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A Job for the Vice-President

There is every reason to hope that Congress will have acted on the presidential succession amendment in time for some, if not most, of the state legislatures to act on it this year. Briefly, this amendment provides for the election of a new Vice-President when the elected Vice-President succeeds to the Presidency, and it defines procedures for determining the circumstances in which a Vice-President serves as Acting President. The amendment will certainly be approved by a constitutional majority of the legislatures. What is important at this point is that there be no delay. The scare most of us got when we awoke one morning to hear that President Johnson had been admitted to Walter Reed Hospital should be spur enough to action. This time — thank God! — it was only a cold. It could be worse than that next time.

The next thing we need to do now is make the Vice-Presidency a significant and attractive office. Vice-Presidents Nixon and Johnson were probably among the ablest Vice-Presidents in our history, and both confessed to frustration in office. It would appear that Vice-President Humphrey has begun to experience the same thing. No man in the full vigor of his powers can be content with merely ceremonial duties or with the "responsibilities" of a messenger boy. Men who are capable of governing enjoy governing and do not enjoy playing the role of a mere understudy.

Happily, there is a job that badly needs doing which the Vice-President might be just the man to do. The District of Columbia needs an executive head, a governor. It is presently run by a board of three commissioners and two committees of Congress — which is to say, nobody is really in charge. There is a big job here for somebody to do, a job as big as the governorship of an important state. It is a job in which the Vice-President would be dealing, although on a smaller scale, with the same kinds of problems the President has to deal with — budgets, appointments, the persuasion of legislators, long-range planning. It is a job to which a good man might gladly commit his energies for its own sake, and not merely because it puts him within a heart-beat of the Presidency.

The Vice-President could be given this job by simple act of Congress. The fact that its demands might make it impossible for him to preside regularly over the Senate presents no great problem; somebody other than the Vice-President usually presides over the Senate anyway. And as for the other jobs that the Vice-President presently holds by presidential assignment, these could be re-assigned with no great difficulty. Indeed, it would be good for the Vice-President's ego to hold one major job on his own rather than a number of lesser jobs by courtesy of the President.

Federal Aid to Education

President Johnson's education message to the Congress calls for the expenditure of

a) one billion dollars in grants to public school districts which serve economically needy children;

b) a hundred million dollars for grants for textbooks and library books for both public and parochial school children;

c) a hundred million dollars for the creation of "supplementary education centers" in which pupils from both public and private schools could receive part of their instruction; and

d) 260 million dollars for Federal scholarships to assist about 140,000 needy college students and for other assistance to higher education.

This package is typically Johnsonian in that it gives everybody involved something that he desperately wants, but at a price. For the private and parochial schools there is indirect aid in the form of textbooks and supplementary education, but they are not offered any kind of direct aid. The public school is offered pinpointed Federal aid to pockets of educational poverty, but at the price of recognizing the private school's entitlement to indirect forms of Federal aid.

Whether the whole package will finally make it through Congress is, of course, another matter. There
is, in our country, a considerable body of rabid anti-Catholic sentiment which has already produced statements to the effect that it would be better to skip the whole thing than to make what it considers these large concessions to Roman Catholic demands. At the opposite extreme there is some Roman Catholic insistence that nothing less than full equality of treatment of the public and parochial school is acceptable. President Johnson seems to be proceeding on the assumption that there is a wide area of middle ground where reasonable compromise is possible, compromise which will allow the nation to get on with the huge and urgent job of guaranteeing to all of the nation’s children an educational floor under their feet.

It has been our observation that an insistence upon absolute justice can prevent the doing of substantial justice. We have, on many occasions, suggested that the private and parochial schools are entitled to equal treatment with the public school and we are still ready to defend that position on moral, if not legal, grounds. But the one thing we can not afford just at this time is stalemate. There is a crisis in American elementary and secondary education which must be dealt with swiftly and effectively. President Johnson’s proposals, which we find disappointing in a number of ways, offer real promise of meeting that crisis. We therefore favor their enactment.

Cops and Robbers

The honor code of the United States Air Force Academy says: “We will not lie, cheat, steal, or tolerate among us those who do.” A hundred or more cadets violated the code in January by stealing examination papers and offering them for sale. A still-undetermined number “tolerated” their offense by failing to report their knowledge of it to Academy officials. The vast majority of the cadets were in no way implicated in the scandal.

No one is going to waste a lot of sympathy on the cheaters. Momentary weakness can lead a student to glance at his neighbor’s paper, but it takes a settled purpose and a sense of complicity which will allow the nation to get on with the huge and urgent job of guaranteeing to all of the nation’s children an educational floor under their feet.

If there is something effeminate about tattling. Boys who grow up under the influence of Christian teaching have drummed it into our children that they must not be tattle-tales. Boys, particularly, are given to understand that there is something effeminate about tattling. Boys who grow up under the influence of Christian teaching hear such things as “A talebearer revealeth secrets, but he that is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter” or “If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone.”

Where young people get confused, it seems to us, is in failing to recognize that an honor system is, necessarily and in its essence, a police system. All systems of control are, ultimately, police systems. The examination proctor — usually a faculty member or a graduate student — is, during the examination period, a cop, and his salary or grant is intended to cover a certain amount of police work. Institutions which have the honor system have, by implication, deputized the whole student body — thus, in effect, replacing the professional, salaried cop with hundreds of amateur, unsalaried deputies. The minute one consents to such a system he forfeits some considerable part of his right of private judgment and becomes an agent of the institution’s disciplinary system. If he is unwilling to make this forfeiture he should not enroll at an institution which requires it.

We have a great deal of sympathy for the decent young men who could not bring themselves to report on fellow students. Their mistake, we would suggest, was on the side of generosity. But it was a mistake, nevertheless, for the cop is indispensable to an ordered society, and the cop who substitutes his private judgment for the duty which he has sworn to do is as much of a menace to society as is the defiant lawbreaker.

Ban the Book!

Chicago’s City Council will vote this month on a resolution by its school committee expressing “unqualified condemnation” of anyone making James Baldwin's novel, Another Country, required reading. The resolution is directed at Mrs. Joanna Clark and the administration of Wright Junior College, a city-owned institution in Chicago, where the novel has been required reading in Mrs. Clark’s literature course.

The novel, according to the school committee’s resolution, “extensively dwells upon homosexuality as though it had redeeming social value, and extensively employs throughout its text vulgar, scurrilous, vile and revolting words and expressions.” Mrs. Clark argues in rebuttal that it is “typical of contemporary literature in dealing with controversial subjects.” Moreover, she says, “When the complaint came in I felt almost bound to use [the novel]. It’s up to every teacher to do as much as possible to preserve academic freedom.” The Chicago School Board has, in effect, supported Mrs. Clark, after assurance by Wright College’s dean that students are permitted to substitute another book for any required book they find offensive.

It may be taken by consent that any language which a committee of Chicago aldermen finds “vulgar, scurrilous, vile, and revolting” must, indeed, border on the indec­icate. It may likewise be taken by consent that those of us who, by the grace of God and a fortunate home background, escaped the disease of homosexuality see no redeeming social value in it. But it must also be agreed that the real world is a mixture of many things and that
among its ingredients are dirty talk and homosexual liaisons. An artist who chooses to explore these aspects of reality may have worthy or ignoble reasons for doing so. What he produces can only be judged by men who have shown themselves competent to distinguish between art and pornography, between realism and prurience. This was done at the time the book was published, in 1962, by many competent reviewers. Their consensus was that it was not a very well done job. The New York Times reviewer called it "mediocre."

We doubt Mrs. Clark's judgment, therefore, in placing it on the required reading list as an example of how contemporary literature deals with controversial subjects. But our quarrel is with her evaluation of this particular book, and with her right to require students to read books which shock themselves, their parents, or the aldermen of the city of Chicago. There has to come a point, even in our culture, where young people are presumed to have passed from adolescence into adulthood, and we think that that point may lie somewhere within the freshman year of college. Wherever it lies, it is the point at which the hitherto-protected youngster has to learn that the world is not all moonlight and roses, that there is obscenity and dirt and illicit sex and people who have rejected the Judaeo-Christian tradition. If home and church and school have done their job well, the young man or woman of eighteen is ready to come to grips with real life. And if they have not, only God in His mercy can prevent them from being crushed by the ugly realities which will, sooner or later, thrust themselves upon them.

The Pep-Pill Racket

It is estimated that half of the annual production of dangerous drugs ends up in the illicit trade. Drug pushers supply teenagers and young people more than five billion pills every year, many of them harmless, but some of them dangerous in themselves and others capable of producing unexpected and violent reactions. Some of them lead to addiction.

Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut has introduced a bill which would give the federal government additional powers to control the distribution of dangerous drugs. The drug industry is opposed to it. (Senator Dodd has a way of irritating powerful interests. Last year he tried to get legislation controlling the sale of firearms and ran into the combined opposition of the National Rifle Association, the John Birch Society, and others who can not imagine a secure America without a gun in every closet.)

It might well be that if we worked for a drug company we, too, would be opposed to Senator Dodd's bill. Every new grant of power to the federal government means that some poor soul gets stuck with more paperwork, more pedantic arrogance on the part of civil servants, and more demands for information that no one needs or looks at. But in our part of the country we have just had an incident that argues powerfully for the bill. A good, salt-of-the-earth type citizen in his sixties was set upon by a gang of boys who robbed him and shot him full of bullets. The boys had — so the police say — been high on pep pills. It is widely believed that most muggings and purse-snatchings in our big cities may be attempts to get money for drugs.

The drug companies say that the problem can be solved on the state and local level. This seems unlikely, in view of the fact that the drugs move in interstate commerce and are easily transported from one jurisdiction to another. Control would seem to be most necessary and most useful at the source of the trade, rather than in its many distributary channels.

Views pro and con Senator Dodd's bill would, we are sure, be welcomed by members of both houses of the Congress.

Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill, 1874-1965

Churchill as a fictional character would have been unbelievable. As a historical figure he is simply there, a phenomenon which historians will be trying to explain for the next five hundred years.

It is never safe to anticipate the judgment of history, but we have a suspicion that Churchill will look even bigger to our descendants a century or more from now than he did to us. We have been so busy, since World War II, rebuilding what that war destroyed that we have not yet gotten around to a close examination of what we so narrowly escaped at the hands of the Nazis. There was more at stake between 1938 and 1945 than the power or prestige or even survival of this nation or that. What was at stake then, as it is now in the conflict between East and West, was the survival of a civilization which we have too glibly called Christian but which, whatever we call it, is worth any exertion to preserve and enlarge.

There was a point at which only one man was capable of calling forth those almost superhuman efforts and sacrifices which that civilization needed to bring to its own self-defense: any other leader, operating with logic and good sense, would have recognized that the jig was up and would have sought the best possible terms of surrender. But Churchill operated not only with other instruments but in different dimensions: he was a throwback to the Age of Chivalry when, given the choice between death and dishonor, even the youngest squire would have chosen death. In an age when mere survival has been given the status of an ultimate value, the man who can reckon with death as a price that may, in certain circumstances, have to be paid for something more ultimate than survival is at a tremendous advantage. He seems, quite literally, bigger than life.

In the event, the great gamble paid off and Churchill was idolized largely for the wrong reason, i.e., because he had succeeded. Certainly he deserved the gratitude of his country and of the world for the part that he played in winning the victory. But his greatness was proved
in those days when victory seemed not only far off but most unlikely. Any man can take great risks in a cause which is likely, in the long run, to succeed. Only great men take great risks for a cause which ought to succeed but probably won't.

Churchill lived a full life, a happy life, an exciting life. He died old and full of honors. It would be hypocritical to mourn his passing, but it is good for us to mourn our loss. He was man writ large, and in the loss of him each of us has lost something of himself, something which we must rediscover, each for himself, if we are to defend, in our day, the values for which he lived and labored.

T.S. Eliot, 1888-1965

... There was a Birth, certainly.
We had evidence and no doubt. I had seen birth and death.
But had thought they were different; this Birth was Hard and bitter for us, like Death, our death.
We returned to our places, these Kingdoms,
But no longer at ease here, in the old dispensation,
With an alien people clutching their gods.
I should be glad of another death.
—T.S. Eliot, "Journey of the Magi." 1927

In every generation for the past two thousand years, wise men have come to Bethlehem to see Him Who was born there and to be re-born in His birth. Their number in any given generation is few, but often among the few are the greatest in their generation. In our generation, these few included the unquestioned master poet of this century, Thomas Stearns Eliot.

Eliot spoke sharply and, when he chose to do so, clearly to his generation, but with the detachment of one "no longer at ease here, in the old dispensation, with an alien people clutching their gods." These gods were not his God. He once defined himself as "an Anglo-Catholic in religion, a classicist in literature, and a royalist in politics" — a combination of eccentricities which should have made him as irrelevant as any one man can be to the Twentieth Century. There were those who wrote him off as an amiable and talented eccentric, but this was not the judgment of those most competent to judge him. They considered him quite simply the one truly great poet of the past half-century.

Eliot turned to the Christian Gospel after he had followed the intellectual and aesthetic fads of his young manhood all the way to their inevitable dead ends. His reputation was made in those pre-Christian days when his poetry reflected the disgust that he felt at the intellectual sterility, the aesthetic phoniness, and the cultural bankruptcy of a world dominated by Apeneck Sweeney and his kin. It was in reaction against that kind of world that he turned to traditional Christianity — possibly, at first, as a kind of romantic escape from an ugly world, but, as his most recent writings show, ultimately as far more than that. For in these writings — particularly in the plays — he is about the Christian's proper business of telling man the truth about himself so that the Gospel may have its chance for a fair hearing.

And now Eliot has been delivered by "another death" from the unease of living in the old dispensation. May he find rest everlasting and may the eternal light shine upon him.

A Concern of the Church

We are running this editorial last because it deals with a problem that we would like our readers to mull over and on which we invite their comment.

It has long been our belief that the most critical problem facing man in our day is not the Bomb but the explosive increase in population which has been going on since the end of World War II and which shows no sign of abating. The dimensions of this explosion are suggested by a recent report of the Population Commission of the United Nations Economic and Social Council which concludes that at the end of the Twentieth Century (just thirty-five years from now) the world will be twice as crowded as it was in 1960. The report goes on to predict that "very high population density would be attained by the end of the century in East Asia and South Asia, surpassing the density of Europe, though this is already high and will go on rising. Since lands unsuitable for dense human settlement are far more extensive in the Asian areas than in Europe and technology is as yet much less developed in Asia, the projected population trends imply great problems to be solved in Asia. The two Asian major areas, furthermore, comprise more than one-half the numbers of mankind."

Statistics and predictions of this kind are, it seems to us, the raw materials of Christian ethics. At the very least, they provide the context within which we must work out our theologies in the fear and love of God, in obedience to His Word, and in a passionate concern for the welfare of human beings. In the context of these realities, what says the Lord to, for instance, the matter of contraception? We are almost sure that He demands of all men, particularly of His Christians, voluntary limitation of family size, but there are brethren who disagree with us. By the same token, we are persuaded that He demands a fundamental reconsideration of our nation's immigration policy and a willingness to reconsider the whole question of what kind of a nation we are building here. But there are good Christians who find it possible to justify present policy.

What we think no Christian can escape is the moral necessity to arrive at some judgment on these matters which he can defend before his own conscience. And we would hope that out of these individual strivings might come a consensus of the Church which would bring a word from God to the complexities and confusions of our age.
I must have been a pretty dull and naive teenager. In comparison with today's teenager, I know I was. My authority for what the teenager is thinking is a rash of articles which have appeared in the last few months. These articles have examined the average teenager, not the delinquent, and it is with the average I am comparing myself.

One gathers that the teenagers recognize several plateaus of status. While conformity is desirable, certain possessions can make one even more desirable. Among these possessions are the right clothes, a substantial record collection, a car of one's own with the family owning two more, a swimming pool in the back yard, and parents with a certain amount of affluence.

I doubt there is such a thing as an "average" teenager and I don't think most of them would consider these possessions necessities. However, I am willing to listen to the experts. And it may be true that these attributes contribute to status. If, when I was a teen-ager, status symbols existed I was either too dull to learn about them or to naive to recognize them. I'm inclined to think, however, that they didn't exist, at least in our town.

Take the matter of clothes. Today teenagers dress alike and the uniform is almost prescribed. Since it is subject to change, new clothes must be purchased more frequently. The Depression was on when I was in high school and I was not the only one who wore hand-me-downs, and none of us minded. At least it added variety to our dress since a good percentage of the boys were wearing their older brother's clothes and their brothers came from different eras.

New clothes were harder to come by in those days and I still remember the thrill of owning my first brand-new white shirt. There was a flaw in that shirt, but I wore it anyway. The shirt had been made by a seamstress who came to our house every Fall and Spring to sew clothes for my sisters, usually middy blouses and skirts. She consented to make up a shirt, and did, but so orient-ed was she to sewing for women, she put the buttons on the wrong side.

I have no way of comparing today with yesterday on the matter of cars since no high school students had any, except those who commuted from farms to the high school. Those parents who did have cars did not chauffeur their children around from one event to another as we do now, and this may be one reason those are referred to as "the good old days."

No teenagers had record collections that I can recall, which is quite a contrast to some of today's teenagers who feel they should own every 45 disc that their favorite folk singer produces. The only records I heard were played on my Grandfather's Victrola, but these consisted of recordings made by Madame Schumann-Heink after her prime and a variety of what sounded like bitter sermons delivered in German.

I can't make a comparison on the matter of swimming pools either, because no one had one. Even if they had, I doubt it would have appealed to us because our town was surrounded with water and swimming holes of every type.

We never considered wealth as a factor in status, again because there was so little of it around. We recognized that the bank president and the president of the mill lived in different worlds, but we didn't envy them. I don't think in those Depression days we ever felt that being on relief or not being on relief was too important either, and it was never a matter for censure or for pride.

If material possessions and wealth in general are important to the teenager today — and I am not willing to concede that they are to a majority, despite the experts — I don't blame them: I blame us and our attitude that we don't want our sons and daughters to be deprived of the things we were deprived of. Reacting to this attitude in parents, the advertising industry has gone overboard in creating a demand for possessions among the teenage set. Under this pressure, it is not surprising that a teen­ager might feel deprived, if he didn't own everything that's advertised.

On the other hand, I can't be the type of father who thinks his sons should suffer through whatever he suffered through, if only because I don't recall ever having suffered as a teenager. And if I was deprived, I never knew it and neither did any of the other teenagers of that day.
The Christological Understanding of Marriage*

By ERHARDT P. WEBER

President, Concordia College
Portland, Oregon

If marriage fails, all society eventually fails. A daily reading of the newspapers might give the impression that other institutions are more important, like the presidency and the Congress of the United States for intelligent and aggressive leadership; the school system for the growth of a vital and relevant democracy; the harmonious relations between capital and labor for economic growth and stability; the opposition to racial and other injustices. Yet, as significant as these various institutions and movements are, none is as essential as the family. As the family goes, so goes the nation, the school, the church, and all of society. The family is basic to all other societal structures. Once its basic foundation cracks and crumbles, the superstructures likewise begin to weaken and over a lengthy period of time topple to the ground.

Modern psychotherapeutic studies are confirming this fact in a variety of ways. They are not only reaffirming what has been frequently said in recent years, that the first few years of the individual's life determine in large measure his pattern of response, but they also are boldly asserting that without parental love and firmness in the earliest years the child invariably will lack personality integration and development, even though it is given the best of institutional care or the finest services of society's numerous charitable organizations. "An ounce of good mother is worth a pound of clergy," states a Spanish proverb. This means that the attitudes of father and mother in a family constellation are in some respects more important for the development of Christian responses than any and all of the agencies of the church.

If the family is basic, then marriage is basic to the family. This truth is so self-evident that we hardly need to substantiate it. Common experience and a massive amount of statistical evidence reveal that if father and mother are at constant odds with one another and possibly break their relationship in separation or divorce, a wound is inflicted on the family body which too often is wound is inflicted on the family body which too often is

seemingly has reached a temporary plateau with one for every four and one-half marriages. Add to this the increased demand on the part of mothers to hold a full-time position outside of the home to keep pace with the rising standard of living; the rapidly changing status of women involving some just, but also tragic, consequences; the popular abuse of sex and its ruinous effects on marital relations; and the general difficulty of men and women, even in this enlightened age, in relating meaningfully and lastingly with one another. The total result is a marriage institution threatened with frightening dangers and perhaps with eventual collapse. Any institution so basic, delightful, meaningful, and yet always confronted with perilous temptations is not only relevant but also deserving of our most critical analysis.

Equally as important as the latter part of the title, namely, the study of marriage, is its beginning, the Christological understanding. In fact, it is the speaker's conviction that much of the powerful meaning and stability of marriage is lost because men will not approach it from the standpoint of Him Who originally ordained it.

Other approaches instead are used. Some insist on the Romantic Approach with classical and modern ingredients. Its emphasis, to oversimplify, is on feeling. If a man feels he is in love, he is and he marries; and if he feels that he no longer is in love, he isn't and he divorces. Marriage in the minds of these adherents is a result of cultural evolution, a pragmatic solution to a given set of inescapable circumstances. The Rationalistic School, by far the most common today among marriage and family students, places the emphasis on good reasoning with an interest in stability, adjustment, and happiness. Its insistence is that scientific data are the only respectable solution to marriage's problems, which in the dim distant future may eliminate all bad adjustments.

The Christological Approach is radically different from both of these, though it acknowledges the emphases of both. It centers its attention, not on nature, nor on man, but on Christ. Its confession is "Kyrios Jesous," Jesus is Lord. He is Lord by virtue of His creation. "All things were made by Him" (John 1:3). Never has He forfeited any part of His creation to the Master Con­triver or to egocentric man. He is Lord because He is the Reconciler. We have been bought with a price; we are not our own (I Corinthians 6:20). Today He lives. "He lives. He lives, who once was dead." He lives as the Ruler of the world, as Head of the Church, as the powerful catalytic agent in human lives to which He gives daily renewal. He is God, but He made Himself of no reputation and became man. As man He became obedient to the death of the cross. "Wherefore," accord-

* These lectures were originally presented to the faculty and students of Valparaiso University as the Gross Memorial Lectures of 1964, honoring the memory of John Martin and Clara Amanda Gross.
ing to Paul, “God also hath highly exalted him... that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father” (Philippians 2:5-11).

Whether man accepts Him or not, He is the Lord. Those who know Him with both inner and outer knowledge insist that He must be the Lord over all of reality including their own lives, their courtship, family, occupation, leisure time, church, politics. The primary question for men of faith is not “What do I or my fellowmen think?” but “What does Christ think?” What Christ thinks is determined by love of God and love of neighbor, a selfless, sacrificial love, always interested in serving, washing the feet of others, even though they be dirty. As He placed His life on the altar of Calvary for the sins of the world, so we who have eyes that see and ears that hear place our lives on the altar of the world, not conforming to it, but conforming to Christ since we have been transformed by His Spirit.

The Christian life, you see, is centered in Jesus Christ. It is Christocentric. It is Christological. It does not hesitate to ask embarrassing questions even though it may not demand absolute answers. Is it right for a Christian to build a $125,000 home when a $35,000 one could adequately serve his purposes and when the difference between the two figures could establish medical installations for the alleviation of suffering and for the saving of men? Is it right for a Christian congregation to build a $1,000,000 structure when human needs within a Christian community like marital difficulties, delinquent children, alcoholism, infirmities of age are neglected? Is it Christologically right for a pastor to lie to a person in a deep state of shock after an accident in which her husband has been killed? Does Christological love at times urge a Christian to sin that a greater good may come? Disturbing questions, aren’t they?

The basic tragedy of the church of today is not her divisions, nor her doctrinal unrest, but her refusal to let Christ be Lord. There is a radical difference between a Christological and an egocentric perspective, but too many people within the church, both clergy and laity, fail to see it or refuse to see it, and if they see it, are not too interested in implementing it for life.

The Christological Understanding of Courtship

Our general topic is “The Christological Understanding of Marriage.” We are attempting to analyze marriage and its various components from the perspective of Jesus Christ. Our specific subject this morning is “The Christological Understanding of Courtship.” Courtship is still not marriage, but if the attitudes and acts of courtship determine in large measure the behavior of a marriage — an assumption widely accepted in sociological circles — not only the marriage, but also the courtship must be subjected to the Christological perspective.

The subject of courtship has numerous concerns. We could spend time analyzing the activities of courtship, particularly the moral permissiveness now so widely practiced. Length of courtship is also significant. Is the dictum true, “The longer the courtship, the happier the marriage?” Much time could be spent with the problems such as the relationship between engagement and marriage. However, because of time we must limit ourselves to just one phase, namely, what are the most important factors in choosing a mate.

If one approached this subject from the Romantic Perspective, I no doubt would choose a partner who most satisfies me — in whose presence, for better or worse, I am the most comfortable. If one analyzed the important factors from the Rationalistic Perspective, those characteristics become desirable which effect easy adjustment for success and happiness. When, however, the study of courtship is viewed from the Christological Perspective, the factor that by far out-distances all others is the religious stance of the partner, more particularly, whether he is a Christ-man, a conformer to Christ rather than to the world, a live man, really alive, who has been resurrected from death. For when two people are united to one another in Christ, they not only are on their way to eternity, but they are given invaluable ingredients for their marriage’s joy and peace. First, they recognize that marriage is not a mere human institution, not a mere contract, not a mere result of trial and error, not a mere product of cultural evolution, not merely the best practical solution to a basic set of needs, but rather an establishment of God. It is God’s institution, not man’s. God is the owner of the house, and we are its renters. Like good tenants we are to live according to the rules He establishes, which rules involve not only restrictions but extraordinary possibilities for joyful and meaningful living. When two parties have this mutual understanding, real strength is given the relationship. At worst, when tensions and conflicts appear and increase, the first thought is not of dissolution, for this is contrary to the landlord’s request. At best, when marriage begins with its usual uncertainties, couples in Christ know that they are beginning a life of which God heartily approves and to which He gives His blessings, and therefore fear is excluded. God, in fact, is the legitimate third party, a term which generally has evil connotations, but when it involves God becomes most desirable.

Second, when two marrying people are in Christ, they have the advantage of a profound, realistic understanding of human nature. Simul iustus et peccator. The exquisitely designed creature, called man, belongs to a fallen race. He does nothing perfectly. He sins, in familiar words, in “thought, word, and deed.” Not only the husband but the wife, not only the wife but the husband — both are sinners. Marriage is far from the new heaven and new earth. It is life which because of its mysterious intimacy can so easily create a living hell. Numerous sociological surveys, some dating as far back as 1935 with the Terman and Burgess and Cottrell studies, reveal that failure to recognize man as frail and sinful lies behind numerous conflicts. The surveyors do
not use this vocabulary, but when their words of "selfish and inconsiderate," "unyielding," "criticizes too much" are translated into theological jargon the meaning is virtually the same. Men who do not take seriously that they are frequently and profoundly sinful are apt to demand perfection of their partners, without taking seriously their own imperfection. They insist that they are always right because they fail to comprehend the tragic limitations of their 2x4 minds. They often have an ingenious ability in locating the mote in the spouse's eye without seeing the beam in their own. The Christological understanding of courtship assumes an awareness of the frailty of both partners. This, in turn, breeds openness, wholesome tolerance, and humility.

Third, when both partners are involved in Christ, then not only sin's awareness but also Christ's powerful dynamic of forgiveness is present. What a power this is! Two people, coming from different backgrounds with characteristic inclination to choose the demonic will inevitably sin against one another in a relationship so intimate as marriage. At times the sins accumulate in such numbers that a virtual iron curtain is established. Communication breaks down. Separate bedrooms are established on occasions. What is needed is a bulldozer to crash and crumble the curtain so that communication and love can be re-established. The Christian knows that the forgiveness of sins is this bulldozer. Convinced that His Christ never tires of forgiving him his sins, day after day and day after day, mortal and venial, murder and lying, pre-marital intercourse and pre-marital lust, he is always ready to forgive his partner both great and small sins and to verbalize his forgiveness with a penitent spirit. Such forgiveness draws people into an even closer relationship, as all of us know from our own experience. I am convinced that the failure to forgive is one of the basic reasons for marital discord today. If married individuals could only admit their frailty and limitations and be ready to ask and to grant forgiveness to one another, many of the reasons for marital tension could be greatly reduced. In his "Sermon on the Mount" Luther concurs: "Hence, the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins is the most important of all, both for us personally and for our relations with others."

Other factors are important. Two people may be lovers of the Lord, but utterly incompatible in personality characteristics. The one is an avid football fan, but hates opera; the other becomes ecstatic over an aria, but loathes athletics. The one enjoys reading and tolerates bowling; the other is always on the move and cares little for books. The one is refined and well-mannered; the other crude and rude. The personalities of Christians are widely and richly diversified. While it is my conviction that, given time, the indwelling Christ can remove any barriers and unite two radically different personalities into a meaningful oneness, Christians are wise in seeking out fellow Christians whose personalities can be interwoven meaningfully and easily into their own. "Opposites attract" may be adventuresome, but statistical evidence affirms that similar likes and dislikes generally make for greater harmony. If compatibility is important, length of courtship becomes an imperative. For to know the other person, not merely at her perfumed best but also under stress and pain, takes time involving numerous varied activities. In the final analysis, diversity in likes and dislikes is not the crucial problem, but rather the ability to understand and tolerate the differences which do exist within a harmonious relationship, especially when this is impregnated with the gluing qualities of Christ's grace.

Finally, parental background is also significant. Some twenty-five years ago Lewis Terman of California and Burgess and Cottrell of Illinois carried on independent research to determine those factors which contributed to harmony and disharmony in marriage. Their specific interests were different, and they therefore had a number of different conclusions. But at one point all their statistical data seemed to converge, namely, that happy marriages are produced by happy parents. If two people are happy in marriage, they usually come from homes of a happy atmosphere. In Christ, innumerable people can transcend poor family backgrounds, but the fact remains, as the Emersonian proverb has it, "Men are what their mothers make them." This only confirms the Christological principle that the home is the most basic institution in all society. They who court are wise in frequent visitations to each other's home.

Courtship is a delightful period; thrills, joys, satisfactions. But it is a most serious time, for the person you choose is yours for life. The attitudes you engender and the activities to which you resort tend invariably to become routine. How essential that Christ be around during such delightful, but crucial days!

The Christological Understanding of Marriage's Meaning

Our basis for today's lecture is the simple yet fascinating story of the second chapter of Genesis. Populating the earth at the time were animals and man. The whole creation was pronounced "very good" by the Creator, but something was lacking for man. It was "not good" that he should be alone. Something was incomplete in his life and he must have completion if he was to fulfill the design of God. The animals who were paraded before him and to which he gave respective names were unable to fill this need. Therefore, Jehovah caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam and from one of his ribs He made Eve. Adam's immediate response was: "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh. She shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man" (Genesis 2:23). Not only did God provide a "helper fit for him," but He made woman out of the very frame of man, indicating the close relationship of the male to the female.

The whole story constitutes a magnificent revelation of the understanding of marriage as seen through the eyes of our Lord. First, man, alone, is pictured as an in-
complete creature, a state described as "not good" in contrast to the "very good" of the rest of creation. Unattached human individuality, according to the Christological understanding, constitutes a danger to the whole creation. "Nothing in God's creation exists for itself; everything exists for everything else" states Otto Piper; "Solitude is not good; man is created for sociability," asserts Gerhard von Rad. Man needs his fellow man if he is to know himself. It is only in relationship to a "thou" that the "I" begins to understand who he is.

But man needs more than a friend to complete his incompleteness. He, man, needs a woman. "Ish," the Hebrew for man, needs "Ishah," the Hebrew for woman; "Mann," according to Luther's interesting translation, needs a "Maennin." Man needs intimate companionship in which he can give legitimate expression to his divine gift of sex. When he does not have this, remaining in the state of incompleteness, he is called a bachelor or spinster, a status in life which has had to bear more than its share of humorous caricatures. This is not to say that some men cannot live profitable lives without marriage. The drive for intimacy can be sublimated, particularly if the individual is consumed by a devotion to his Lord, but these exceptions dare never be made the general rule without bringing havoc to creation's order. Man is incomplete as a single person.

The second truth which this creation account conveys is that while man and woman are basically the same they nevertheless are different. Their individual characteristics are designed to give that which the other lacks. The most obvious differences are those of a biological nature. No matter how loudly the equal-rights-for-women proponents may shout, the women will no doubt have to bear children for a long time to come and the men to provide semen. Men and women differ physiologically. Man is stronger in respect to sheer physical strength and because of this the woman is called the "weaker vessel." They differ in intellect and emotion, not in their power to think and act but rather in the direction of these. A man's logic lies primarily with abstract thought and objective analysis; a woman's with concrete individuals and subjective analysis. The man has the logic of ideas and the woman the logic of persons. In his studies Kinsey concluded that the woman tends to love the whole person while males are primarily interested in coitus without denying the validity of other factors. As Alexis Carrell remarked, man and woman are different in every cell of their body from head to toe.

They are basically the same, and yet different so that they together might now constitute a "oneness of flesh." We do not have the time to analyze the term "oneness of flesh," but it implies the most profound, intimate, and mysterious relationship of all human reality. So close is the effected unity, according to our Lord, that it should never be torn asunder. And it should never be torn asunder, because the two are no longer twain but one flesh (Matthew 19:5), "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder" (Matthew 19:6). So intimate is this oneness of marriage that the Apostle Paul identifies the husband with the wife: "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself" (Ephesians 5:28). To hate his wife is not only to hate his wife, but also himself. The two are separate personalities, and yet within the oneness of marriage, the one can be identified with the other. So intimate is the oneness that the Apostle Paul in this same passage does not hesitate to compare the relationship of husband and wife with that profound relationship of Christ and the church. Without Christ there is no church, for He is the Head which supplies the body and its members with nourishment and strength. The relationship of husband and wife is similarly profound and mysterious. This close relationship of marriage ought not surprise us, for the woman was taken from man and to man she must return in marriage. The "oneness of flesh," therefore, is not merely social, nor narrowly biological, but, encompassing both the social and the biological, it is a profound, intimate, total interpersonal relationship of two people involving body, mind, and spirit.

The Christological understanding of marriage's meaning thus holds that marriage is the completion of man's natural incompleteness, uniting two similar, yet dissimilar, people into a profound, mysterious, lifelong oneness of flesh for the greater effectiveness of the two individuals. How right Emil Brunner is in his comment:

... deeper reflection and also historical experience show that the true nature of marriage is only disclosed to faith. It is not presumptuous and it is not dogmatic to speak of "Christian marriage" as the truest form of the idea of marriage, not only in the sense that marriage is most perfectly realized within the sphere of Christianity, but also in the sense that here both its significance and its nature have been more clearly perceived.

Is the marriage relationship in which many of you already are and which others of you are anticipating today hungering and thirsting after righteousness and meaning? Then let it sup with Jesus Christ, the Lord, who gives marriage enrichment and power.

The Christological Understanding of Sex

Our subtopic for today is "The Christological Understanding of Sex." Is there any need to establish the intimate connection between sex and marriage? They are inextricably bound to each other. Sex without marriage is possible, but marriage without sex is abnormal. Marriage without sex, called syneisaktism, wherein in the early church married people by mutual agreement abstained from intercourse to earn special merit before God, was soon abandoned as being too impractical. Sex is a powerful drive which can be used for better or for worse.

Modern twentieth century culture seems determined
to use it for worse. Whether it be literature, painting and sculpture, music, advertising, science, politics or the law, in almost every area of activity it seems to suffer abuse. The modern magazine, sophisticated like Playboy or unsophisticated like those on most corner newsstands; the modern Hollywood productions like almost any named; the modern novels like Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover or Miller's Tropics; the modern drama like "Tea and Sympathy" or "Duel of Angels"—all point to man's preoccupation with sexual interest and activity. Pitirim Sorokin, a demanding sociologist, comments: "Thus, whatever aspect of our culture is considered, each is packed with sex obsession. Its vast totality bombards us continuously, from cradle to grave, from all points of our living space, at almost every step of our activity, feeling, and thinking." More modern substantiation of this can be found in Time's recent appraisal of "Sex in the U.S.: Mores and Morality" (Time, January 24, 1964, pp. 54-59).

Perhaps the first great shock to the more innocent minded came with the publication of Kinsey's first volume on the Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. His statistics must be carefully handled. Generally they asserted that over 67% of all men engage in pre-marital intercourse and 50% of the women, and that 50% of the males and 26% of the females engage in extra-marital relations. At the time Kinsey was accused of practically everything, including an inexcusable faulty use of scientific methodology, but in the intervening years his once shocking data have been corroborated by a number of other studies.

The tragedy of America in its current "sexplosion," as one recent writer called it, is not only the widespread permissiveness and perversion but more its failure to feel guilty about its errant behavior and its willingness even to defend it. Any reading of the minutes of the past history of the world seems to substantiate that collapses of civilizations invariably involve sexual perversion on the part of its people. When sex goes wrong, it, like cancer, metastasizes the entire body.

Is it necessary to point out that a Christological understanding of sex is most uncomfortable in a reckless, permissive atmosphere like our own? For, according to the Christ perspective, sex is a divine gift, not merely a glandular, bestial reaction, instilled in the human race for man's welfare and enjoyment. Throughout the Old and New Testament it is viewed positively, even though some Old Testament practices raise some questioning eyebrows. At the very beginning before the Fall, contrary to Augustine, it was included under the pronouncement of "very good," an evaluation God gave to His entire creation. The newly married Israelite was exempted from a year of military service after his marriage, the assumption being that he had some adjustments to make (Deuteronomy 24, 5). In describing the glory of the sun the Psalmist compares it to a "bridegroom coming out of his chamber" (Psalm 19, 5). Is not the expression of sexual satisfaction a fitting metaphor for nature's sun?

In the New Testament sex is attached to soma, body, that which attaches to Christ, and not to sarx, flesh, that which is regarded as the instrument of sin.

Sex is a divine gift for good. But like all of God's gifts, it must be used according to the divine order; otherwise, powerful as it is, it can disrupt and destroy. The Christological use is that as sexual intercourse it is to be used only within the context of marriage. For the purpose of such intercourse is to bind two married people into an even greater, more profound unity of oneness of flesh. So laden with meaning is the sexual act that the Apostle Paul flatly asserts that anyone who has intercourse with a harlot is one flesh with her (I Cor. 6, 16). Ascending to the Christological perspective, the sexual act visibilizes, concretizes, and personalizes the unique unity between the two. It is comparable to the Sacrament of the Altar. And if the comparison shocks you, it may be that your understanding has been thoroughly conditioned by the crassness and brashness of our times. Just as the Sacrament visibilizes and personalizes the Gospel, sexual intercourse visibilizes and personalizes the love between two married people. In addition, it is that means by which men become co-creators with God in bringing children into the world.

But sex involves more. It is not to be restricted to sexual intercourse but is also to include sexual attraction. Have you ever wondered why men and women are attracted to members of the opposite sex most unlike their attraction to members of the same sex? This is not to be taken for granted—the ticklish sensations of the heart. They belong to the gift, to encourage delightfully and virtually drive people into a marital relationship, the order of God.

Because sex is such a marvelous, powerful, unique gift, its protection has been incorporated into one of the commandments, the sixth. When men abuse sex, they not only disobey one of God's demands, but they also desecrate one of the strongest forces of the Divine for binding two people into a most intimate union. The tremendous increase in marital discord and disruption must be attributed in large measure to man's sexual recklessness and permissiveness.

This means that all who hold the Christological perspective will refuse any pre-marital relations, even with that one who is most deeply loved. Knowing that the thought precedes the deed, the Christ-man strives to keep his mind pure without being naively pietistic. When Dr. Lester Kirkendall of Oregon State University advocates a change in pre-marital conduct by permitting a couple in love to have sexual relations, he, in my judgment, is not only brutalizing the profound meaning of sex and marriage, but he also is granting far too much discretionary power to courting minds to distinguish between transitory and permanent love which ends in marriage. Courtship is delightful, but it demands mutual discipline. Sex is a divine gift. But, according to the Christological understanding, it must be used according to the divine pattern if its full glory is to be realized.
Are you now in the exciting days of courtship? For Christ's sake and your own, please do not sell your birth-right for a mess of pottage.

The Christological Understanding of Love

In this final lecture I should like to concentrate on "The Christological Understanding of Love." For love and marriage go together as a horse and carriage. The pity is that few words have been so distorted by common usage as love, so that at times it hardly resembles its original.

Some, for instance, identify it with romantic sensations. Love is the ticklish sensation of the heart. When you have it, you will know, for you will sing and shout and even go crazy. This might be called the "Hollywood" conception of love. "Love is honored, the beloved is idealized if not idolized, and dating and love-making are quixotic, bold and daring adventures" (Floyd M. Martinson, Marriage and the American Ideal, New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1960, p. 52). Romantically defined, love is principally an emotion.

This romantic conception ought not to be spurned by the Christian Faith. For Christianity is not opposed to an emotional thrill. Thrills belong to the joys of life and are part of creation's order. Romantic love may well be compared to the foam on the beer. The foam obviously is not the beer, but beer without foam is flat and invites suspicions. Romantic love enlivens, enriches, and fulfills the marriage demand.

The pity, however, is that it constantly runs wild. It identifies the foam with the beer; thrills and emotional overtones with love itself. It demands that love be unbridled, permitted to roam and soar wherever it pleases. The result is an absence of stability, intense today but dull and staid tomorrow. Experiences of married people concur that the character of love changes at various times during the courtship and marriage period. To maintain a constant passionate thrill within marriage is an impossibility. No wonder that many people who regard this type of love as the feature of marriage become disillusioned and ultimately find their way to the divorce courts. Romantic love is to be cherished, but not deified.

Others associate marriage love with friendship (philia). Such love is characterized by the desire to be together and to do things together. When this love is present within the context of marriage, husband and wife "love" to do things together. They are companions in the various interests of life - religious, educational, artistic, recreational.

Love like this in the marriage relationship is highly commendable. "Studies of the activities of engaged couples," comments Martinson (op. cit., p. 108), "indicate that both the number and the kind of common interests in which the couple participate make for congeniality and unity." God gives to marriage "oneness" and complementarity, but mutual interests contribute immeasurably to the actual fulfillment.

This does not mean that friendship love within marriage cannot be perverted. One is reminded of the lines: God bless John and me, Our son Bob and his wife, Us four and no more. Philia love often has the tendency to be exclusive, to close the circle of one's associates. When this occurs, it becomes perverted and changes its color.

A third kind of married love is eros. Eros has had a long and curious history. At one time it identified with sexual passion or lust; at another with escape from the sinful earthy to an absorption into the divine (de Rouge-mont); at another with man's endeavors to save himself (Nygren). But whatever its description, in every case it involves a concern for self, a self-respect, an interest in something or someone for what he or it can profit the love. "... the fundamental essential element is desire, a will-to-possess seeking satisfaction, either on the sensual or on the supersensual plane, in the attainment and enjoyment of its object" (Derrick Sherwin Bailey, The Mystery of Love and Marriage, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952, p. 25).

The question arises whether this eros can be brought into the context of a Christian understanding of love. It is true that man is sinful, but he also is God's creation, and therefore endowed with certain needs which must in some measure be satisfied. If he is to be an effective individual, he must feed himself, procure the needed hours of sleep, engage in recreation. He is by nature so constituted that he normally must have a marital partner to fulfill his personality. Normally he must have sexual expression. He, especially in his marriage, will constantly strive for personality improvement. Such interests in personal fulfillment may seem selfish, but they need not be. For when an individual seeks personal improvement for greater altruistic service, such activity should be classified as godly self-concern, rather than egocentric selfishness.

The fourth kind of love is agape. It is the queen of all loves, which other loves, be they romantic, philiaic, or erotic, must obey and adore. Agape is not selfish, but selfless, always ready to give, without expecting anything in return, loving even the undesirable and the enemy. It is not acquisitive but sacrificial even at the expense of its own welfare, ready to lose its life that another may gain it. It does not demand something of value from the beloved; it rather creates it in the other. It is the "transvaluation of all ancient values" in that it is other-centered rather than ego-centered.

Such agape love does not grow in the soil of natural man. For man in his fallenness is both covertly and overtly self-centered. The source of agape is God; He is its Creator and men receive it as a gift. "God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." This love was not unveiled to men in vague abstraction, but dramatically and concretely given in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. Most appropriately for our purposes, this Christ is called the Bridegroom and
His Church, the Bride. It is the Bridegroom who left His celestial home, humbled Himself and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross (Philippians 2:8). “Greater love hath no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends” (John 5:13). This is precisely what the Bridegroom did, giving Himself into death for His Bride that she “may not perish but have everlasting life.” (John 3:16).

Is there any need to describe why this love is so necessary for a successful and productive marriage? When it is present, marriage takes on stability and life. The two partners have high respect for each other. They regard themselves as agents of God’s love, and each other as the one for Whom Christ died. The one in Martin Buber’s terms, looks upon himself as the “I” and the other as the “Thou.” The one prefers not to view the other person as an “it,” an object for study and analysis, though this at times is inevitable, but rather as a person, a “Thou” with whom the “I” has a profound and intimate relationship. For this reason the partner does everything within his power to aid the “Thou” in developing his full self with all his varied talents so that he becomes the most effective servant possible for the purposes of God. When advancements come to the “Thou,” the “I” rejoices with them that rejoice, and when reverses come, the “I” weeps with them that weep (Romans 12:15).

Under agape complementarity and oneness find their finest expression. Selfless, sacrificial, always concerned about giving and helping, agape fuses two into one flesh. As we already mentioned in Lecture II, agape produces the readiness to forgive, that magical bulldozer that destroys the iron curtains of accumulated sin which constantly threaten to cut off communication. Agape strives for the best, but it is capable of bearing the worst. Common experience reveals that marriage has its disappointments and tragedies, which so frequently disrupt relationships. But agape’s heart is fixed, fixed to Christ, and therefore knows that all things, good and bad, work together for the good of them that love God (Romans 8:28).

Superhuman love like this is available to every marriage. You need not climb to heaven, nor plummet to the ocean depths, nor experiment with yoga, nor engage in hocus-pocus or astrological predictions to obtain it. It is nigh you, closer than you think, in the Word and the Sacrament. Read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the Word, especially during this Lenten Season, for in that Word is Christ and Christ is love, enough and more for every human individual.

We have completed our journey in five installments, all too hurriedly, but we hope not totally inadequately. We have attempted to describe marriage and its various components from the perspective of Jesus Christ. Our prayerful hope is that your understanding and appreciation of this most basic order of God has been profoundly enriched. Unless I misread myself and you and, for that matter, all humanity, numerous were the occasions during these lectures when we were struck with a deep sense of sin, guilt, and shame. Too often we do not permit Christ to have the priority when in courting we select our lifetime mates. In Christ we understand marriage as a profound, mysterious, life-long unity of oneness of flesh, but a few members of His body already have botched their first effort. We know by faith that sexual intercourse is Christ’s unique gift for the personalizing of marital love and therefore to be restricted to marriage, but like David some of Christ’s people tragically join the world and fall. Born of Christ, we know that we should love selflessly, but we love selfishly; we know that we should give, but we insist on getting. We should have pure minds, but how frequently we lust!

How does one escape from this body of death? At the end of our journey we find ourselves prostrate in the dust, in the dust of the cross, crying out, “Lord, be merciful to me a sinner.” And it is at this point that the magnificent glory of our faith breaks forth in blinding brilliance. For from the Christ of the Lenten cross comes the undeserved reply: “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” “Though their sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as wool.” “The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.” What comfort, what power! But this word of forgiveness dare never be converted to cheap grace. We who are His will not, cannot use it as a pillow for our lazy heads. Rather it is for us a springboard for constructive reaction and action, namely, that we who are here firmly resolve that our marriage, our courtship, our gift of sex, and our love will always be understood and practiced from the viewpoint of Jesus Christ, the Christological perspective. For only through His eyes do we of darkness really see. “In luce tua videmus lucem.” In Thy light we see light.
The Pattern in T.S. Eliot’s Carpet

By ALLEN J. KOPPENHAVER
Assistant Professor of English
Wittenberg University

Having had to teach college freshmen the poetry of T.S. Eliot, I was forced to establish for them, as well as for myself, certain patterns in the major work of the canon which would, like a road map, help them get safely through the unfamiliar world of his work without becoming lost in the Slough of Despond created by the austerity of his reputation, or without becoming imprisoned in the Castle of Giant Despair built stone upon stone by the critics who have dwarfed his work— at least by physical comparison to their own — with the abundance and variety of their views. I realize that I may be adding another stone to the fortress, but I shall take that chance in the hope that the pattern which I have established for my freshmen may be helpful for the general reader of Eliot’s work.

Eliot said of Shakespeare’s work:
We do not understand Shakespeare from a single reading, and certainly not from a single play. There is a relation between the various plays of Shakespeare, taken in order; and it is a work of years to venture one individual interpretation of the pattern in Shakespeare’s carpet.1

If I may paraphrase Eliot, “We do not understand Eliot from a single reading, and certainly not from a single poem.” Yet almost every detractor has attacked him on the basis of single poems, or even single lines. He is condemned as a poet of the tired world and “Prufrock” is used to illustrate. He is called a poet of despair and The Waste Land is hauled into the literary court room. He is accused of having betrayed the literary intelligentsia of the “twenties” by his surprising conversion to Anglo-Catholicism, and Ash Wednesday becomes the victim. Yet he continues to be popular, he continues to be read, he continues to influence poets, dramatists, literary critics; and few theologians seem to be able to get through a year’s sermons or articles without a few references to his works. The reasons are numerous. He has a fine sense of drama. He is able to create vivid characters (or caricatures) in the best Browning tradition. He has a fine sense of music both in his metrics and in the overall forms of his compositions. All of these are worthy topics to be developed. Yet I would like to examine the larger pattern of his work.

Paraphrasing him once more: “There is a relation between the various poems of Eliot, taken in order; and it is a work of years to venture one individual interpretation of the pattern in Eliot’s carpet.” Let me show you what I mean.

Eliot grew up in the atmosphere of St. Louis and New England in the twilight period of the Victorian-Georgian Age, and it had definite effects upon his early work.

I do not think the reader will struggle too hard to see these effects in the 1917 Poems, his first small collection containing “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock,” the major and most characteristic poem of the collection. These poems were filled with Prufrockian types, people who could not act, who hesitated to make any decisions, who were in a large sense “trimmers” similar to those of Canto III in Dante’s Inferno, doomed to whirl forever outside the gates of Hell. Even Hell would not have them, for they had been neither good nor evil, merely indifferent, and the sinners in Hell would have had something to gloat over had these shades been permitted entrance. So this condition becomes the worst condition in any spiritual journey. The journey, in fact, cannot begin until a decision has been made. Even the existentialist condemns this type because of the inauthentic nature of the trimmer’s life.

Eliot’s next group of published poems, the 1920 Poems, were dominated by a new figure, a gargantuan boor named Sweeney. If Prufrock’s habitat was primarily the drawing room, Sweeney’s was the brothel. Yet Apeneck Sweeney, arms dangling, for all his crudeness, and poignant aspects of Prufrock’s poem is that he can reason and to remember. What Sweeney Agonistes

So far as we are human, what we do must be either evil or good; so far as we do evil or good, we are human; and it is better, in a paradoxical way, to do evil than to do nothing: at least, we exist. 2

But Sweeney’s way is not the way. It is better than Prufrock’s, yet is still essentially animal. The one thing which distinguishes man from the beast is his superior ability to reason and to remember. One of the peculiar and poignant aspects of Prufrock’s poem is that he can discuss his condition, but can do nothing about it. He is dead to one world, powerless to be born into another. Sweeney, on the other hand, is too much of an animal to record his own experience, and it is for Gerontion, in a poem of that name, to diagnose the problem. What Sweeney was to find out years later in another poem was that the senses decay, that bodies wear out and die, and he described this condition in Sweeney Agonistes as the “hoo-ha’s.”

Gerontion is a man who has a keen sense of history, but he lacks belief in anything. Of history he can say: History has many cunning passages, contrived corridors

And issues, deceives with whispering ambitions, Guides us by vanities. Think now
She gives when our attention is distracted
And what she gives, gives with such supple confusions
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That the giving famishes the craving. Gives too late
What’s not believed in, or if still believed.
In memory only, reconsidered passion. Gives too soon
Into weak hands, what’s thought can be dispensed with
Till the refusal propagates a fear. Think
Neither fear nor courage saves us. Unnatural vices
Are fathered by our heroism. Virtues
Are forced upon us by our impudent crimes.
These tears are shaken from the wrath-bearing tree.

This is what the man of understanding has discovered,
that all of our knowledge has merely served to confuse us, “the giving famishing the craving.” We do not arrive at peace, at least Gerontion does not, for at the end of his poem he sits in his dry corner, sleepily awaiting the rain. What he has shown in his poem is a miniature waste land. There was a new poem to come with a different speaker, one with a fantastic comprehension of history. Eliot described that waste land through the mind of Tiresias, a pagan prophet.

Eliot had an enormous problem to overcome in the creation of this most significant poem, The Waste Land. He had himself undergone a nervous breakdown. He had recognized numerous ills which beset his age: a world troubled with new sexual freedoms which he caricatured in Sweeney’s adventures; a world that had not been saved by the war to end all wars; a world “that was trying a non-Christian mentality” which would be followed by a new dark age; a world that had more information than any world previous, yet had less wisdom, and consequently derived less peace from all this proliferation of facts. “After such knowledge, what forgiveness?” he might have asked with Gerontion. And in The Waste Land and through Tiresias he describes the problem. The epigraph to the poem offers one of the keys into its intricacies. The epigraph concerns a Sibyl in a bottle, an incident recorded by Petronius in his Satyricon. The Sibyl was given eternal life but not eternal youth, and by the time of the event which Petronius records, she has withered terribly. She is asked, “Sibyl, what is the matter?” She replies, “I want to die.” This is the mood of Tiresias at the end of his poem, for he is the central consciousness. “What Tiresias sees is, in fact, the substance of the poem.” Eliot tells the reader. Tiresias has been both man and woman in history and thus can record the human experience in a way no other person could. He is also a prophet, and in the framework of this poem, he is now alive, and has a perspective of history broader and more comprehensive than any man. He is the personification of recorded human experience. And in the end of his poem he sits upon the bank of the Thames, looking back over the arid plain of time with only fragments “shored against his ruins.” He has seen the rise and fall of civilizations and has come to recognize that man has learned very little. His only resource is the stoic pose he takes at the end. “Shall I at least set my lands in order?” he asks. His condition is a better condition, at least, than Sweeney’s, but he does not arrive at peace. Eliot said:

Stoicism is the refuge for the individual in an indifferent or hostile world too big for him; it is the permanent substratum of a number of versions of cheering oneself up . . . The stoical attitude is the reverse of Christian humility.

Tiresias is unable to cheer himself up. And though he can say the right words, Give, Sympathize, Control, at the end as an answer to the problem, he does not really commit himself to these. In Christian terms, at least, those who would wish to enter Purgatory must desire to suffer in order to be saved. Tiresias, the pagan seer, is unable to make this decision. He is unable to give, to sympathize, or to control.

Where does one go from a world of insanity? This is the question Harry asks late in the play, The Family Reunion, at a point where he, like Tiresias, is at his rope’s end. But he gives the right answer in Eliot’s terms:

Somewhere on the other side of despair, To the worship in the desert . . .

Following his discussion of Stoicism referred to earlier, Eliot examines Marlowe’s proud hero Tamburlaine, and then one of the unique heroes of Elizabethan literature. Faustus, who has “reached that point of horror at which even pride is abandoned.” It is at this point that the speaker of Ash Wednesday begins his poem, the next and last of the major poems before Eliot embarked upon his drama. The speaker of Ash Wednesday has abandoned his pride and is able by the end of his poem to accept something upon which to rejoice; he can believe in something. The world of his poem is a world of paradoxes, of experiences which would dismay all but the true believer. But it is a world of peculiar serenity. Thomas a Becket in Murder in the Cathedral describes it when he says, “So then, He gave to His disciples peace, but not peace as the world gives.” It is the kind of peace that results when one realizes the truth of another major Christian paradox, that one must lose his life in order to save it.

The journey through Eliot’s poetry is a pilgrim’s progress for the reader. The reader has been involved in a journey much like Bunyan’s Christian and for the same reasons. Along the way he has met rather unusual dramatic figures, not unlike Bunyan’s allegorical figures, characters who might be identified by large cards. Prufrock would wear Man of Inaction or Trimmer, preferring not to participate in the world. Sweeney, on the other hand, would wear Man of Action, or Sensualist, trusting his senses and finding them wrong. Gerontion and Tiresias, considered as a similar type, would wear Man of Reason or Stoic, participating as each does in the world of men, bound in time, but powerless to find peace in their own terms. The speaker of Ash Wednesday has divorced himself from the world of reason and has committed himself to Purgatory; he has willed his suffering in order to arrive at the fulfillment Gerontion and Tiresias have sought. His sign would read simply Christian.
Here was a pattern then, not one Eliot was aware of all along, but one he lived through and out of which he wrote fine poetry. The pattern in itself is a universal one. The human’s first step into life is through direct action (some never make it). And his first experience with life is sensual. The rude awakening comes when he finds that the senses decay and life ends, and so, using his unique faculty, he reasons and then philosophizes upon existence. This brings him temporary relief from anguish. But philosophies fail too, and do not define the ultimate experience of death and after. This much of the pattern Eliot worked out in miniature in his poem, “Animula.” Facing the fact of death a man may choose a number of answers, among them suicide as an end of absurdity, or faith, absurd itself in rational terms, yet a part of human experience. Eliot chose as his answer the Christian God, a choice growing out of his own experience and great understanding of human experience. Having said all this in his poetry, he then dramatized it in his first play, Murder in the Cathedral, but his method of working this out is something too complicated to develop here.

Having drawn my finger thus far over the pattern in the carpet of Eliot’s poetry, hoping that I have at least diagrammed one of the images therein, I would say, as Virgil says to Dante when he leaves him at the threshold of Paradise:

Son, the temporal fire and the eternal, hast thou seen, and art come to a place where I of myself, discern no further.

2Selected Essays, p. 429.
3Selected Essays, pp. 131-132.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

Several times “In Luce Tua” has cheered the decisions of Secretary McNamara, noting that “he can get away with it.” With what is he getting away? In the highly touted tax savings by closing military installations, his slide rule says he will save $13,000,000 in construction costs, which have been approved by Congress, for the base in which I am interested. Before he can move the function (as he says he will) the government will be forced to construct similar facilities in higher cost areas. The armed forces will also be forced to move thousands of military personnel and their equipment at a cost estimated at more than $5,000,000. They will also abandon 500 centrally heated and air conditioned housing units completed five years ago. The waste will exceed $13,000,000.

About 1200 service families will default on house payments because their move will remove the house market. The families are to move to an area without comparable government housing and with a shortage of civilian housing, making what is available more costly.

The emotional impact on service people is causing many of the more gifted and more highly educated people to leave the service. The older persons nearing retirement and the younger who do not have the better gifts are willing to be the subjects of decisions which do not weigh the human factor or consider the economy and emotions of families, because they are not anxious to compete with civilians.

Do you want the highly complicated and technical instruments of defense to be placed into the hands of the less gifted when the present generation of mature service people retire? (This they promise to do as soon as they qualify.) Are you certain that you know what you are encouraging Mr. McNamara to do and with what you say you want him to “get away”? Can it be possible that he may be penny wise and pound foolish? Would you want him to operate Valparaiso University with his slide rule? Your educational program is almost insignificant in comparison to the world’s largest system of education, the United States Air Force.

Amarillo, Texas

* * * * *

Dear Editor:

We took The Cresset for a year but just don’t feel it is a Christian magazine. The general thinking in the country is toward socialism which soon leads to communism and The Cresset is falling right in line. Satan has a marvelous foothold in the Missouri Synod and better yet in Valparaiso. In believe we are our brother’s keeper and should do all we can for all that seek but certainly not like the country we live in today advocates. Soon you will all be sorry you let the devil snag you by his cunning ways of “civil rights” etc. and you will all be slaves instead of the “Great Society” because you don’t understand.

We don’t need The Cresset. We have the Scriptures. We will pray for you as you may have much to answer for in guiding souls away from God.

Sincerely,

NAME WITHHELD BY THE EDITORS

Huntington Beach, California

REPLY BY THE EDITORS

The above letter is published because it is representative of a growing number of letters which we have received in the weeks since the election, some anonymous, most signed, but usually listing no street address to which we can reply.

It is our belief that a Christian does not lightly accuse a fellow-Christian of doing the works of the devil and guiding souls away from God. In the polity of every church, there are orderly procedures prescribed for disciplining those who do injury to the faith and morals of their brethren, and those who believe that they see such injury done are bound in conscience to take such action as is available to them to see to it that it is stopped. The writers of the letter to which these comments are directed are not free to hurl a charge and then run. If they believe what they say, they are obliged by love and by the polity of the Church to proceed through the degrees of admonition to bring about either our repentance or our excommunication.

Furthermore, as citizens of the United States we are tired of the phony patriotism which permits people to hate “the country we live in today” under the guise of loyalty to a country which has never existed and could never exist except in their imagination. We love this country — hangnails, warts, and all. And we do not think that the citizens of Fantasyland are any better equipped than are other foreigners to tell Americans how to manage their own affairs.
The More the Merrier

By WALTER SORELL

One cannot help noticing that, this season, a great many plays were presented that had a minimum of dramatic personae. Has the two-or three-character play become a trend? It is a question to which only next season will give the answer.

There have been plays before with such paucity of characters. Hartog's "The Fourposter" once analyzed the problems of marriage in a most charming way with the help of Jessica Tandy and Hume Cronyn, and not so long ago Gibson tested the lability of lonesome people in a big city in "Two for the Seesaw." But they were May flies which have now turned into a sturdy, enduring species.

A special niche must be reserved for O'Neill's "Hughie," a long one-act play which looks like a character study for one of the figures in "The Iceman Cometh." It actually is a long monologue with a more or less silent night clerk in a fleabag of a midtown New York hotel where Erie Smith, a small-time Broadway hanger-on spins the gossamer of his illusions. Only Jason Robards' impressive talent could make it a success.

In the same way as "The Fourposter" succeeded, "A Girl Could Get Lucky" missed, and this trifle of a comedy about love and marriage could not make the author Don Appell lucky nor the audience happy. It was too tightly tailored for a matinee audience, and, unfortunately, they come only twice a week. Enid Rudd's "Peterpat" was a bit more gimmicky than that unlucky girl, but it also spelled sex with three capital letters and pivoted around bickering and making up in a romantic fashion. Both plays were blessed with a short life.

Perhaps "The Owl and the Pussycat," a comedy by Bill Manhoff, makes the most of that vicious circllet of bickering, attracting each other, fighting, and making up. The insubstantiality of a predictable substance is punctuated with a few fresh and surprising ideas. Out of this bedroom collision between a part-time prostitute and a pseudo-intellectual emerge one or two startlingly human moments which only prove that Mr. Manhoff was too much bent on writing a commercial success while knowing better.

Now we move from the duologue to the terzettos, and it is no longer love or "Luv" alone — however you spell it, it remains the solar complexus of comedy. It transcends the ordinary. Murray Schisgal's "Luv" puts on an air of modernism and mixes love and marriage with loneliness, suicide, and Ionescoesque trivalities triumphing over cliched logic. It matters little whatever marriages are made or unmade in this comedy; it survives its bizarre escapades in a delightfully theatrical way — also perhaps because of director Mike Nichols' ingenuity.

"Slow Dance on the Killing Ground" is the intriguing title of William Hanley's play that brings three different, but equally desperate, human beings together. They meet in a luncheonette on the night Eichmann was hanged: the storekeeper, a non-Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany; a Negro boy in flight from the law; an eighteen-year-old girl in search of an abortionist. This trio of human failures fights for the illusion of existence, or tries to assert that life is worth being preserved, or that life will be found in the life after death.

At the end of last season the trend of the short cast play began with Frank D. Gilroy's "The Subject Was Roses," in which a family's feelings are taken apart and put together — the feelings of a couple and their son, their interrelations and misunderstandings.

All these plays pose the question whether the choice of such a small cast was a matter of dramaturgic needs, or due to economic considerations, the challenge of self-imposed limitation, or the temptation of giving in to a gimmick. True, brevity is the soul of wit and the master dramatist proves himself when he can sustain the highest interest with the least means. An undeniable fact remains the difficulty of finding a producer for a play with a large cast nowadays. But I think the economic problem is not as paramount as we are made to believe. The two-or three-character play may easily be a symptom of our time, which is in such haste that it cannot let the fate of a human being slowly unfold from deep within its milieu. Perhaps it has something to do with our proverbial problem of isolation which prefers this paucity, this nakedness-to-the-dramaturgic-bone.

However it may be, it remains a histrionic truth that you can exhaust a situation with so very few people, but you can not exhaust the human being, who usually comes better alive through point and counterpoint, through the illumination of a many-faced environment which determines our reactions and the way of our whole existence. A full harmonization is needed to gratify eye and ear and to visualize the extended dimension which every play must have and hide. It seems we have become too much frightened and concerned with ourselves to be concerned. It is an appalling playfulness which has taken possession of our artists. They pretend a need for experimentation by running away from the responsibilities of craftsmanship and artistry.

The classics knew what they were doing. And I rather rely on Sophocles, Shakespeare, and Moliere than on the Hanleys, Schisgals, Rudds, and Manhoffs. Should the only sign of the dramatic art of our time to be read by generations to come be the scribbling on the wall: "Gilroy was here!? I hope not.
Pious Autonomy

By FREDERICK W. DANKER
Associate Professor of
New Testament Exegesis
Concordia Seminary (St. Louis)

Moreover, when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou hast fasted, anoint thine head, and wash thy face: That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly. Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

Saint Matthew 6:16-21

In his play Father Serge, Count Leo Tolstoy works out the psychology of what has been aptly phrased “pious autonomy.” It is a malady which charts a short path from the gates of heaven to the brink of hell. The Russian writer might well have used the words in Matthew 6 as his text, for the warning of Jesus confronts us who are Christians with the fact that we are living contradictions. We claim to be sons of God, but we try to elect ourselves to that sonship over the sins which we describe in others. We claim Jesus Christ as Lord, but find it easier to walk the broad road of collective decision. We hear the Word, “Sell all and follow Me,” and terminate our pilgrim’s progress in the service of Mammon. We call ourselves free while we forge the chains of enslavement to personal mental convenience. Believers, yet disbelieving. This is the schism of the self which prompts our Lord to use blunt language — “Don’t be like the scowling phonies.”

At first the connection between fasting and banknotes appears tenuous. It seems as though Jesus moves on to another topic. But the profound relation is apparent when we see how claims of true religion often go hand in hand with a false sense of values and materialism. Rapidly changing cultural and social forms expose our schizophrenic pattern. They reveal that what is often identified as Christian society is substantially the product of established social and economic moulds from which the embarrassing ingredient of self-scrutiny has prudently kept its distance. Then comes the explosion. The status will no longer quo. Race riots, teen-age delinquency, decline of the national image on the international scene, moral disintegration in government — these are partial responses to autonomy, to self-centeredness, to smug enjoyment of ease, to pious disengagement from social responsibility in the name of objective Gospel concern.

Now it may appear that at a place like Valparaiso University we are engaged primarily in a program of attack on these and other ills through an educational process aimed at equipping men and women for the future. But it is wholesome to recall that beyond the infamous shadows cast by the crematoria at Dachau rise Germany’s cathedrals and universities. And precisely because our University combines the spire and the laboratory, our peril is compounded, for it is easier to fast here and forget that we are part of the problem, even as many religionists in Jesus’ day failed to note the hour on God’s clock.

That controversial play The Deputy writes large the price at which relevant Christianity is to be bought in these ambiguous times. With less appearance of fasting, and with less history of material concern, the bishop of Rome might have been able to spell out a stronger case for humanity, especially for Jews who were not “converted.” The fasting against which Jesus warns is the spiritual reputation bought cheaply without real sacrifice of the self. Instead, the major accent is on the stage properties. Thus it is possible on this campus to fast long hours of studious engagement in things religious and on the academic side to have your eyes set on the prestige and comfort that courses in medicine or law or engineering can ultimately buy. One of my saddest experiences was in a certain dentist’s chair. It was not the work on the tooth that pained me so much as the large lack of social responsibility displayed by a man with genuine professional competence. After years of training at government expense he hoped to earn enough money in his practice to buy a farm and spend his life after forty as a country gentleman. The fact that his training would be put in cold storage at the expense of people who needed his expert services did not seem to disturb him a bit. One might also inquire how many students of social studies have appeared to fast to the last ounce of strength for humanity, only to be on a quest for solutions to their own problems as they go out to handle “cases” instead of loving people.

Time fails to speak of the fasting appearance our pastors and parents see on our trips home, while time, the Church’s investment, and opportunity are squandered. And what about our administration and teaching staff? As an expert in knowing how to fast to be seen of men, I can well understand the temptations to appear greatly harassed by “unappreciative” students and by a con-
On Second Thought

Great literature often relieves the tension of its climax through the sudden intrusion of comic scenes with tragic overtones. If the Bible were merely literature, we would point to the scene in the Garden of Gethsemane as a good example. The hopelessness as the disciples flee, leaving their Lord alone, is momentarily lightened with the picture of Mark leaving his linen cloth behind and fleeing naked. But this is only minor comedy. The story of Peter is more closely related to the climax.

Filled with apocalyptic vision, aflame to set his Lord on a throne where He belonged, expecting to be supported at any moment by legions of angels, Peter drew his sword and struck out for the Kingdom. In his ears rang the battle cry of Jonathan against the Philistines, the shout of Judas Maccabeus against the Seleucids. It was a moment of high courage, of great faith. Peter saw the whole future of the kingdom of God resting on his wielded sword. He lopped off the ear of a slave, and watched in shame as his Lord healed the wound and rebuked him for trying to lead the army of his God.

It was a monstrous deed that Peter did. For this mob His priority we can be raised to the heights.

Some of you perhaps have heard of Kurt Gerstein. After joining the National Socialist party Gerstein was dismayed to learn its true character as an instrument of oppression. After futile protests of policy he was put in a concentration camp. There the fuller depravity of the movement galvanized him into heroic decision. Gerstein resolved to join Hitler’s elite SS corps and bore from within at the vitals of Nazism. Like Tertullian, who reminded Christians that they went into discipleship with their eyes open, knowing full well that their lives were forfeit with the decision, Gerstein and his family were well aware of what would happen should the Nazis be toppled. In addition to his diversion of large quantities of prussic acid designed for the “final solution” Gerstein compiled a damning dossier on Nazi officials, but those who might have used it to mobilize conscience ignored his plea. Like Commandant Weiss at Dachau Gerstein met a tragic end. Because he fasted in secret he was arrested as a war criminal by those who shared unknowingly Gerstein’s sense of human concern and was taken to a prison in Paris. There he died a violent death under perplexing circumstances. Because he was willing to pay the premium on a free conscience, the village where he once conducted organized illegal Bible study now shares his memory with grateful Jewish leaders.

Confession followed by absolution leads us to the recognition that we do not understand the Bible unless we participate in its objectives. The beginning and end of theology and true religion is Love. For the Spirit who produces this love we must pray. And this is the function of fasting — to aid in the achievement of that goal.
Oft in the stilly night, ere slumber’s chains have bound me, I begin to wonder whether the composition of music has fallen on evil days. Black pessimism creeps into my being; for as I trek through life with my ears open, I hear many laboriously concocted compositions that are said to be good music, and it happens altogether too often that I encounter men and women who do not hesitate to call these effusions great.

Are the years causing me to disdain the present and worship the past? Am I searching so assiduously and so eagerly for another Bach, another Mozart, another Beethoven, another Brahms, another Schubert, another Chopin, and another Wagner that I overlook, ignore, and frown on many beautiful things that are coming into being almost every day? Am I losing sight of much surpassingly excellent craftsmanship? Am I congenitally hostile to new ideas and novel ways of expression? Am I condemning in a disgustingly pharisaical manner all experimentalism in the domain of music? I do not think so.

I am a sworn enemy of all turgidity in music. I loathe pretentiousness, and I despise compositions that cover an appalling ignorance of fundamentals with a blanket of circumambulatory fustian and down-right nothingness.

Am I bilious — or even atrabilious — as I write? Is a louse crawling about on my liver? Not at all. As a matter of fact, my heart is overflowing with loving-kindness as I pour out the phials of my boredom. But what can I or anyone else accomplish with loving-kindness when little or no understanding of the art of writing music confronts one in so much of what is being composed today?

I know that some modern composers have a great deal to say and say it exceedingly well. But their number is by no means legion. Some concocters of compositions seem to have an uncontrollable desire to outdo everyone else in extraordinarily and startlingly effective writing. Have they ever heard about the wonderful power of restraint? Many turn their backs on significant achievements of the past and strive in the sweat of their faces to create music that is altogether new and novel in every respect. A plague on them!

Am I referring primarily to what, broadly speaking, is known as jazz? Certainly not. Long ago I was reprimanded officially and unofficially for taking up the cudgels for what I called good jazz. But even those nudges did not cause a louse to cavort about on my liver. I took them in my stride. I have said time and again that if Mr. Bach were alive today, he would not boggle at composing jazz. But it would be good jazz. I am not afraid to make the same statement about Messrs. Mozart, Beethoven, Brahms, Schubert, Chopin, and Wagner.

Jazz may not be the highest type of music, yet it is a completely legitimate type. In itself it is by no means a bastardly excrecence. Those who are in the habit of referring to it as a bunion, so to speak, should devote a few years to the study of the history of music.

I am not speaking of liking or disliking. If you like jazz, then you like it. If you dislike it, then you dislike it. This is a free country. I abominate all jazz which I consider execrable, and I am unabashedly fond of jazz which I regard as good.

Naturally, jazz, too, has had to put up with some vile offshoots and by-products. But must I condemn it in its entirety because of its bunionlike outgrowths? No.

Am I opposed to dissonances? Assuredly not. Have you ever noted how masterfully Mozart and Beethoven — to mention only two great figures in music — made use of dissonances? Dissonances can be beautiful. But when they are employed merely for the purpose of showing how dissonant one can be, they are for the birds.

I frown on a wholesale resort to what is known as the 12-tone row. Yet this Schoenbergian device can sometimes lead to remarkably pleasing results. In fact, my eardrums have occasionally come in contact with thoroughly delectable melodies based on the 12-tone row. But to make a fetish of the 12-tone row is for the birds. Once again I pity the poor birds!

Do I consider it impossible to create new forms in music? No. If a composer succeeds in devising and developing something as fascinating as the fugue, I shall leap for joy. But this will not induce me to decry the fugue as hopelessly old hat. Those who search for new forms of expression merely for the sake of propounding something that will be regarded as new will never banish the wonderful fugues of Bach and Mozart from the world of tone.

I look for a number of things when I expose my ears to modern music. Above all, however, I look for melodies — melodies that are worth remembering and cherishing. How many of them do I encounter? Exceedingly few.

Those who undertake to compose what is known as “serious” music should take a leaf or two out of the book of those who write what are called “musicals.” Why? Because melody is absolutely essential in “musicals.” The tunes these works purvey are often verminous, it is true; but at all events those who concoct them do not leave all melody to the birds.

I shall conclude by repeating my frequently reiterated statement that George Gershwin was a great melodist. Now hurl your brickbats!
The New English Bible (Oxford, 1961)

Jesus was led off under arrest to the house of Caiaphas the High Priest, where the lawyers and elders were assembled. Peter followed him at a distance till he came to the High Priest's courtyard, and going in he sat down there among the attendants, meaning to see the end of it all.

The chief priests and the whole Council tried to find some allegation against Jesus on which a death-sentence could be based; but they failed to find one, though many came forward with false evidence. Finally two men alleged that he had said, 'I can pull down the temple of God, and rebuild it in three days.' At this the High Priest rose and said to him, 'Have you no answer to the charge that these witnesses bring against you?' But Jesus kept silence. The High Priest then said, 'By the living God I charge you to tell us: Are you the Messiah, the Son of God?' Jesus replied, 'The words are yours. But I tell you this: from now on, you will see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of God and coming on the clouds of heaven.' At these words the High Priest tore his robes and exclaimed, 'Blasphemy! Need we call further witnesses? You have heard the blasphemy. What is your opinion?' 'He is guilty,' they answered; 'he should die.'

Then they spat in his face and beat him with their fists; and others said, as they struck him, 'Now Messiah, if you are a prophet, tell us who hit you.'

Meanwhile Peter was sitting outside in the courtyard when a serving-maid accosted him and said, 'You were there too with Jesus the Galilean.' Peter denied it in face of them all. 'I do not know what you mean', he said. He then went out to the gateway, where another girl, seeing him, said to the people there, 'This fellow was with Jesus of Nazareth.' Once again he denied it, saying with an oath, 'I do not know the man.' Shortly afterwards the bystanders came up and said to Peter, 'Surely you are another of them; your accent gives you away!' At this he broke into curses and declared with an oath: 'I do not know the man.' At that moment the cock crew. And Peter remembered how Jesus had said, 'Before the cock crows you will disown me three times.' He went outside, and wept bitterly.

Churchill

"Nobody gives Churchill a chance to recover ... Britons know the dread blow will fall sometime and are braced against it." Daily News Wire Service, January 20, 1965

Why? Why dread? This great strong man is old - Leave him to God, Let him go in peace.

But why am I afraid?

He was my youth: Defiant, determined Confident: Full of knowledge

And clear-eyed hope, Courage and sacrifice. And honor, Adventure, and work to do.

Somehow as he lived, There was still a world to conquer.

Somehow as he dies, A part of my life is gone, And I am not so brief anymore.

ANNE SPRINGSTEEN
Books of the Month

An Engaging History Of The Papacy

*Rome and Reunion* (Oxford, 1965, $5.00), by Prof. Frederick Grant, joins the considerable literature which is responding to the remarkable current events in Rome. Grant is the grand old man of New Testament studies in America, but also an active churchman who represented the Anglican communion officially at Vatican II. He has given us a book that offers no inside information as to what went on at the Council; rather, he seeks to understand the papacy itself from a historical point of view, and thus to address a problem which is uppermost in the minds of most Protestants when they think of relations with Rome: the obstacle to reunion that the papacy seems to present.

Many Protestants regard the papacy as an obstacle; Lutherans should raise different kinds of questions. Yet many Lutherans do in fact share the Protestant suspicions; this book speaks to them.

Anyway the book is a good one, but very Anglican. Grant is not technically a historian of the church; still he is at home in narrating that history, and provides some interesting surprises. He attempts to present the human side of the papacy: the men and the office have developed in history as a response to historical conditions. For example, he shows how the papacy stood alone in the West as the one institution which could face the new frontiers of Europe in the fifth and sixth centuries, and deal with the vast barbarian movements of Northern Europe, to whom the future of Europe belonged. Grant, of course, does not attempt to conceal the weaknesses of this institution or to obscure the fact that the office has been occupied by rogues from time to time. A frank examination of the papacy does reveal an enormous debt owed this institution both by Western culture and the Western church. Grant's thoroughly honest but sympathetic treatment needs to be studied by anyone concerned with the future of the church; the papacy will not disappear, and in the future shape of our one world, an ecumenical church may once again appreciate what such an institution can mean for it. The Lutheran suspicion of the papacy has grown from late- Reformation polemics; even the Lutheran confessions — though they speak of Anti-Christ — contain generous references to the papacy. This is, of course, perfectly consistent with a theology which regards the general constitution of the church to be a matter of human device rather than divine law. Thus new institutions can come into being or take form, depending on the needs which history presents; the Praesidium of the Missouri Synod, for example, is a unique collective form of church executive capacity which has only recently developed as a response to a number of historical factors.

This historical portrait of the papacy is the book's most valuable contribution; Grant also comments on many other matters of importance. The need for genuine critical Bible study is very much on his mind. Brooding over the book is a mood that is unmistakably Anglican; Grant writes as a product of high Anglican spirituality. He is concerned about moral and spiritual renewal in general. For Lutheran ears he tends to subsume the church into general religious categories. He talks a great deal about the need for modern man to have contact once again with spiritual realities. His very Anglican emphasis on the way in which the present experience of the church nearly determines the belief of the church (He even makes the present experience of Christ the ground of the Incarnation, a statement that surely requires qualification), may puzzle Lutheran readers, though this needs to be learned again. This viewpoint, overstated and under-qualified by Grant, permits him to give Mariology and Mariolatry a very appreciative hearing: since so many Christians do in fact venerate Mary there must be something to the practice, albeit this may not necessarily be imposed on every form of Christianity.

For the history of the papacy, scholars will of course always turn to Erich Caspar's great work; but both scholars and lay folk will be delighted by several hours in the company of this learned and gracious mind. The book has faults which become virtues by their capacity to raise questions. The reader will long ponder the tentative direction of solution he makes use of. Grant tends to minimize the latter. Yet it cannot be denied that often theological differences do result "not from profound exercises in logic but from defects in human imagination, and overliteralism in human thought, and the spirit of pugnacity and will-to-dominate, and the lust to compel the faith of others." Another volume intended for the general reader is Heinz Zahn's, *The Historical Jesus* (Harper, 1963, $3.50). Zahn is a German theological journalist, and narrates an account of the study of the life of Jesus in our century, particularly in the past few decades. No problem has been so central to the intellectual life of the Christian West as this. It is natural, therefore, that the problem has attracted the finest minds in history and theology during the past century. But the debates have been intricate, and the current phase, preoccupied with the questions raised by Dr. Bultmann, indeed requires a guide in order to understand it. If anyone needs an introduction to the subject on a level accessible to a person of general education, this volume will do it. It suffers from the major defect, common to much German theology, of assuming that the entire problematic is being dealt with by Germans alone. This provincialism leads the author to several foolish observations about the state of Anglo-Saxon research. But never mind. The developments on the continent do have an importance and interest that form a unified theme for this book; only the reader should not suppose that the entire story of current research is told here. For Lutherans, the book is of special importance, for the issues raised by Bultmann are alleged by him to be Lutheran in character. RICHARD BAEPLER

WORTH NOTING

The Voice of Illness

*The Voice of Illness*, by Aarne Siirala (Fortress, $4.50).

As Paul Tillich suggests in his Foreword Dr. Aarne Siirala has given us a book that "is an important link in the ever-increasing number of writings which deal positively with the relation of religion to psychotherapy and medicine in general." There is no doubt that this book cannot be read without immediate strong reactions. The book traverses the middle between pastor and doctor to which both give attention, the life of the individual and community in sickness and in health. Dr. Siirala comes well equipped for the task. Besides being an internationally known theologian and Luther scholar he was also for a number of years director of the Therapeia Foundation in Finland, a meeting place for theologians and psychiatrists.

This book is written to the problem of mental illness and its relation to the task of the church. In the encounter with illness he says that some very serious questions are raised that "call into question essential marks of Christianity: the proclamation of the word and the establishment of community." (p. 30)

In endeavoring to pose the problem and the tentative direction of solution he makes use of three concepts — therapy, prophecy, and illness. He sees illness as an expression of a total organism and not just a problem of one of its parts and also an expression of the larger community of which the organism is a member. Illness is thus also communal in nature. Illness reaches into the most vital functions of this individual within community, into the formation of its words and the formation of communities. Simply conceived illness is a breakdown in the unity of the individual, both intra-personal and inter-personal.

What is prophecy? Words have a prophetic function. The prophetic function belongs to human existence as such. "It is in the very nature of man's being to form words through
which the individual and the community express publicly a certain interpretation, a certain 'prophecy' of their experience." (p. 43)

These words of prophecy may grow into symbols creating unity or they may be diabolically prevented into destroying unity. Both illness and health manifest themselves in the forming of words. This does raise serious concerns, for if this is true then no particular individual or community can validly claim to represent the "right" prophecy merely by appealing to the original sources of Christianity or to some form of Christian community. Dialogue between prophecies becomes essential. Also, "if theology acknowledges its participation in the prophetic situation, and recognizes that the words which it forms are not exclusively its own creation but issue from the union of theology with all other words of prophecy, then every effort to find criteria for differentiating right and wrong prophecy can properly be said to be 'theological study.'" (p. 45)

What is therapy? The encounter with illness takes place through listening to the voice of illness, to the formation of its words. Therapy is seen in terms of dialogue. Listening to the illness makes possible the formation of new words. Any symbolic forming of words which can create communion is possible only if real listening takes place, only where there is no avoidance or stifling of the reality of illness.

The encounter with illness and the words which express this illness become fertile ground for the understanding of and the differentiation of "prophecy". If one properly listens to the voice of illness insight can be gained into the task of forming symbolically creative words of prophecy and proclamation. Take heart, all you practical theologians, for this seems to me to suggest rather radical implications for the field of Practical Theology. It suggests that pastoral theology is not simply a practical discipline, it is also a fruitful source of theological construction.

If Siirola sees any splits in reality as an indication of illness then one cannot help but get excited by the far reaching implications of the following statement: "The dichotomy (two parallel truths, faith-reason, soul-body, supernatural-natural) which we are now questioning is an expression of a split in reality which has appeared in various forms throughout the development of Western culture". (p. 63) The split which Siirola seeks to overcome is the split manifested by assigning the function of "prophecy" to the realm of man's spiritual life and "therapy" to the problems of man's physical or emotional and mental life. What he is suggesting is that the psychotherapist is participating in the religious task of the church, and that any therapeutic encounter with illness "demands that theological, humanistic, and naturalistic understandings in the history of therapy become organically (my emphasis) intertwined." (p. 69)

In general, The Voice of Illness calls into question the attempt to isolate a religious language as though this were expressive of a specific part of the human personality. It calls into question the popular religious model of the "horizontal and the vertical", as though religion were concerned with the vertical with the horizontal being natural fruits or results of this concern. It suggests that the cultivation of the horizontal is as much a central concern of Christianity as is the cultivation of the vertical. In fact, it suggests that perhaps this model, while it serves useful purposes, is insufficient to express the totality of the concern of the religious enterprise for wholeness. bluntly, to cure a patient of emotional problems may not be a preliminary to the main event (salvation) but may be, in that particular situation, the main event taking shape. Both psychotherapy and theology deal with the same reality.

This may be a point of criticism of Siirola's book, but it also may be a clue to further investigation into the relation between healing and salvation, a clue to that kind of understanding of the ministry of Christ which sees it as a unified organic whole with the cross being symbolic of what was going on in a profound way throughout His entire ministry, and a clue into a deeper understanding of the whole drama of salvation.

NORMAND J. WIDIGER

Columbia Essays on Modern Writers
(Columbia University Press, paper, 65 cents each)

To interpret and to evaluate tentatively the works of modern, non-American writers, William York Tindall, editor of the "Columbia Essays on Modern Writers," has drawn together a distinguished group of literary critics and scholars. In the first six pamphlets of this series Germaine Bree writes on Albert Camus, Samuel Hynes writes on William Golding, Theodore Ziolkowski on the Austrian novelist Hermann Broch, Mr. Tindall on Samuel Beckett, Peter Bien on Constantine Cavafy, and John Unterecker on Lawrence Durrell. The series, just beginning (future essays are planned), is a supplement to the older and equally valuable "University of Minnesota Pamphlets on American Writers." Like the Minnesota studies, the Columbia essays, forty-eight page pamphlets, priced at 65¢ each, can be read at one sitting, but merit more.

Each pamphlet contains limited though essential biographical material on the writer, analysis (not merely summary) of his early and later works, a panoply of recurrent themes, some consideration of elements of his style, cautious evaluation of the writer's works, and a selected bibliography; in this respect the series is designed as a guide for the ordinary reader of modern literature. Taken together, the essays provide a viable symposium on both the artistic and intellectual achievements of modern writing (so far in the series mainly English and Western European), and in this respect the Columbia studies offer to the serious student a concise and readily available compendium of insights into the diverse and divided modern mind.

No exorbitant claims are made for these writers. Their prominence on the modern literary scene is assumed, and thus the critic's emphasis is upon the merits and defects of individual works. Through lucid and competent analysis, however, the critic manages to detail those reasons why the writer deserves careful and continuing examination. In general, those reasons vary between technical skill and intellectual insight. Mr. Ziolkowski averns that though the philosophy of Hermann Broch is substantial, it often mirrors "the existential analysis of thinkers like Jaspers or Camus." Consequently his "real contribution is literary..." a page of his prose is instantly recognizable as his alone." This originality, states Mr. Ziolkowski, points to Broch's most significant insight into man's experience: "Broch's vision of the immanence of death will probably be regarded as his most original contribution to human experience. His evocation of the totalitv and simultaneity of life is his greatest achievement in literature." A broader but equally conservative claim is made by Miss Bree. Albert Camus, she notes, "belongs to the tradition of conscious thinking and hard discipline in art." She continues, "Camus had defined his own realm quite early and explored it with sustained intellectual and artistic integrity, thus achieving a difficult balance between the erotic and the critical, between the solitude of the self and the claims of society. There are, of course, other works, other expressions just as valid as his, but his writing seems to have the decisive resonance that we associate with durable works of literature."

Such is this series' basic approach to modern writing. To establish the artistic and intellectual significance of a writer's work has always been a critical aim. To maintain a sense of exploration, while performing that function, is often ignored. These essays are engaging navigators through the writer's world.

PHILIP RAISOR

March 1965
In *The Christian in Politics* (Oxford University Press), Walter James asserts that in modern circumstances, “... when our increasing mastery of nature and power to plan our own environment seem securely established,” there are many Christians, also compelled by feelings of their own power, who are tempted “…to drag in Christianity where it is hardly at home.” If the world is to be controlled by all this mastery and changed by all this power, why not control and power in Christian hands and in Christian directions? Is it not time, in this flexible world of rapid change, for God to run the world through His Christian servants? Interested in making Christianity relevant, sometimes in a very compulsive manner, some Christians like to talk this way: God must take over to make this a decent world in which to live; therefore, God’s people must take over in the important places of the world—education, politics, communications, business, labor, publishing, social services.

It is difficult, James also asserts, to bring this off, inasmuch as the concerns of these areas are different from those of religion. The Christian has been called to demonstrate a concern for the other world, for the Good Life yet to come. The politician as an example, as Aristotle had insisted according to James’ version, is dedicated to the Good Life in the Here and Now. Aristotle avoided the intricacies of such dual allegiances because he saw no conflict “…between a man’s religion and his duty to the State because for him, broadly speaking, God and Caesar were one.” In keeping with this, James suggests that those “…who believe most strongly that Christianity may be related to politics … tend to hold a Greek view of the State.” And they are really thinking “…of raising the Kingdom of God on earth.”

The Christian, by the very nature of his Christianity, is called upon to take part in politics, to participate in the activities of this world. James explains participation in this manner: “They [Christians] are particularly called to take part by the side of other men. The natural order in which all men live was created by God and it must be sustained by men. Such work for a Christian is a work of love. God loves his children and loving Him means to love them, and the arena of love is the world; its sinfulness is no reason for turning our backs on it.”

This point of view reminds us of Reinhold Niebuhr in books like his *Moral Man and Immoral Society* and *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*. According to Nie-buhr, there must be these complicated dual allegiances for the imperatives of the Christian life must always be in conflict with the rigorous necessities of collective living. Moreover, as finite human beings we “…never know what is right for us, nor what is best for the other person.” James points out that the Christian makes his choices, his decisions, where many cross-currents play upon his decision-making processes: the forces of family necessities, the mandates of his vocation, his own ideas and inclinations, and many new circumstances. How can all this be related to the will of God? Certainly the Christian will be forced to accept the demands and the patterns of expectations that his roles in the created orders place upon him.

The Christian must be true to his positions in God’s created order. In the order of nature the Christian stands “…on a par with the non-Christian, just as there are no denominations in the science of physics.” The Christian must give himself to the tasks of this world with “greater energy” and “a profounder seriousness before his task than he would have had without it.” The Christian in politics acquires a sharper awareness of his sins and shortcomings than people in sheltered and stabilized situations. Looking back over his life, the Christian will recall many deliberate actions which, as it were, can be settled only between himself and God. He will discover things done by him, possibly at the end of a chain of sins and errors leaving him no good choices, which he knows cannot be defended, even before men. His only hope is in that understanding which is called mercy. This is even truer of the politician.”

And what did Christ say to a politician called Pilate? “Thou wouldst have no power against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath greater sin.”
During the third week in January the eyes of the world were focused on the capitals of two great nations. In London the English kept their long, somber vigil as a revered countryman waged a gallant but losing battle with death. On this side of the Atlantic daily bedecked Washington, D.C., took on a festive air in anticipation of the inauguration of a President.

Lyndon Baines Johnson became the 36th President of the United States on January 20. The events of the day, the preinaugural festivities, and the inauguration ceremonies were given full and comprehensive coverage by the three major television networks. This enabled every citizen to participate in the historic occasion. With the exception of unnecessary repetition and an overemphasis on trivial details, one could not find fault with events as they happened. After all, the cameras merely caught the telecasts. It was my good fortune to see Sir Winston nonetheless typified the glory and the grandeur of the empire as it was in his youth. It was entirely fitting that the pomp and pageantry that are part and parcel of England's rich heritage of tradition should be marshalled in a last tribute to a man who had served his country so long, so well, and in so many capacities. It is safe to say that the village of Bladon, where Churchill lies buried, has taken on new significance and will never again be just a dot on the map. As long as there are free men who cherish freedom of body, mind, and spirit, visitors will journey to St. Martin's Churchyard to stand for a moment at the grave of the mighty warrior to whom we are all indebted. NBC, CBS, BBC, and CBC deserve our gratitude and wholehearted commendation for their joint coverage of a truly historic event.

Here are other excellent telecasts that must have given pleasure to discriminating viewers: Young People's Concert (CBS); The Magnificent Yankee, Korea, The Capitol, and The Mystery of Stonehenge (NBC).

My Fair Lady was a smash hit from the night it opened a six-and-a-half-year run on Broadway in March 1956. Why not? Here we had the scintillating wit of George Bernard Shaw, the lilting music of Frederick Loewe, and Alan Jan Lerner's engaging lyrics fashioned into a superb production and enacted by an all-star cast. It was my good fortune to see My Fair Lady performed by a fine road company in 1957. This was a thrilling experience. I found the film version of My Fair Lady (Warners, George Cukor) not only equally thrilling but completely captivating. This is first-rate entertainment — gay, colorful, charming, and exciting. I do not hesitate to say that My Fair Lady fully merits all the awards it seems destined to receive. But this year there should be two Oscars for the musical category. Mary Poppins seems to me to be equally deserving on all counts. In addition, Mary Poppins has a special magic that comes only from the enchanting world of make-believe.
Something important this month — at least I hope so. There are two reasons. First: a few nights ago I was brought up short by a striking sentence which had been written years ago by one of my colleagues on this magazine, now sainted. Tucked away in the corner of an old issue of the Lutheran Witness, it rang like a high bell: "We know a man who does not expect to be assigned to a place in the great mansions and who asks no more than a humble arbor where no telephone will trouble and where toil is ended. But when half an eternity or so has been spent listening to the great chant, wafted to him from far away over beds of asphodel, of those more worthy than he and closer to the Presence — he hopes to have some wiser ones come and visit him and explain why in the far-off, unhappy days of earth there had to be, ever and anon, strife and contention among those who loved the Lord Jesus and who in all sincerity called him Master." Half an eternity has not yet passed for Theodore Graebner, but perhaps the Father who is more gracious than we can expect or even imagine has already explained the mystery to him.

Second reason: From time to time I still have occasion to sit and talk with the rising generation. They are a strangely lovable crowd. We have not given them much, these children of a dying world — stones for bread, guns for butter, fear for hope, hate for love. Their candles burn low. So it was probably inevitable that they would build a wall of cynicism against the world which we have made for them. And, indeed, the cynicism does not especially bother me. I suspect that it is often a measure of their sensitivity to the horror of the Twentieth Century. When I listen to their skeptical, yet often curiously wistful, remarks about life and living, I hear echoes of the thunder over Sinai — the sins of the fathers coming to rest upon the heads of their children, inevitably and terribly.

One thing, however, disturbs me more than anything else — their appalling cynicism concerning the Church. They are willing to listen to the voice of Jesus Christ; He seems to haunt them as He has always haunted men and women who have caught a glimpse of His figure staggering along the Via Dolorosa. For the Church, however, many of these young people have little use. They are unable to bridge the awful gap between the faith which the Church professes and the faith which she lives. They see in her too much organization, too many hypocrites, too much hate and too little love, too many men and women who have reduced the living glory of the Faith to a cold acceptance of dead intellectual propositions, too much smallness and pettiness and jealousy and fear.

And so I am compelled, even as my sainted colleague, to say, "And yet," "Nevertheless," "Despite everything." Certainly it is one of the mysteries of evil that it is able to corrupt human hearts even when they are engaged in the highest and holiest task on earth. And yet there is something else. We must not permit these young people to see only the wrong side of the tapestry. For beyond the hypocrites and the Pharisees stands the great silent host of the hidden saints. Young men who consciously enter a profession in which there will be no prospect of earthly reward, in which they will be constantly at the mercy of sharp tongues, despised by half the world and ridiculed by nearly all the rest. Or the nurse who gives her years to healing. Or the mother who makes her work in the kitchen a Te Deum. Or the invalid who holds back the tears until there is no one but God to see them. Or the young woman who makes the pounding of a typewriter an act of worship. These are the real children of God. These are the greatest subjects of the King. We must not forget them.

Nor must we forget that behind and above them stands the great but invisible cloud of witnesses which the Scriptures call the Body of Christ, the City of God, the Bride of Christ. These — the visible ones and those no longer visible to us — are the Church of Christ. It is time for us to see again the height and depth of the worn and wonderful words: "I believe in the Holy Christian Church, the Communion of Saints." She is the living messenger of the living God, the contemporary of all civilizations, the building of living stones rising under the gentle hammers of the grace of God. Everything good in our world has come from the Church. She has been the mother of freedom, the inspirer of music and painting and architecture, the guardian of men's minds and the hope of men's hearts. She is the communion which inhabits the world and the ages, sweeping from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil to the "fields of asphodel."

And so, I suggest that the rising generation look again at the words, "I believe in the Holy Christian Church," in our day the low place of the bruised reed and the smoking flax, but also the high place of the trumpets and the soldiers of God. I believe in this Holy Christian Church because I believe in Jesus Christ. And life's highest privilege, I am very sure, is to light a candle, however small and feeble, on her altars.