes this—Dumas the generous, Dumas the wit, Dumas the gourmet. The author wants the reader to feel, as he does, the gay life of those never-to-be-forgotten, but never-to-be-lived-again days. One can see the bubbles in the champagne and smell the aroma of a delicate omelet. All of this is very pleasant, light and innocuous, but I for one would like to sip a little of the wine and sample a little of the
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food. Dumas left his mark in the world of literature. The concoction the author has prepared has an appetizing air, but since he denies the reader a real taste one can not be sure that he has created a “king” or a “clown prince.” The reader and Dumas deserves more than this.

AUTUMN COMES EARLY
By Howard Breslin (Crowell, $3.95)
Deborah Clifford is a New England “spinster” at thirty as a result of the loss of all finance in the war in Korea. The small Connecticut town offers no possibilities to her for marriage and both she and the community accept it as natural that she should settle down as the assistant librarian. Dinner the third Sunday of every month with her fiance’s parents and her work provide her diversions. Johnny Leo comes to the town as a player on the local professional baseball team. He is younger than Deborah and though his background (second-generation American and Roman Catholic) is different from Deborah’s (many-generation New England and Puritan) their attraction for each other is the same.

Their romance affords a source of interest and gossip for the small community and, naturally, alienates her would-be-inlaws. A disastrous flood (Mr. Breslin states that he based this book on the storm that hit Connecticut in the summer of 1955) almost destroys the community and in the aftermath of the disaster Deborah finally resolves the conflict between her head and her heart.

The characters are fairly well drawn and the descriptive passages, particularly about the storm, are good. The denouement seems a little too pat.

PEYTON PLACE
By Grace Metalious (Messner, $3.95)

Peyton Place, which is publicized as “the extraordinary new novel that lifts the lid off a small New England town,” generates enough steam to demolish the town. Although the characters are numerous enough and the action is violent enough to fill several novels, the author manages to keep a firm grip on the controls while moving at breakneck speed.

The people of Peyton Place, an old, ingrown town, both fear and indulge in gossip. Among the many characters are representatives of all ages and of all walks of life. When Mrs. Metalious examines their interlacing lives, she does not fail to inspect the contents of their closets. She rattles the bony remains of shame she finds there until most of the closet skeleton owners get their comeuppance.

It is unfortunate that Mrs. Metalious is preoccupied with violence of action and emotion. Combining murder, rape, suicide, abortion, gory accidents—to mention a few—produces a supersaturated solution that detracts from her storytelling skill. There also is no need for her graphic bedroom scenes. Her lack of restraint is all the more regrettable because she shows a fine sensitivity to the undercurrent of small town life.

CARLENE BARTELT

BEYOND THE BLACK STUMP
By Nevil Shute (Morrow, $3.75)
A naive, young American geologist, while prospecting for oil on a huge and lonely sheep ranch in West Australia, meets, and falls in love with the daughter of a rancher. At the request of her mother, the girl delays accepting the geologist’s proposal of marriage until after she has visited her future home in America. During the visit with the geologist’s parents she finds the pseudo-frontier of Washington state too civilized in comparison with the new frontier in Australia and, consequently, she rejects the proposal and returns home. This is a fairly slick and consequent novel in which the author, Nevil Shute, now living in Australia, stacks the cards against the Americans.

HOMECOMING
By C. P. Snow (Scribner, $3.95)

Homecoming is the sixth in a sequence of novels by C. P. Snow entitled Strangers and Brothers. Unlike many novels of a series, this one can stand alone.

The central figure is Lewis Eliot, formerly in industry and now a civil servant, who has risen in life the hard way. Mr. Snow here presents an account of his emotional life and career in London just before, during, and after the war.

When the novel opens, Eliot is enduring a dismal marriage with a deeply neurotic woman who finally commits suicide. There follows a long love affair with a younger woman, Margaret, who temporarily ends their relationship by marrying another man. After Eliot grows up emotionally, he sets about to break up the marriage so that he can marry Margaret himself. In the end Eliot and Margaret find happiness in their home and children.

Mr. Snow is at his best when he turns his attention to Eliot’s administrative work in a government office. Especially interesting are the scenes that reveal the policies of a top-secret atomic energy project and the manner in which a few high-ranking civil servants determine the job futures of others.

Homecoming has a painfully slow beginning. If, however, the reader will stick with it, he will be rewarded by unusually fine, precise prose that goes to the heart of the matter of motive and consequence.

CARLENE BARTELT

GENERAL

THE TEACHER’S TREASURE CHEST
Edited by Leo Deuel (Prentice-Hall, $4.95)
Many people have had many things to say about teachers and teaching. From the very serious to the very funny, the entire gamut of possibilities has been explored. From the biographical essay to the cartoon, the entire range of expression has been utilized. Mr. Leo Deuel has gathered together seventy pieces representing the ranges of possibility and method and put them together in this volume which should, if anything, at least solve the problem of the teacher-friend on one’s Christmas shopping list.

The roster of authors of these stories, poems, articles, etc. reads like a Literary Who’s Who: Stephen Vincent Benet, Heywood Broun, James Hilton, Emily Kimbrough, Sinclair Lewis, John P. Marquand, Ogden Nash, and James Thurber, to mention a few. The Introduction is by Benjamin Fine of the New York Times.

THE OLD WEST SPEAKS
By Howard R. Driggs (Prentice-Hall, $10.00)

Howard R. Driggs is a descendant of a family of Mormons who emigrated to Utah as a result of attacks made against them in the east and mid-western parts of the United States. Mr. Driggs is now eighty-three and for a number of years he has been writing about the west—the west he remembers and the west he heard about as a child and young man from his family and elders. In this book Mr. Driggs, according to the dust jacket, allows the “Old West” to speak through the words of some of its explorers, settlers, etc. In places he does this but for the most part it is author Driggs recalling history. This is not meant as a criticism for what the author has to tell is well worth reading.

Mr. Driggs, in telling about the west, dwells heavily, and naturally, on the events that concerned him or his ancestors. He tells about the decision of the Mormons to leave Illinois, their great difficulties in reaching the west, their troubles in the plain states—troubles with Indians and with nature, and finally the settling of Utah and particularly Salt Lake City. He tells about the “war” between the United States and the Utah Territory and recaptures a little of the home and family life of
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the early Mormons. When he is not recalling Mormon history Mr. Driggs tells about some of the American Indians and the problems that they presented to the settlers. He describes the wild life that existed on the plains and in the valleys. He gives a graphic account of the origin and development of both the Pony Express and the extension of the telegraph across the continent. He does all of this with warmth and with a very personal interest in and enthusiasm for the old west.

The book itself is very attractive. It is in large format and is profusely illustrated with the photographs and paintings of William Henry Jackson. Mr. Jackson spent most of his life taking photographs or painting pictures in the west and the author's selection of the ones to be used in this volume is good. There is also a bibliography. This book is a little on the expensive side but it would make a nice present for anyone interested in this area of the United States. Although it dwells at some length on Mormon history it is true that the Mormon emigration and settlement of Utah is an important chapter in the history of the old west.

AN APPROACH TO CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

A Symposium edited by Rupert E. Davies (Philosophical Library, $4.75)

The matter of the connection, if one there be, between Christianity and education is a matter that has troubled a good many persons. It is still a troublesome problem and no doubt will always continue as such. It has been a subject of more than considerable interest on the campus of Valparaiso University. Once the University passed its early fiscal crises, and the state of the country did not involve depression or war, the members of the University family started to engage in analysis and speculation as to the nexus between religion and the work of the University.

That this has also been a matter of concern in England is evidenced by this current book. Nine British educators, four from Oxford and Cambridge and the others from various educational institutions, have contributed this symposium on the general subject. Mr. Rupert E. Davies, the editor, is a Tutor at Didsbury College, Bristol, and he opens the symposium with the statement "Wanted—A Christian Philosophy of Education." His colleagues, most of whom are probably unknown in this country, take up: seriatim, Education, Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Science in Christian Education, History, the Classics, Literature, and Modern Languages.

Mr. Davies' contribution is perhaps of most general interest. Teachers in the various fields covered may be particularly interested in some of the specialized approaches. Those so interested may find that their local bookshop does not have this book in stock. It may be necessary to communicate directly with the publisher. The address is The Philosophical Library, Inc., 15 East 40th Street, New York 16, N.Y. For the present I prefer to deal with Mr. Davies' general introduction to the matter.

Mr. Davies does two things that, I think, should be helpful to anyone who has ever been troubled over this business of reconciling religion and education. It is, of course, the educator in the religion-oriented school who is most concerned over this problem. The two things that Mr. Davies does are, on the one hand, to sketch out the five prevalent views as he sees them with regard to the problem (with a criticism of their weaknesses), and, on the other, to offer his own reconciliation. I think that his presentation of the five viewpoints should be helpful to anyone attempting to categorize himself and, in finding a grouping that appeals to him, in attempting to determine the validity of Davies' criticism thereof.

The first viewpoint, or attitude as he calls it, asserts that a democracy can exist only so long as it has a moral foundation. That a study of academic subjects alone does not create the necessary moral atmosphere. Since Christianity offers the "best" moral principles it should be taught in order to preserve democracy. I have heard this particular approach on a number of occasions. I have heard it most dramatically coupled with an assertion that Abraham Lincoln and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., for example, were the products of an afterglow of a Christian renaissance. I have heard concern expressed that when this afterglow disappears democracy may be in for a hard time; that the Christian position must be kept constantly in front of young people to offset this danger. Mr. Davies' attack on this attitude is the expected one that it means the employment of Christianity as a means to an end. Christianity is to be used to achieve a good end, the democratic ideal. This, as Mr. Davies points out, does emphasize the greatness of Christ as a man and as a teacher but it denies the essential claim of Christianity.

The second attitude is one that the author considers the "almost automatic one." This view sees religion as the sole duty of the Churches and education as the sole duty of the schools. Proponents of this attitude would, Mr. Davies asserts, approve of teaching Scripture in the schools and in a daily act of worship on the part of the academic community, but would feel that there is a dichotomy and that it is not essential to establish any connection between religion and education. I think that perhaps Mr. Davies overstates this attitude somewhat. His criticism of this attitude is that it assumes that a student—or anybody for that matter—can have his life split into two separate parts without evil consequences. He asserts that the dividing of a life into sections results in either a decay of religious interests or a decay of secular interests, "... or else produces a nervous breakdown." He also asserts that this attitude abandons the Christian claim to "... embrace and control the whole of life."

The third attitude he terms "Fundamentalist." "... a man completely and perfectly fulfils the divine purpose for his life if he enters into a redeeming, reconciling, personal knowledge of God through Jesus Christ. This is the 'one thing needful.' Without it, a man can have nothing; with it, he has already everything." The holders of this attitude assert that the sole function of education is to bring young people to the personal knowledge of God. This makes this task the supreme goal of education and the teaching of Scripture and the Christian faith are the important adjuncts. Everything else in the curriculum is taught either to train the mind to think or to make a living, or both. Human culture, human history, and human ideals do not provide young people with knowledge of God.

Mr. Davies criticizes this view on three grounds: (1) He says that this attitude charges God with "... most outrageous mockery of the human race." That it denies that God's creation is at work in the development of the human spirit. "The Christian conception of God is a very queer thing, if it makes out that He is, among other things, a practical joker of the most exquisite and intricate cruelty." (2) If the academic subjects (history, art, science, etc.) contain any truth at all then it must be God's truth for all truth comes from God. Mr. Davies does not like the proposition that the truth that comes from the Bible is different than the truth yielded by so-called academic subjects. He asserts that there is only one kind of truth—God's, but that there are two ways of obtaining it—revelation and reason. (3) If God is the creator of the universe he must have created it according to certain principles. That what is discovered—in the arts, in history, in science—is God's method of creation and that the truth sought and obtained is truth about the nature of God.

The fourth attitude is held, by and large, by persons who accept somewhat the Fundamentalist position but refuses to follow that position to its logical conclusions.
— the third attitude. These persons are willing to accept the notion that secular knowledge is knowledge of God but that it only becomes so when it is possessed by someone with the Christian faith. That the academic search—the discovery of an academic truth—provides fellowship with God for the Christian and thus enhances his life whereas this same search—this same discovery—does nothing for the non-Christian. In this approach the so-called secular subjects are in the curriculum only for the benefit of "... those who are already or are becoming Christians." Mr. Davies asserts that this is an attractive view, particularly to persons who have experienced a deepening of their insights as a result of their knowledge of Christ. It does not do to emphasize the secular subjects. Yet, he asserts, it makes the value of these subjects negligible for non-Christians and that, again, this is to make God a mocker and to overlook the fact that all truth is God's truth. He points out, however, that in rejecting this attitude he does not mean to deny "... that a man's understanding of nature and of every kind of beauty is enormously increased, or can be, by a knowledge of God in Christ, any more than we deny that his religious experience is enhanced by a knowledge of science and art."

The fifth attitude I would prefer to allow Mr. Davies to state in its entirety in his own words since I think it the one in which many teacher-readers of the CRESSET might be most interested:

"The fifth attitude is perhaps ultimately derived from Luther, and comes nearer than anything that we have so far considered to a real understanding of the problems involved; it is rooted in the conception of 'vocation.' According to it, every man and woman with a function in human society has a divine calling to perform a particular task: there is the calling of the preacher, the teacher, the poet, the scientist, the statesman, the housewife, the cobbler, and so on. These callings, or vocations, are separate from one another, and God requires every man to do his own work and not intrude on that of others, although there may be in special cases no particular objection to the idea that a man has more than one vocation. In a school, this means that it is the vocation of the teacher to acquaint his pupils with the various branches of human knowledge, and to train their minds and emotions; it is the vocation of the preacher, in this case the teacher of religious subjects, to bring the pupils to a true faith in God through Jesus Christ. These two vocations are separate; but both are necessary, since God has set all the various vocations within the framework of human society. And each man is to fulfill his vocation to the glory of God."

His criticism of this view is much the same as his criticism of the second attitude.

"In education it appears to divide the life of the school, and therefore the experience of the pupil, into water-tight compartments; in ordinary life it appears to assert the autonomy of the statesman, the business man, the doctor, and many others in such a way as to place them very nearly above the moral law, and at the same time to prevent such people as poets, who have the irritating habit of invading every department of life and experience, from exercising their proper function, and to preclude the Christian preacher from passing judgment on political matters, or from attempting to suggest that a Christian order of society is desirable."

In addition, he asserts that this attitude does not allow any place for the religious experience of pre-Christians (Plato) or non-Christians (Buddha). How can these, he asks, "... be fitted into the scheme of divine vocations? Yet it is surely pardonable to deny that they had fellowship with God and knowledge of His nature."

Mr. Davies then suggests that a synthesis of the universe and of its apparently contradictory and diverse elements must be theoretically possible although he indicates that it may not, in actual practice, be possible. He states that he feels the attempt worth making. "To leave the attempt aside, and accept single things, such as democracy, or freedom, or culture, as having truth and value separately, in and by themselves, is to acquiesce in a lazy pluralism which is not very far removed from polytheism."

His synthesis, in paraphrase, runs like this: For each person to fulfill the divine purpose for himself he must know God as He is revealed in and by Christ and must come to God through Christ. The knowledge of God through Christ must be the co-ordinating principle of the synthesis. "We do not put the knowledge of God through Christ on a level with any other form of knowledge whatsoever; but in a unique, unapproachable, transcendent relation to all other knowledges." The "other knowledges" which the knowledge of God through Christ co-ordinates are also knowledges of God. Mr. Davies then distinguishes between knowledge acquired by virtue of having understood and accepted certain propositions about Him and knowledge acquired by virtue of having personal fellowship with Him. These are distinct but not separable and one can not exist without the other. These other knowledges of God are partly, Mr. Davies asserts, propositional and partly personal.

Under "propositional" he puts science, art, history and non-Christian religions and philosophies. By themselves they supply the student with knowledge and information about God that is not to be found elsewhere but cautions that this knowledge is fragmentary and incomplete.

"The revelation of God in and through Christ, fully understood, completes what is partial and corrects what is untrue; it is the integrating, co-ordinating principle of all knowledge. It is that with which the structure of knowledge holds together, and without which it falls apart into innumerable fragments. It is not a revelation alongside other revelations; it is the revelation, in a class by itself."

Under "personal" he puts the arts and religion although he does not rule out science and philosophy in this area.

"Science, the arts, friendship, the higher non-Christian religions, all give personal fellowship with God on the levels below the 'I and thou' relationship; or, to put it otherwise, they establish relations between God and only part, or parts, of our being."

But he cautions, again, that this is not enough.

"The work of Christ is to bring us into a personal relationship with God which includes the whole of our nature. That relationship is reconciling and redeeming in the fullest possible sense. For Christ deals with the centre of our being, breaks down the hard core of our selfishness and turns us toward God; thus we are reconciled to God, forgiven, and at the same time liberated from the power of evil, redeemed. Thus reconciled and redeemed, we are ready to begin to enter as whole persons into fellowship with God—an 'I and thou' relationship which deeply involves, commits and directs our whole individual and social life."

Finally, he asserts that it is the task of education to unify all of the diverse elements on the co-ordinating principle that he has suggested. "... to assist the answering of Charles Wesley's prayer at the opening of his brother's school at Kingswood: 'Unite the pair so oft disjointed, Knowledge and vital piety.'"

Whether or not Mr. Davies' synthesis will stand the test of actual practice remains, of course, a matter of pragmatism. I think that Mr. Davies has been quite
It is not always possible for the staff of The New Books to thoroughly cover the various fields of publishing interest. Some books that may interest the staff may not interest the general reader. Because of limited advertising budget some publishers are reluctant to part with review copies which means that a significant book may not be mentioned in the CRESSET book column. The entire book section is at present undergoing a transformation and reorganization which it is hoped will result in a better coverage in the various areas that should interest a CRESSET reader. The Editor of the CRESSET receives, regularly, a flow of mail from the magazine's readers. This mail is both critical and laudatory. Almost none of it has to do with books. This gives rise to the speculation that (1) none of the writers-readers examine this section, or (2) if they do they are not moved to discuss same.

The result of this is that the staff of The New Books works in the dark, so to speak, with regard to reader interest. In an attempt to clean its desk the transformation ahead the following books are most briefly noted.

The field of personal history, whether it be biography or autobiography, seems always to be popular. Mr. Donald Elder has recently contributed a long and detailed account of the life of the American humorist Ring Lardner (Ring Lardner, Doubleday, $4.75). Mr. Lardner's place in the American literary scene has not been established as yet even though his position in other areas of the American scene appears quite clearly. Mr. Elder wove into his account of this prominent American excerpts from his own writings. Some photographs and a bibliography. George Orwell, the English writer, came to the attention of the American people by virtue of Animal Farm and 1984. Mr. Christopher Hollis has contributed a book on Orwell (A Study of George Orwell, Regency, $3.75) that is as much a study of Orwell's books as of the man himself. Mr. E. H. Visiak does much the same for Joseph Conrad (The Mirror of Conrad, Philosophical Library, $4.75) as Mr. Hollis for Mr. Orwell—to capture the picture of the artist from his works.

Marian Anderson, whose contribution to the American artistic scene is so well-known, has now written her own autobiography (My Lord, What a Morning, Viking, $5.00), in which she tells what it is like to be both an artist and a member of a minority group with its own problems. Peter Freuchen, who recently earned for himself considerable publicity on a TV quiz show, wrote an account of his life a number of years ago (Vagant Viking). His present voyage into the limelight has prompted his publisher to re-issue this book in a large, paperback format (Messner). In a recent book entitled The Curious Art of Autobiography (Philosophical Library, $7.50) Mr. H. N. Wethered has examined some of the well-known travelers in this field.

Some readers of the CRESSET may think it bad taste to find anything humorous in Christmas. The secular aspect of this religious holiday has, however, inspired some rather good humor and Eric Posselt has gathered much of it together in a small book (A Merry, Merry Christmas Book, Prentice-Hall, $2.95). There are cartoons, poems, and stories and the contributing authors include Robert Benchley, George Ade, Stephen Leacock, Frank Sullivan, and Christopher Morley, to name a few.

Much has been written about the conquest of Mount Everest and some of the books have been reviewed in these pages. Now Edmund Hillary, the conqueror, has written his own story (High Adventure, Dutton, $4.50). John Baker White, an Englishman who served in his country's psychological warfare division, gives an interesting account of some of the ways that the English and allied forces used the strategy of the lie to confuse and mislead the enemy (The Big Lie, Crowell, $4.00). A fascinating account of one of the many "little" activities that contributed to the final victory. Mr. Fletcher Pratt has gathered together an account of sixteen battles that he feels were decisive to Western civilization (The Battles That Changed History, Hanover House, $4.95). His survey starts with Alexander the Great and ends with the decisive defeat of the Japanese at Midway.
A Minority Report

It Takes A Lot of Money
To Run A National Campaign

By VICTOR F. HOFFMANN

In mid-September, The Baltimore Sun editorialized: "Vice President Nixon began his cross-country campaign tour with a grin, as recommended to Republican candidates by President Eisenhower, and with a general approach to the matter of winning votes that could only be described as one of sweetness and light."

This sweetness and light fell on unsuspecting people. Vice President Nixon praised Mrs. Roosevelt. She had created a "great amount of good will" around the world, said Mr. Nixon, and had an international reputation. Mr. Nixon also praised Adlai Stevenson for his forthright stand on the case of Alger Hiss. Countless times, Mr. Nixon has acknowledged that the Democratic standard bearers are tough campaigners.

About the same time, Adlai Stevenson was spreading his own version of sweetness and light. He had said little to embarrass the administration in the Suez affair. He had said countless times that Mr. Eisenhower was a fine man and that he respected the President. His reluctance to play "footsie-wootsie" with Harry Truman pleased a great many Republicans in high places.

Republicans praising Democrats. Democrats pulling their punches on Republicans. Democrats chastising Democrats. The world of politics for one sublime moment had gone beserk. This was crazier than a bunch of bed-bugs with no beds.

But, then, this is the opinion of many Americans. Whether with sweetness and light or not, American politics, such Americans contend, is pathological.

And many Americans become pathological whenever they consider the cost and energy devoted to American politics. One of the citizens of my precinct remarked the other day: "Americans are sure willing to pay for their craziness, for their fads—Presley, Ike, Adlai, Nixon, Kefauver, world series, and what have you.

American politics has certainly become big business. This should be a concern of all Americans.

One campaign trip alone is big business. This was hinted at in a statement from a Nixon press release on September 20: "The new technique of 'prop-stop' campaigning has reached its peak of exhausting complexity aboard the flagship airliner 'Little Rock'."

This press release was issued from Nixon's plane "in flight." His headquarters "in flight" was a DC-6-B with a full entourage of 51 technicians plus one wife, Pat. For fifteen days, fifteen thousand miles, and in thirty-two states, Dick Nixon preached the Eisenhower gospel of peace and prosperity.

According to the press releases, Nixon averaged two to three speeches a day and Pat gathered roses at every "prop-stop."

His immediate political technicians were an executive secretary, an assistant secretary, two press secretaries, a campaign assistant, a research assistant, a tour manager, a TV consultant, a movie cameraman from the Republican National Committee, two airline representatives, the president of the Young Republicans of America, a doctor, and two Secret Service Guards.

In addition, thirty-one press representatives were carried at the expense of their respective sponsors.

To keep this entourage on the straight and narrow radar path, there were two pilots, a flight engineer, and two stewardesses who ran "an all-day bar and buffet."

This flight alone cost the Republican National Committee fifty thousand dollars or about one thousand dollars a passenger "body."

The schedule for Monday, October 1, read as follows: leave Tampa, Florida, at 6:30 a.m.; arrive Grand Rapids, Michigan, at 11:15 a.m.; leave Grand Rapids at 2:15 p.m.; arrive Milwaukee, Wisconsin, at 2:00 p.m.; leave Milwaukee at 10:00 p.m.; arrive at Hartford, Connecticut, at 3:20 a.m.

A lot of people in politically high places are repeating this procedure many times all over the nation. This is a lot of expense to travel across the nation, the cynic would say, to yell "wicked nonsense" and "misstatement of fact."

It costs a lot, to be sure. The financing of political campaigns, to be just as sure, is one of the great and unsolved problems of American politics. Parties in financial trouble are often forced to cater to special interests, the people who have the bulk of the money in the United States. Very often, the guy on the corner who criticizes politics a great deal refuses to contribute one red cent or even an iota of work to "politicking."

Such people are writing their own obituaries. May they die in peace. As a matter of fact, they might already be dying a slow death.
From ancient Greek drama to up-to-the-minute Rock'n' Roll! This is the wide scope of entertainment offered to TV viewers at the beginning of the fall season.

The presentation of an abbreviated version of Antigone, the concluding drama in the famous trilogy written by Sophocles more than 2,000 years ago, marked the return to the air waves of the Kaiser Aluminum Hour.

Rock'n' Roll we have with us practically around the clock, both on TV and radio.

Meanwhile the debate over Rock'n' Roll continues to rage. There are those who stoutly defend the twitch-and-twang performers of Rock'n' Roll; others condemn the new style and those who perform it, as vulgar and boring. Since I have seen many phases of musical madness come and go—from swing to bebop—I am optimistic enough to believe that this, too, shall pass away.

Producers Showcase, Playhouse 90, Omnibus, Ford Star Jubilee, Video Theater, Hall of Fame, and Opera Theater are to be the outstanding productions scheduled for presentation this season. In spite of an intense search for new faces, fresh material, and undiscovered talent, the roster of comedies and comedians remains practically unchanged. Alas, we are sorely in need of fresh material! Comedians and comedies have fallen into a stereotyped pattern. Why? The answer is simple. A new program clicks, and what happens? Other producers knock themselves out to cash in on the idea with more-or-less successful copies.

The give-away programs afford an excellent example. A short time ago a few quiz programs, with modest prizes for the successful contestants, made their appearance on radio and television. And now? Now we have The $64,000 Question, The $64,000 Challenge, The Big Surprise, High Finance, You Bet Your Life, and no less than five newcomers: Tic Tac Dough, Giant Step, Twenty-One, Treasure Hunt, and The Most Beautiful Girl in the World. Where will it end?

According to a report recently issued by the American Research Bureau, the Ed Sullivan Show ranks second in a list of the ten most popular TV shows. At that time The $64,000 Question occupied first place. It seems to me that the secret of Mr. Sullivan's success lies in the wide variety of the material presented and in the natural curiosity inherent in each of us to see and hear the famous—and sometimes the infamous—personages of our day. In the first of a series of articles to be published in Collier's Mr. Sullivan observes that he has "traveled this world from Capri to Copenhagen, Tokyo to Stockholm, Reykjavik to Rio. And in those travels I've been privileged to meet and work with the great and glamorous people of our world, and found most of them not so different from the generous-hearted neighbors in Port Chester (Mr. Sullivan was born in Port Chester, N. Y.)." He continues: "I've found that the standards that obtained in Port Chester are also in the make-up of Paris, London, Dublin, Boston, Pittsburgh, Des Moines and San Diego. Towns differ, people don't."

A recent press release reported the purchase of a large number of oldtime hit movies by three major TV networks. Will these films—all highly successful in their day—be as successful and as effective today on the small TV screen? One wonders. Times change, and, of even greater importance, the allure of the big stars of the past may be lost on younger viewers to whom these players are nothing more than names.

It will be interesting to see if The Bad Seed (Warners, Mervyn Le Roy) is destined to become a big money maker. I hope not. If it is, we are sure to be afflicted with a rash of films in which a wide-eyed, innocent-looking child is made to portray a coldblooded psychopathic killer. The novel The Bad Seed, written by the late William March and made into a hit stage play by Maxwell Anderson, is a dark and morbid tale. For the comfort of parents everywhere I hasten to add that it is declared by scientists to be biologically unsound in its basic premise. I hope that I am not unduly squeamish, and I know that I have never believed in, or advocated, restrictive censorship for any art form. But I do disapprove wholeheartedly of The Bad Seed—the novel, the stage play, and the film. Although the screen version is recommended for adults only, apparently no attempt is made to bar children and adolescents. At any rate, there were children and teen-agers in the audience when I saw the picture.

Bigger Than Life (20th Century-Fox, Nicholas Ray) must be classified as a first-rate thriller rather than as a sober, factual medical documentary. James Mason brilliantly portrays the stricken school teacher who has come to depend on ever increasing doses of pills to keep up his spirits and to make him feel "ten feet tall." I have read that the medical profession has declared that Bigger Than Life is both unsound and misleading from the medical viewpoint. It might conceivably have a salutary effect on the alarmingly large number of pill-takers who depend on tranquilizer pills.
NOVEMBER CODA

If there is a curious mixture of melancholy and joy in these notes for November it is due to the fact that November on a campus is just like that.... a fusion of complementary, not warring, emotions ... joy over the warm murmur of teaching and learning...a white autumn moon rolling high over elms whose empty branches mark a tracery against the sky more beautiful than all the flowers of spring...the strong laughter of the young and the gentle eccentricities of the old... All are here now in November and they take the heart captive more securely year after year....

But the melancholy is here too.... In our latitude the falling leaf, only a soft rustle to the ear, is like solemn thunder in the soul.... I am reminded again that, with all the arts we have learned, we have not yet learned the art of dying...either to time or to ourselves.... There is still too much of the heat of summer and the clamor of the world in our hearts for us to touch surely the serenity of November or to learn the divine lesson of a physical world which dies now to be born again at another season....

It is not surprising therefore that I find myself in November more interested in the trees of our town than at any other season of the year.... There is something obedient and faithful about them, something reverently permanent, which is great and good for our impermanence.... There are two trees before my house which are much older than I am... There is an oak a half mile down the road which has been here longer than the University.... I remember that some of my journeying friends say that there are cedars on Lebanon which the axes of Solomon spared and olive trees on Olivet which might have rustled in the ears of the Man Who was young and dying when they were already old and strong.... Someone has said that it is better to plant a tree than to build a city or a university—it will outlast them both....

And so our November trees hold in their bare arms the joy and the melancholy of the season.... They speak to the listening heart of the beautiful order of Providence...and they whisper also of the day when I too shall be untouched by any passion and no longer marred by evil.... Tonight they will stand in majestic silence and darkness—for my learning; tomorrow, in another November, they will stand for others, watching the life of my children as they have watched mine....

But there are other reasons for the joy and melancholy of November.... Beyond my window, sheltered now against the cold, are the trees; beside the window, snug against the walls, are the other good companions of the season—my books.... My time for them and with them has become less each year as I too have lost myself—and them—in the art of practicality.... Each dawning winter, however, there are a few evenings when my books come into their own, even if only momentarily.... The cheerful fire winks at all the furniture in the room and an occasional arrogant log dies with a rebellious crackle.... I put off the outer world with my coat and shoes and put on joy with the familiar touch of a book read long ago when there was more time for these moments of contentment.... There is a warm sense of comfort in the awareness of the cold outside and the memory of friends who are now safe forever from the winter wind....

What is to be read on such a November night? Each one of us must know that for himself and no teacher can direct the mood or guide the choice of a book at this hour.... For me there is a warm volume of Keats to whom I was warmly introduced by an enthusiastic teacher thirty years ago.... Or there is Chesterton who often makes remarkable sense beneath his glittering paradoxes.... Or some of the minor voices of our articulate age—David Morton, Lizette Woodworth Reese, Aldous Huxley.... If I am especially wide awake I turn to the host of men who during the past thirty years have again made religion vital, relevant, and exciting.... There are Niebuhr, Tillich, C. S. Lewis, John Baillie, Emil Brunner and many others.... Not for many centuries has there been such a galaxy of men who know God and have translated their knowledge into good words which deserve our attention now in the world's November.... They are good, very good companions for a winter night.... We have need of these golden journeys and these silver-tongued prophets—now more than ever before.... Every month is a good month to learn a little more about God...but November with His voice speaking through the dying trees and falling leaves, with the Days of All Souls and All Saints and Thanksgiving, is a particularly good time to remember His speaking voice and His sacramental presence....