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Viet Nam Again

The President of the United States gets an annual salary of $100,000, a furnished house, and a generous expense allowance — and there are times when he earns every cent of it. President Johnson has been earning his pay these past few weeks as he seeks to find some solution to the apparently insoluble bind we have gotten ourselves into in Viet Nam.

We would guess that the President has received just about all of the advice he wants or needs. What he needs, and what no man on earth can give him, is a decision. This decision, in the final analysis, he and he alone must make.

It is obvious that any decision he might make will be attended by many risks, some inherent in the decision itself, some unforeseeable. Those who espouse a simple “Win the War” policy, at whatever cost, are asking us to take the risk of an escalation which could bring on World War III. Those who espouse a policy of tit-for-tat are asking us to commit ourselves to year after year of what we have now. Those who espouse a policy of negotiation seem to overlook the fact that our action in Viet Nam right now is an attempt to force her northern neighbor to live up to agreements negotiated in the past. Those who urge us to withdraw from Viet Nam are, in effect, advising us to accept the risk of turning all of southeastern Asia over to the Communists.

Like most citizens, we have a policy preference, but it is a preference powerfully influenced by our glands and poorly informed by the kind of information and advice which the President has been receiving. We therefore refuse to divulge it — not because we are unwilling to take whatever reaction there may be to it, but because we think there has been quite enough poorly-informed shooting off at the mouth on the Viet Nam issue.

What the President probably needs more than advice right now is the reassurance that, whatever policy line he chooses to establish and follow, he will have a united nation behind him. This sounds, admittedly, like the old Rah-Rah stuff, but in a time of national crisis — which is what we are in right now — there is urgent need of mutual encouragement and support. It should be obvious that the President can not simultaneously follow all of the conflicting advice he has been getting, and it should be equally obvious that he can not anticipate all of the risks that will attend whatever course of action he may choose to commit us to as a nation. But we have elected him as our President and given him the sole power of final decision — which means, it seems to us, that we have committed ourselves morally to back him up, whatever may be the policy line which he finally adopts.

Moonshot

Ranger VIII was another spectacular achievement, and it gave our space people some first-rate pictures of the surface of the moon. But pictures can tell only so much. As of this writing, the scientists were still unsure about the nature of the moon’s surface. Some of them doubt that its surface is solid enough to take the weight of a spacecraft. Others are convinced that under a possibly dusty surface there is hard material. Very likely we shall not know who is right until some human being stands on that surface and tells us what he sees.

And there’s the rub. In a British publication we saw a story some time ago which we have not yet seen in any American publication. It quoted Professor Marcel Florkin of Liege University, an authority on space medicine and President of the International Union of Biochemists, as having said — and subsequently denied that he said — that no human being could survive more than five days in a state of weightlessness because “absence of gravity modifies the multiplication of cells.” He is said to have claimed that, on their return to earth, all of the astronauts were in an “abnormal” state and that Valentina Tereshkova was in a very abnormal psychic state.

We have no way of knowing whether these statements square with the facts. We do know that two of our astronauts have been troubled with disorders of the inner ear. It seems logical to suppose that any condition which
disturbed the delicate balance of forces within which life exists could have serious consequences. And theologically one could suspect that the Creator has provided His own means for ensuring that the infection of man's sin is not carried beyond our planet into the rest of the universe.

But leaving the medical argument out of it as "not proved," and excluding theological speculations as nothing more than speculations, there remains the economic argument for taking another look at this business of shooting the moon. We live in a world of screaming want — want of food, want of clothing, want of shelter, want of medicine, want of love, want of purpose. Money can not meet all of these wants, but it can do much to relieve them. We have no right to escape from the screams and wails and groanings of mankind by taking off to the moon or to some distant planet.

The Greeks had a word for the attitude which has seized us and threatens to destroy us. They called it *hybris*, by which they meant the pride that drives man to try to jump the great gulf which separates the human from the divine. Man has been given great capacities and great opportunities to use them. But his freedom is defined by his responsibility — and that responsibility is to his fellow man who is hungry and thirsty and naked and sick and unjustly confined.

**The Price of Admiralty**

We hope we are not intruding into our "Sights and Sound" columnist's reserve, but we have to say a word of thanks to CBS, to Eric Sevareid, and to Walter Lippmann for an unusually memorable hour, the annual descent of Mr. Lippmann from his editorial Olympus to the steamy jungles of mass television.

Mr. Lippmann was, as always, stimulating. The word that he had for us on this occasion was that America does not have the capacity — and therefore is not under the obligation — to set everything right everywhere in this world. He suggested that we have quite enough to do in building the Great Society at home and honoring our obligations to our close allies, without involving ourselves in every cat-and-dog fight that breaks out in our troubled world.

Mr. Lippmann speaks from the vantage point of advanced age and from the perspective of a long career as a commentator on public affairs. The neo-isolationist views which he presents must, therefore, be taken with full seriousness. More than that, the prospect which they open up to us is an inviting one — an America going quietly about its own business in a world where "lesser breeds without the law" persist in overturning their own governments and threatening each other's territory.

It may be that Mr. Lippmann is recommending the path which would best serve the nation's self-interest, and it may also very well be that in a naughty and perverse world the best that any nation can do is pursue its own enlightened self-interest. There is always danger in calling nations to levels of moral conduct which only the rarest individuals manage, by God's grace, to achieve. But there is also, we fear, great danger in offering a great nation the comfort of a doctrine of limited responsibility. The realities of any given situation will, indeed, limit what even the greatest nation can accomplish within it, but for that nation to enter the situation with a feeling of anything less than total responsibility for it encourages, we fear, cavalier and irresponsible behavior.

To be strong is to be under many obligations. To have great power is to be under a heavy moral obligation to serve. We remember a stray line from a bad poem about the British Empire: "If blood be the price of admiralty, my God, we have paid to the full." Blood is the price of admiralty, and we shall not have established our national greatness until we have paid to the full, until we have played the role which the truly great empires of the past played in their days, the role of the suffering servant.

**The Spirit in the Church**

Delegates to the 177th annual general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church will be called upon next month to consider a document called the Confession of 1967, a new creed which has been drawn up by a committee of pastors and theologians under the chairmanship of Dr. Edward A. Dowey, Jr.

Theology is not our field, so we pass no judgment upon the theological adequacy of this new creed. But surely this is a time for every church to get honest with itself, with the world, and with God. It is a time for every church really to believe, teach, and confess what it claims to believe, teach, and confess and to quit parroting the formulations of the past merely because to do so is more comfortable than to come to grips with the questions which are being asked by honest men both within and outside the Church.

The new confession includes, among other things, a statement on the social mission of the church, an assertion that the Scriptures must be reinterpreted in each age in the light of increased knowledge, and a de-emphasis of the Westminster Confession (to which it gives the status of only one among seven attempts to express the Christian faith). In terms of Lutheran polity, it is an attempt to state, in credal terms, the actual *publica doctrina* of the Presbyterian Church in these middle decades of the Twentieth Century, the doctrine which is being preached from Presbyterian pulpits and believed by the faithful Presbyterian in the pew, irrespective of what the Westminster Confession may say.

It is to be hoped that churches representing the other great Christian traditions will soon face up to this same responsibility. God is true and unchangeable, and His Word is the only fully authoritative witness we have to His nature and will. But there is nothing final in our interpretations of His Word, nothing immutable about the principles by which we operate in our interpreting, and nothing sacred about the confessions which we have drawn up in the light of our understanding, at any given
moment in time, of the Divine Mystery. We still walk by faith, not by sight, and our walk is always a journey under the Holy Spirit who leads His people into the truth. To say that this leading stopped at any particular point in history, whether it be 100 A.D. or 325 A.D. or 1526 A.D. or 1935 A.D. is to deny the ongoing work of the Spirit and to leave the Church without resources to address itself to a new age.

We are sure that this living Spirit will be with our Presbyterian brethren next month as they consider this new attempt to put His truth into human words. May He be and remain with His whole Church in this our troubled day!

The Right to Vote

In a recent appearance on “Meet the Press,” Senator Russell Long (D-La.) observed that wherever in the South the Negro has been registered to vote there has come a great easing of inter-racial frictions. John Herbers made the same point in a recent special report to The New York Times in which he said: “On the local and state levels the registration of Negroes in significant numbers has eliminated racism as a prime political issue.”

In places like Selma and Wilcox County, Alabama, of course, you have sheriffs and registrars who certainly don’t read The New York Times and who, apparently, have not yet read the Civil Rights Act of 1964, either. For that act specifically provides that registration standards within any registration unit must be the same for everyone, that minor errors on registration applications shall not disqualify a prospective voter, that literacy tests for voter registration shall not require more than a sixth-grade education, and that all tests shall be conducted wholly in writing. In one way or another, all of these provisions of the Civil Rights Act are being violated in the Black Belt of Mississippi and Alabama. And it is in protest against these violations that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference have been demonstrating in Selma and in Wilcox County.

Fortunately, the Negro no longer faces a solid wall of white opposition when he asserts his rights in the South. Many of the most thoughtful whites have long ago come to recognize that we can not survive as two nations within the same boundaries. A possibly even larger number of whites have become bored with the whole business and are anxious to turn their energies to some more fruitful endeavor than bucking history. But there are still enough red-necks around — some of them, unfortunately, in public office — to keep the kettle boiling and to bring ridicule and discredit on their communities.

Worse than that, they bring more of the very Federal intervention which they claim to deplore. In the present situation, for instance, they have driven Dr. King and his supporters to demand further Federal legislation to ensure that the rights guaranteed under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will not become dead letters. It seems very likely that the Johnson administration will recommend most of what Dr. King is asking for. And it is thus that states’ rights are eroded — not by some predetermined decision of the Federal government to take over powers previously exercised by the states but by a response on the part of the Federal government to situations in which its citizens are not receiving that equal justice which is their due under the law.

Concern in Selma

Speaking of Selma, the Church of Jesus Christ showed itself at its best there on Saturday, March 6, when seventy white Alabama Christians demonstrated in front of the Dallas County courthouse “to tell the nation that there are white people in Alabama who will speak out against the events which have recently occurred in this and neighboring counties and towns.” The leader and spokesman of the demonstrators was the Reverend Joseph Ellwanger, pastor of St. Paul (Missouri Synod) Lutheran Church in Birmingham and a longtime friend of ours whose courage has been a source of strength to many of his brethren, white and black, in the church.

Specifically the group was protesting “the brutal way in which police at times have attempted to break up peaceful assemblies by American citizens who are exercising their constitutional right to protest injustice” and the “open and subtle intimidation of persons seeking to register to vote.”

This, we would suggest, is the church in action where its testimony has meaning and significance. If it will not arise for the oppression of the poor and the sighing of the needy there is little point to its acting, much less speaking, at all. This was recognized by a white Roman Catholic priest in Selma, Father Maurice F. Ouellet, who told the demonstrators, “You people are taking a tremendous step here today. I’m sure you know what you’re getting into and I know God will be with you.”

Semi-Obituary for the U.N.

The United Nations may not be the last, best hope of mankind, but it is the only instrument we have for the task of keeping some semblance of peace in our turbulent age. We are aware of its failures, for these make headlines. We are seldom aware of its successes, for when it succeeds it prevents bad news from happening.

The U.N. is the nearest thing we have to what we need most, a world government. But its weaknesses are those which plagued the United States under the Articles of Confederation; it may plead and it may attempt to persuade, but it can not command. And the U.N. stands now at the point where the United States stood in 1783; it must form a more perfect union or it must fall apart.

In the case of the U.N., a more perfect union need not mean the creation of a super-nation, although eventually this must come. At the moment what seems to be needed most is some new and more rational way of distributing power in the General Assembly. Article 18 of the Char-
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ter provides that "each member of the United Nations shall have one vote in the General Assembly" and that "decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting." This may be the way things are supposed to go in the United Nations General Assembly, but it certainly has little to do with how things are settled in real life. A vote of 100-2 in the General Assembly would have essentially no meaning at all if the two negative votes happened to have been cast by the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Speaking practically, it is almost impossible to amend the Charter. For the present, therefore, the most feasible course of action would seem to be to keep as much of the U.N.'s serious business as possible out of the General Assembly, where any two-bit republic can engineer a crisis, and let the Security Council handle things. To do this may violate the spirit of the Charter, but it must be remembered that the Charter was drawn up before there were such things as Soviet satellites and a Balkanized Africa.

Beyond the immediate present lies a hard job of rethinking the nature, composition, and functions of the United Nations. Obviously it must become something more than an assembly of ambassadors, each voting on instructions from his home government. Obviously something must be done to relate voting power to actual power. Probably some means must be found to give the United Nations a peace-keeping force of its own. Almost certainly Red China will have to be given the seat which is rightfully hers in the Assembly and the Security Council, repugnant as the idea is to us. In short, the brief, unhappy life of the 19th General Assembly should have warned us that the time for talk about strengthening the United Nations is past. There must either be quick and decisive action to strengthen the U.N. or we must find some other way to keep the little bit of peace that is left in our world.

---

**Magdalene**

BORIS PASTERNAK (1890-1960)

Others houseclean for holy days.  
Let them; I am different from them;  
Out of this bowl where oils and spice  
Mingle, I bathe Thy naked feet.

I cannot find Thy sandals; tears  
Defeat my looking. Like a shroud,  
Strands of my undone hair tumble  
Before my eyes. I hold Thy feet

Against the rough cloth of my skirt;  
I have washed them with my tears. Lord:  
I have wound about them a strand  
Of beads, and shod Thee with my hair.

As if because of Thee time stopped,  
I see, vivid, the years ahead —  
Thou hast made me a prophetess;  
Today I shall foretell the world:

The veil will fall in the temple,  
And we huddle like animals  
While under our feet the earth yaws  
(Perhaps because it pities me).

Once more the ranks of soldiery  
Will form and the horsemen ride out.  
Tall as a waterspout, the Cross  
Will thrust skyward over our heads.

At the root of the Crucifix  
I shall bow down, faint, bite my lips.  
So many are embraced by Thy arms  
Flung to the beam-ends of the Cross

That here my visions end; what world  
Is worth such suffering and strength?  
So many souls, so many lives,  
So many cities, rivers, groves.

Three days will pass, and in their void  
Shall I ponder Thy multitudes,  
Yearning to join our Prophecies:  
My dream of death — Thy Resurrection.

---

Translated from the Russian by Robley Wilson, Jr.
Every Spring I practice a type of self-torture known as gardening. I know better, but I have never been able to overcome this compulsion that drives me out into the yard with spade, hoe, and rake on the first day featuring lukewarm sunshine. This compulsion, it seems to me, is derived from three sources: 1) my ancestors, 2) seed catalogs, and 3) a strong remembrance of home-canned foods.

I know almost nothing about my ancestors beyond my grandfather, who came over from Holland at the age of eight, and absolutely nothing beyond his father, but I have reason to believe that my ancestors, over the centuries, tilled every inch of soil between the Zuider Zee and the Oder River. It must be their blood in my veins that forces me out to the garden at the first sign of moist, warm soil.

The seed catalogs are also to blame. I am convinced the seed producers have an arrangement with the postal department so their catalogs are delivered only on days when a blizzard is blowing or when the temperature is below zero. Even though I know I will be trapped the moment I pick up the seed catalog, I enjoy receiving this cheery publication with its pictures of flower beds in profuse bloom and its artist's sketches of perfectly ripened vegetables.

As the snow blows past the window, I sit with the seed catalog in my lap and mentally plan my garden for the Spring. This year I am going to try this variety of tomato since it produces, according to the sketch, a particularly large, red, and ripe fruit. My radishes this year are going to be the same red with just the right amount of white on the bottom, and my green beans and early June peas will be as plump and fresh looking as those illustrated in the catalog. I know better, but I also know when I am hooked.

Unfortunately I can also recall too clearly the days of home canning. There is something so comforting about the thought of growing one's own produce, carrying it to the kitchen for canning, and then seeing it safely stored in the cellar for the Winter. Even I realize that home canning has practically disappeared from the American scene, and I forget, momentarily, what an uncomfortable job it was working in a kitchen filled with steam on a hot August day. All I recall is the cellar in Fall filled with row upon row of beautiful colored fruits and vegetables in glass jars, bushels of apples and potatoes, and crocks of sausage in lard, and that is sufficient to get me out into the garden every year.

Perhaps I should mention that the plot I garden is not large. It is approximately the size of a small room, but it offers challenges often lacking in a 40-acre field. In the Winter I picture the dirt in my gardening plot as rich, loamy soil. It is not. My soil consists of clay, a rather coarse sand, and what is euphemistically known in these parts as river bottom gravel, though there is no river within 20 miles.

Something about this soil resists tender, loving care. Despite all the spading, hoeing, and raking I perform on it every Spring, its texture is never consistent. Parts of the plot are too loose and parts too lumpy, and I have never even succeeded in making the whole thing look level.

I have long known that while I have inherited the urge to till, I never inherited my ancestors' apparent ability to make things grow, and I am living proof they didn't all starve to death. Faithfully each year I plant the seeds at the proper time and at the exact depth recommended on the seed package. My watering technique verges on the scientific and the soil is neither too moist nor too dry.

And for all that labor and attention, what does the garden produce? I suppose if I could gather on one day all of the vegetables I normally gather over a period of several weeks, there would be sufficient food to feed my family one meal.

For some reason, the peas have shriveled in the pod and the beans have the consistency of twigs. The radishes are so hot only a person raised on Mexican seasonings could eat them. Few tomatoes come out on the vine and these never completely ripen. It is only in the Fall, the day before the first frost, that the tomatoes begin to show signs of real progress.

However, during the growing season that plot of ground produces at least twenty crops of weeds which come to maturity and/or bloom in record time. The variety of weeds is enormous and I have often thought of dedicating this particular patch of land to botanical science.

Better yet, this year I wrote the Department of Agriculture and asked if they would be willing to take an 8 x 10 plot of ground into their Soil Bank. I would like to get something out of that soil beside a relief of compulsions.
The Social Economics of Philanthropy

BY RICHARD H. LAUBE

Associate Professor of Economics and Finance

Valparaiso University

Most writers in the field of philanthropy settle for a definition that in one way or another uses the phrase “love of mankind.” Such an approach tends to stress the moral theme of philanthropy. And yet can anyone studying this process from the economic viewpoint omit the element of benevolence? Economic writers often say that the study of economics is concerned with the satisfaction of human wants and if this objective does not include concern over the well-being of a fellow man then economics could be challenged as the most selfish of the social sciences.

However, such an approach implies the attempt to disentangle the motives that underlie the philanthropic action. We are not sure which human being possesses qualifications for such an evaluation.

Economics tends to confine its analysis to exchange transactions. Thus the one-way street of philanthropy has not been covered very extensively by economists. Because of the difficulty of analyzing motives and the single directionism of philanthropy, it has had relatively minor treatment in economic literature.

Since philanthropy easily slides into the category of welfare economics, we are again faced with the concern for man’s well-being. It implies the question, does the philanthropic system contribute to results which can be considered the highest possible level of mankind’s general well-being? Premature as this question is at this point, it still sets the compass for the balance of this topic.

Can an economic system have charted goals which are capable of evaluation in terms of the unilateral process we commonly call philanthropy? Does philanthropy interfere with freedom of choice and individual rights? Does it contribute to the highest standard of living? Does it allow for a distribution of resources that would, for general welfare, be considered equitable?

Historical Setting

If philanthropy is defined as the “love of mankind” it by far antedates the exchange system. Therefore any history of philanthropy must begin with the beginning of time, for, in effect, the first move any early occupant of this earth made to aid a contemporary in distress would have been the first act of philanthropy. This very fact forces any writer of a history of philanthropy to encompass all human activity from the year “one.” Obviously, we shall not make such a try here. It is not difficult to extract philanthropic efforts from any regular historical account of the past.

The concept of giving, however, in the sense we define it today — donating without quid pro quo — is of relatively recent origin. Early man restricted philanthropy, if it could be so defined, to his family. Thus anyone in need went to his family for help. Everyone had a helping family someplace. There was no necessity for external philanthropy. Society had very carefully stipulated these obligations even to the extent of covering the aberrant who refused to work.

Greek and Roman philanthropizing was conceived in a much broader way. Giving was more general and public. It was made available to all regardless of need. It built war vessels, established parks, set up food centers for all comers. Such acts were codified in the Theodosian Code and the Justinian Code.

In later years the formal church became a center where the needy sought aid. Contributions were received by the church so that it could serve as an impartial administrator. But as the practice grew, such voluntary giving was inadequate. This lack culminated in such edicts as the Capitularies of Charlemagne, wherein the tithe became the standard gift for church support.

This growth of more or less organized philanthropy crested in an English Act in 1601 (Statute of Charitable Uses) later to be better known as the forerunner of the Poor Laws.

An unusual form of the dole evolved from the funeral rite. Late in the Sixteenth Century it was very common for large groups of the destitute to gather at funerals of the wealthy. It is recorded that at the Earl of Shrewsbury’s funeral, eight thousand people, mostly vagrants, appeared ostensibly to mourn but actually to receive handouts. The mourners “sorrow” was so intense that several were killed because of the crush.

Two hundred and thirty three years after the passage of the Statute of Charitable Uses, after suffering the economic and social consequences of these Poor Laws and their many opportunistic amendments, England attempted corrective measures with the passage of the Poor Law Reform Act (1834). This act not only removed the abuses of the very old Poor Law, but it recognized the even broader approach to absorbing social costs by the community (parish) so that, by 1909, 70% of the support of the new program came from Imperial funds.

Legislation itself did not clear up matters since a seriously complicating factor, the Industrial Revolution, was injecting itself into the economy at the same time. This economic event called for severe economic adjustments that were not easily absorbed by a populace that had already spent many years seeking some kind of economic equilibrium.

Early American philanthropy generally followed prin-
principles laid down by English tradition, except that the "do-gooders" were perhaps even more pronounced. Men like Roger Williams, John Winthrop, William Penn, and Cotton Mather did try to better the standard of giving in America.

The tone of settlement in America was such that the philanthropic relationship became highly developed. As early as 1830 it was so evident that, as a result of a visit, Alexis de Tocqueville was prompted to write:

These Americans are the most peculiar people in the world. You'll not believe it when I tell you how they behave. In a local community in their country a citizen may conceive of some need which is not being met. What does he do? He goes across the street and discusses it with his neighbor. Then what happens? A committee comes into existence and then the committee begins functioning on behalf of that need and you won't believe this but it's true. All of this is done without reference to any bureaucrat. All of this is done by the private citizens on their own initiative.

Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions consistently form associations . . . to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes . . .

The health of a democratic society may be measured by the quality of functions performed by private citizens.5

A decade and a half later, the following was written by another visitor to the American scene:

Munificent bequests and donations for public purposes, whether charitable or educational, form a striking feature in modern history of the United States . . . Not only is it common for rich capitalists to leave by will a portion of their fortune towards the endowment of national institutions, but individuals during their lifetime make magnificent grants of money for the same objects.6

A more contemporary example of this public charity for private use shows up in a financial arrangement in 1851 in St. Louis that probably was the forerunner of Traveler's Aid. Bryan Mulloughy established a covered wagon fund for travel relief for poor emigrants and travelers to the new west.7

Current philanthropic activity in America revolves largely around the legal aspects. Estates (philanthropy to relatives, faithful servants, favorite charities, etc.) of even minimum size are carefully formulated so as to forward a large part of the residue on to the next generation, either publicly or privately. Because of this situation, a few words about tax considerations are in order.

Religious and charitable deductions were first allowed in the 1917 Revenue Act in an unlimited amount. An amendment in the same year placed a 15% upper limit, however. The reason for the allowance was the war environment. Congress was concerned that the high rates of war-time taxation would seriously affect private giving. So, in order to encourage continued support of many private activities which, if not privately supported, would most likely fall onto government support, the Congress felt that at least a partial subsidization would be helpful.

It is interesting to note that the same point was made by Carl T. Curtis, Senator from Nebraska, in a similar setting in 1944 as Congress was discussing the extension of the standard deduction. Senator Curtis said that the failure to make additional allowances would reduce private giving and "... put us on the road to totalitarianism."8

Currently individuals have a 30% of adjusted gross income limitation on contributions to public charitable organizations and a 20% of adjusted gross income limitation on private charitable organizations. Corporate philanthropic contributions cannot exceed 5% of taxable income.

The Magnitude of Philanthropy in the United States

In any study of this field, one is confronted with the serious problem of measurement. The fact that a large amount of philanthropy is a private matter precludes the possibility of accurate statistics on the magnitude of national philanthropy.

Two approaches could be used. The donees could be canvassed to attempt to accumulate their total receipts. One problem which results is that while major donees are identifiable, the individuals are not. It can be further complicated by the fact that not all donees are willing to publicize their receipts.

The other approach could call for an enumeration of all donors. This would require a virtual census. The only feasible way to get at this source is to rely on tax reports for claimed philanthropic contributions. This source is questionable because it omits person-to-person philanthropy not legally includible on tax returns. Furthermore, its accuracy is open to question because, since 1941, the standard deduction feature on tax reports for individuals does not require the detailed accounting for contributions to eligible charities. Finally, any element of under or over-reporting of these deductions tends to distort the accuracy.

In spite of these difficulties, several sources have made serious attempts to estimate and gather evidence of the statistical magnitude of philanthropy.

Andrews' (Philanthropic Foundations) calculations of the size of charitable contributions totals $4 billions in 1949. His estimate of corporate giving for the same purpose in 1947 was $241 millions as contrasted with only $30 millions in 1936 with about one-third going to Community Chests.

Kahn (Personal Deductions in the Federal Income Tax) records philanthropy as reflected in tax reports. His latest national total is $4,878 millions for 1956. This is 3.94% of adjusted gross income on all returns. His investigation concludes that philanthropy as record-
ed on tax returns is rather inelastic related to income.

The most recent estimate appears in Philanthropy and Public Policy as follows:9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent of GNP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Domestic Philanthropy $10-12 billions</td>
<td>2.0-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foreign Philanthropy 600 millions</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Domestic Philanthropy 50 billions</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Foreign Philanthropy 3-4 billions</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This estimate implies that current total philanthropy, both public and private, now totals 10% of GNP, i.e., as a nation we are tithing. Much of this increase falls in the field of public philanthropy.

Vickery’s estimates, while not as recent, indicate a much higher figure for deductible contributions as taken from income tax records. For 1958 he ascertains a total of $5.694 billions for contributions from those taxpayers who itemize their deductions.10

For comparison, Clough estimates that in all of Europe philanthropy consists of less than 1/2 of 1% of national income and is suffering a downward trend.11 Whether this is an omen of things to come in the United States one can only guess.

However, for collective personal philanthropy, Kahn’s statistics show that over time the percentage of giving shows little relative change. For the two decades prior to 1940, the average individual contribution as a percent of adjusted gross income as taken from tax returns was 2% with an annual range of from 1.81% (1925) to 2.29 (1932).12

Philanthropy is usually classified by types of donees. The following table indicates these, with estimates for amount given to each:

**Estimated Total Amount of Philanthropy by Individuals, Classified by Area of Service, 1954**

(In millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>$2,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>283-369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Foreign Aid</td>
<td>60-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>156-187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,043 - 4,239</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kahn, op. cit., p. 218.

As the table shows, individuals contributed most heavily to religious organizations.

A careful perusal of the statistics of philanthropy gives the general impression that it will move in an upward trend. Past records indicate, however, that this trend will rise very slowly for the part played in philanthropy by individuals. This trend prediction is based on previously cited percentage participation.

On the basis of dollar volume, the trend appears to be more substantial. Projecting the historical records of giving, barring any major economic reversal such as war or depression, we see that the philanthropic dollar volume has doubled every six to eight years for the last twenty years. Since the rate of increase as a percentage of adjusted gross income has not changed appreciably, it appears that this dollar increase is due to the rise in the population. Therefore, rough projections of population statistics would put total giving close to the $9 billions level by 1970. Giving based on a national income projection would probably push the total beyond the $10 billions mark for 1970.

**Motivational Facets of Philanthropy**

Philanthropic effort must be divided into two parts: (1) collective philanthropy and (2) individual philanthropy.

A business-like analogical approach to philanthropy can be found in the field of insurance — specifically fire insurance. Aside from the contractual aspects, the fire insurance program is merely a large group (whose minimum size is actuarially calculated) of people, each contributing a set amount to cover the costs of those who have fire losses. Philanthropy is a similar process. The important exception is that philanthropy is considered to be voluntary. Philanthropy also does not contain the exclusivity of benefits held by the insureds. One may obtain a Red Cross allowance regardless of the amount contributed. A mere change of color changes the picture completely on benefits, e.g., Blue Cross!

Thus we see that philanthropy is a non-legislative process whereby society attempts to cover certain social costs. Its significant economic difference is that it is without compulsion, at least the compulsion with which we are customarily acquainted.

One example is educational philanthropy. Most everyone knows that very few collegiate educational institutions charge sufficient tuition to cover all cost of leading a student through four years of class attendance for the baccalaureate degree. The portion not covered by fees and tuition can be considered a social cost. This difference must be raised from so-called outside sources. Federalized higher education might require that such deficiencies be absorbed by government allocations which arise from tax revenues. This would obviate the need for appeals to alumni, conferences with foundation officials, and the like.

Or, either as an alternative or as a subsequent evolution from the above, the government might decree that the price system would be allowed to operate in full; tuition will be allowed to seek its own level. This, of course would mean that only the rich would be allowed to attend college. Such a system would make little allowance for intellectual aptitude. It would limit the intellectual breadth of our populace with possible higher social costs for subsequent generations.

However, under present procedures the government is content to play a relatively passive role in directing the flow of funds for this cause. It permits philanthropic motives to make up this deficit with the additional blessing (call it subsidization, if you will) that amounts given to approved institutions can also be deducted on the in-
dividual and corporate income tax return. This system has the advantage of permitting personal allocation of these resources without government intervention. It may not be out of order to indicate that the present system does not seem to operate at a pace sufficient to accommodate needs. This is probably due to the lag between need and ability to contribute to college support. Hence, the government has intervened to the extent that grants and scholarships are forthcoming from this source.

Economically, the act of philanthropy must be identified as spending — spending in the sense of refraining from saving. It must, however, be removed from the class of consumption spending because the spender derives no measurable benefit as in the case of typical consumptive expenditures, i.e., food, clothing, and other necessities — even luxuries.

Yet to apply the word “spending” to this act cannot be called completely correct. The compulsion which motivates personal philanthropy may have to be investigated before any hasty conclusion on the nomenclature can be arrived at.

Why is philanthropy a $4.5 billion segment of our economy? While not really getting at materialistic sources, Maimonides centuries ago identified eight degrees of philanthropy ranging from giving to the degree that the recipient becomes independent to the lowest type of giving that is done grudgingly.

No attempt is made to match Maimonides and the profundity of the Mishneh Torah, but it is certainly possible to identify basic urges with which philanthropy must be concerned. The following suggestions are not intended to be comprehensive or necessarily singular as a motive for a giving effort; they do no doubt enter into the motivational psychology prompting philanthropic activities:

1. Emulation
   This is probably based on the “keeping up with the Joneses” psychology. Professional fund-raisers use this approach rather intensely in their procedures to get the big givers on the list first under the theory that the others will attempt to follow suit.

2. Tax factor
   Giving is not as expensive as it appears since the deductibility feature on tax return lessens the cost to the donor. Furthermore, variation of the tax impact is introduced by the progressive tax brackets now in effect.

3. Conscientiousness
   This is based on the idea that a large number of almoners are approved and certified and therefore must be worthy causes; one should contribute something.

4. Love of mankind
   This motive goes back to the basic definition of philanthropy. It is presumed that it concerns compassion.

5. Alternate costs
   This motive is up for serious attack from many sides. It is submitted, however, that it is a realistic issue in spite of the fact that individuals very seldom evaluate the alternative costs in a philanthropic effort. It nevertheless exists very subtly. The point is that if the Red Cross was not able to raise the millions of dollars through solicitation, the services it performs in disasters and other needy causes would need to be borne by someone.

Economic Evaluation

Basically, philanthropy thrives or fails through the attitudes of the donors. What shapes the attitudes of donors? It is thought by many that, from the individual viewpoint, personal philanthropy and giving is a function of personal income. Each person gives according to some standard of available resources. The “tithe” is a fundamental of this relationship. However, once a “standard of giving” is established, most individuals make reasonable attempts to maintain that level. Over-all individual giving statistics appear to contain too stable a trend to conclude otherwise.

As personal income varies, two possible reactions set in. If one loses a portion of his income, he very likely will attempt to continue his previous level of philanthropy. His understanding of the needs for which he was contributing, carefully conceived, are not likely to lessen appreciably at first. Moreover, a small drop in personal income is usually considered temporary. Most people will try to “live as before” under the motivation that one does not readily admit a defeat that may only be of fleeting consequence.

Statistics give at least partial credence to the fact that there is some lag in reaction to reducing giving to a drop in income. Contributions fell steadily over the six year period, but at a rate slower than income as evidenced by the general steadiness of the trend with an actual percentage increase in five of the six years. This seems to show that personal giving settles at a plateau that does not change with a change in income level. Extending the above table into subsequent years, we see no appreciable percentage change until the end of World War II. From that date forward, the percentage was on the increase.

Individual philanthropy involves so many personal actions that it is difficult to categorize. Two types are easily indistinguishable: (1) philanthropic efforts of individuals to group activities, and (2) philanthropic efforts of individuals to individuals. The former are measurable in that contributions of this sort are generally deducted on income tax return and therefore appear in statistical records. The latter, being ineligible for tax recognition, are statistically hard to come by.

One area of individual effort that seems to be overlooked concerning the individual-to-individual philanthropy is contributions that support an eligible relative as defined in the income tax code. Where a son supports
his aged mother in full we see an example of the shifting of family social costs from one generation to another. Boulding carries this still further in his comments concerning the support of the young by the middle-aged who, in turn, expect support from the young when the latter achieve their middle-age status.

Research in the Statistics of Income in the area of exemptions for other than immediate family might reveal some evidence of the magnitude of this problem. It can be questioned whether this is real philanthropy because the blood relationship may be the sole motivating factor for this support and, while it is done, it may be done somewhat grudgingly.

In spite of the heavy individual participation in philanthropy, we also have various collective forms of philanthropy. The government is the largest by far. We cannot say that the government gives directly because it can give only what it gets, and it gets only taxes. But since the taxpayer-voter seems to agree to certain levels of government giving, the program continues. Government relief programs, health and welfare programs and the like are means of transmitting these tax dollars to worthy recipients. Apparently the taxpayer approves of these measures.

The source of all philanthropy is the individual. His personal "giving" or "foregoing" is the support of all benevolent activities. To say that a foundation gives is not entirely correct. To say that a corporation gives is equally questionable. In each case it was the stockholder who had to forego larger dividends because of corporate giving — whether it was a direct gift of the corporation to a needy cause or whether the gift went through a foundation channel. Of late, corporate stockholders have generated murmurings in opposition to corporate "giving."

In the case of the corporation where personal ownership is slowly giving way to professional management, we see the corporation taking on a citizenship type of personality. These professional managers are quite concerned with the corporate image since they feel more intimately the social responsibility of the corporation. It is because of this that we see more and more corporate participation directly in philanthropy, their giving being confined rather heavily to local benevolences such as Community Chest and Red Feather projects.

Recently there has been an apparent trend to place some of the social cost of higher education on the corporation. Colleges have organized state societies to solicit funds from the large corporations located in their respective states. The monies collected are placed in a central fund from which disbursements are made to the participating colleges in varying amounts according to a pre-set formula.

This type of corporate solicitation is most likely based on the theory that the corporation obtains some of the benefits of the product of the colleges by hiring graduates and therefore should assist in covering the social costs involved. Eells feels that this is their only justification for giving because basically the corporation "... is mis-cast as a philanthropist." He suggests that corporations should follow rather strictly the prudent investment rule.\textsuperscript{13}

Since corporations in many ways are equal to individual citizens, it is not too much to expect them to participate in philanthropic efforts.

**Philanthropy and the Market System**

As is well known, today's market system is basically an individual-oriented economic device. The fundamental economic pressures exerted within this parameter are derived mainly from attitudes, inclinations, and tastes of the individual. While it can be argued as to whether he directs the "tack" of modern business, it is nevertheless his "economic demand vote" that affects many business decisions.

In this competitive arena, the costs of acquiring the resources necessary to satisfy this consumer demand are usually broadly defined as private costs. The market system is thought designed to provide a market price that will tend to cover these economic costs as the pressures of supply and demand interact. That it does not cover these costs is a sub-topic of the broad social cost area that is apart from the approach to philanthropy used herein.

Not so easily recognizable or even identifiable are a group of costs labeled social costs. These are costs that the private sector does not bear directly. They are such that private activities cannot acknowledge with sufficient accuracy to include in their cost calculation, or, if identifiable, do not wish to acknowledge.

Medieval economic theory generally conceded that once a worker is hired it became the entrepreneur's responsibility to see that this worker and his family subsist. It was a paternalistic viewpoint. Today, if a worker must be severed from employment for almost any reason, the employer looks on this with at least one favorable eye — he no longer needs to pay this man. Ignoring the man's productivity, the employer's private costs fall.

However, the man is a member of society and must live. Our social philosophy will not permit him to cease living. We allow him to apply for and get certain social aid. This cost then becomes a social cost, at least in part.

We see then that certain elements of economic activity enjoy certain benefits. Because of the inability (or unwillingness) of these firms to bear the social costs indirectly attached to their venture, they obtain the advantages of lower costs, lower prices, and, ceteris paribus, a wider market for their product. The ability of a business activity to avoid responsibility for these social costs tends to place them in a more favorable market position.

To alleviate this disproportionate absorption of costs, there are fundamentally two means of approach. Both approaches rely on the assumption that the misallocation can be identified.

The first is essentially one of legislation and can be
subdivided two ways. In the case where a firm is not bearing its share of the social costs, a government can institute regulations which cause this firm to pay for any social "damage" done; for example, smoke abatement or stream pollution. The other half of the legislative correction can come through specific taxes levied against those who cause excessive social costs. Neither of these two methods will be treated here.

What does concern us here is the second major rectifying device — that of philanthropy.

Does philanthropy have a proper place in the market system? This question also asks another, "Should we allow the market system to function in such a way as to cover its own shortcomings?" This question is based on a premise that the market system is imperfect.

In the area of employment, for example, not all who wish to be employed can always be hired. Their inability to earn a livelihood causes destitution and sore spots on the market system. This question also asks another, "Does philanthropy have a place in the market system?" It

can easily be seen that chaos would result from allowing the market system to correct itself without the aid of philanthropy. Starvation, disease, and death, along with other serious social consequences, would ensue. Such consequences are not necessarily the basic fault of the market system as a functioning system, but more the results of the setting in which it must operate. The complexity of our present society is so great that the market system causes serious lags that develop due to the slow reaction of one segment of the economy to another. So, before the system can bring about a rectification, a new immense problem is created that takes over and is magnified all out of the original proportion. In some situations, only the philanthropic "shock troop" is adequate to cope with these problems. The inability of the system to absorb all problems requires that the extra pressures be covered by government welfare funds (public philanthropy) and Community Chest agencies (private philanthropy).

Finally, does the vast activity of philanthropy have any tendency to bring about a more equitable distribution of income?

This question bears on the nature of philanthropy and the magnitude of philanthropy. If a wealthy individual gives a sizable portion of his assets to a poor relative, has a re-distribution taken place? Yes, very probably. But since the bulk of general philanthropy is originated by numerous small contributions, we are initiat-

ing very little significant change in the pattern of individual income.

Moreover, there is the question of the comparison of the level of income of the donors and the level of income of the donees. In many areas of philanthropic activity these levels are not particularly far apart. Much of the medical and educational philanthropy is generated by people who are not far removed from the same level of income of the beneficiaries of these services. Vickery concludes that

"... the overall picture would appear to remain one in which the role of philanthropy in (income) redistribution is relatively slight."

No evidence is in sight which makes explicit the sudden demise of philanthropy. With foundation giving growing and government activity in this area expanding, it appears to be a rather permanent fixture on the American scene.

However, the evidence seems to set the compass in a direction towards more public philanthropy. This refers to both government and other large benefactors rather than either personal or collective private philanthropy. Very likely this is a result of the high level of complexity in our society that individuals do not care to sift out the deserving beneficiaries. We are saying that this job is best left to the professionals. And the best way to support these professional almoneers is to provide them with highly organized fund-raising devices, i.e., taxes, government allocations, Community Chest drives, and Red Feather agencies.

While the reasons for philanthropy are ever-changing, and perhaps we have graduated out of the Poor Law category, it appears that there will always remain a need for philanthropy. Only the complete elimination of an inequitable distribution of income has the possibility of cancelling all philanthropic needs. This is not clearly visible on the economic horizon.

Perhaps this is what Maimonides was trying to say as he wrote these words, "... the most meritorious of all, is to anticipate charity by Preventing poverty ...

8 Congressional Record, 1944, 78th Congress, Second Session.
12 Kohn, op. cit., Table 13, p. 49.
14 Vickery, op. cit., p. 45.
Birthday Homage to Dante

By HERBERT H. UMBACH
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The Year of Dante is being observed in Italy during 1965 to mark the 700th birthday of the great writer. Prominent activities will center in Florence where Dante was born in 1265, and in Ravenna where he died in 1321. The Ravenna celebrations begin April 25, to continue through October 31. For an author of his stature, this seems slight indeed — especially when it comes upon the heels of all the hullabaloo last year for Shakespeare’s mere 400th. My essay is an informal tribute to this essential poet whose continuing influence is one of the literary wonders of our world! As for myself, little did I realize how very much his inspiration would mean when, as a student years ago at Cornell University in the Department of The Comparative Study of Literature, I eagerly absorbed his vivid works in the original Italian supplemented with selected translations and criticisms. In all my study and editing of John Donne, as similarly in my teaching especially the graduate course in Milton, it is Dante above others who has shaped the vision and spirit therein.

A modern poet, Mario Speracio, expresses my point metaphorically in a sonnet:

FOR A STATUE OF DANTE
His features look upon the traffic-tossed,
Familiar square of our metropolis.
He tempered scenes of suffering and the lost
With words of beauty, love, and Beatrice.

This man who lashed injustice in his time
Has found the road where saint and sinner stroll;
Unfolding in a golden weave of rhyme
The love and indignation in his soul.

The sob of oceans and the whirl of spheres,
Or winds that finger harps of silver rain;
The melody of angels, touched with tears
For mankind’s grief... and God is heard again

Along our busy Broad Way, where we find
Infernal grief or heaven in the mind.

Dante (or Durante) Alighieri, a man of towering intellect coupled with passionate temperament and mystic devotion, was by turns a scholar, a soldier, one of the six priors who ruled Florence, a prophet, and (for his last twenty years) a political exile. Every thread of this medieval diversity is colorfully reflected in his writings. His was a respectable lineage. Doesn’t everyone, whether or not he has read Dante, know of his reputed meeting with Beatrice when he was nine years old and she a few months younger? Educated first by Dominican monks and later in a Franciscan school, Dante appears to have made an intensive study of the Provencal and early French poets. He experimented with drawing, composed verses of an amorous nature, and developed at least some acquaintance with music.

Don’t consider him a melancholy, young aesthete. Despite the conventionalized portraits of the poet crowned with a wreath, or the sentimental impression which many readers have of him mooning his life away over scornful Beatrice, the real Dante spent much of his career amid intrigue and warfare — thus was, for some years, a man of action (the best training school for writers!). History’s long struggle between the papal party, the Guelfs, and the imperial group, the Ghibellines, was nominally ended: but Florence, still torn by the aftermath of this strife and by local organizations known as the Whites (Bianchi) and the Blacks (Neri) was a hotbed of factions. Essentially, the Church, the Empire, and democracy of a sort were all at loggerheads. Then too, as one party gained power and then another, exile and murder claimed many of Dante’s friends and acquaintances; in one of the battles, that of Campaldino, Dante took part. This practical side of his nature was recognized by his appointment as a Prior aforementioned, to serve as a magistrate for the republic. Moreover, he went on ambassadorial missions for his city. While absent on one such assignment in 1302 he was, as a White, exiled from the city and never went back, though thirteen years later he was invited to return if he would subscribe to certain humiliating conditions. His sterling character is indicated in his refusal, made on the ground that he preferred to watch the sun and stars so as to meditate on the truths of philosophy with honor, rather than come back home under dishonorable terms. The rest of his life he spent in various cities of Italy — Verona, Bologna, Padua — and it is possible that for a time he was even in Paris; but he died in 1321 in Ravenna, an ardent Ghibelline whose services even then were honored by patrons.

His Great Writings

Prominent among his writings is The New Life (Vita Nuova), circa 1291-1300, thirty-one poems principally sonnets and canzoni set into a prose background, a commemoration of Dante’s love for Beatrice according to the current theory of courtly love as transmitted by the poets of France, a literary convention which ultra-idealized womankind. Here it is interesting to observe that Beatrice scarcely knew young Dante, married a banker, and died when our poet was twenty-five; he, meanwhile,
married (about the actual time of the death of Beatrice) Gemma Donati, by whom he had four children.

In addition to sonnets and ballata, several other of his minor writings deserve mention. For example, there is *The Banquet* (*Convito, Conversio*), ?1301-1309. Never finished, it was planned as a general introduction plus a commentary on each of fourteen *canzoni* to be a text on universal knowledge, an attempt to bring philosophy to the layman by providing a feast from the crumbs off the table of the great thinkers. Actually this work is little more than a popular rendering in Italian of the Aristotelian writings by Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, as influenced by Boethius. Here Beatrice appears as an allegory of divine philosophy, no doubt a phase in the apotheosis previously indicated. *On the Vulgar Tongue (De Vulgari Eloquentia, De Volgari Eloquio)*, ?1304, is a document in Latin prose in which Dante defends the use of his native Italian as a literary language, versus Latin for literary works. Its significance is not only for the spirited presentation of the vernacular, but also for its account of current Italian dialects, with precepts on Italian metrics. Again, the author completed merely one-and-a-fraction of the proposed four books. A treatise on politics and government, *On Monarchy (De Monarchia)*, 1313, offers in three books a pro-Ghibelline prose, Latin exposition of Dante’s beliefs concerning the separation of the temporal and spiritual spheres of government: 1) that temporal monarchy is necessary for the good of the world; 2) that the Roman people should rule by Divine will; and 3) that emperors receive their authority directly from God and not from the Pope.

His most important composition was by him given the simple title *The Comedy (La Commedia)*. Begun in 1307, it was finished by 1321. The now-famous adjective “Divine” was added later by his appreciative readers (Has this kind of accolade ever been repeated? who were less constrained by modesty! A comedy it is in the restricted sense or meaning that the book ends happily; no reader will be repaid who looks into it to discover a Falstaff or a Mr. Pickwick. Avowedly the long poem was written to instruct and to improve, rather than to spin a story. Here is a literary epic, like its great successor in Great Britain, John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. Unlike the *Iliad* or the *Song of Roland* or the *Lay of the Nibelungs* or the *Lapponia*, all of which were formed largely from orally transmitted legends and songs, it is the almost entirely fictional creation of one man’s genius. Neither is it a national epic like the *Aeneid*, for its protagonist (Dante himself) is not an embodiment of the traditional virtues of the country; some critics, however, see in it the Italian turmoil of the thirteenth century. With the author as hero, the characters most frequently noticed are the poet’s actual acquaintances or friends as well as foes. What a miraculous blending of such literary types as the Autobiography, the Encyclopedia, the Journey, the Vision, the (what label?) poem in praise of woman, the Allegory, etc. I call it the Ultimate Epic inasmuch as its theme is preparation for the life after death, conspicuously the principal concern of not merely medieval man but of Everyman in all times and places, chiefly motivated by the great Biblical writers and Christian commentators.

### The Medieval Mind

Because Dante lived in an age so different from our own, to understand his technique we first must analyze this phase of the medieval mind. Imprecise though it is, this useful abstraction will assist us to appreciate and understand what the great poem means. Unlike the method of modern science, for instance, which works from observation of facts to some theories confirmed by experiment, the medieval thinker worked from theory to fact—thereby he was disposed to take as unquestionably primary and real the theology and philosophy that supported Scripture. And any facts inconsistent with doctrine were (at least until Galileo’s historic discoveries) ignored, suppressed, or rationalized away. This attitude was poetically characterized by Longfellow in 1865 when he introduced his American translation of *The Divine Comedy* by six original sonnets, two for each part, comparing the poem to a cathedral. Indeed the one is a “medieval miracle of song” as the other is a medieval miracle of stone: in both a Gothic union of opposites, of saints and gargoyles contending for pride of place. Each detail among thousands is worked out with such loving care that it is an artistic entity in itself; yet all are woven into an intricate pattern, a unified whole that produces upon our imagination one literally grand, central effect!

Today we can see that for centuries after the time of St. Augustine (A.D. 354-430), theological and philosophical doctrine was chiefly Platonic in western culture. Plato’s conception of an illusory world of sense and a spiritual realm of real, eternal Ideas supplied the rationale for Christian other-worldliness. Near the close of the Dark Ages, in the monastic islands of learning scattered about Europe, a synthesis had been achieved thereby which gave intellectual stability to the faith. Theology ruled the seven liberal arts, a theology of Augustinian Platonism. Largely responsible for shattering this synthesis was Peter Abelard (1079-1142), a teacher of magnetic personality and commanding intellect, who won numerous converts to his position that the disinterested reason need not be subject to the strictures of theology. Feared, attacked, and persecuted by the Platonists, Abelard nevertheless cleared the way for a battle of philosophies that lasted more than a century, riddling Christendom with charges of heresy and filling the newly founded universities with students eager to gain true instruction from the brilliant though often bitter debates of the scholastic masters.

In other words, with doctrinal civil war raging, the medieval church was in effect without an unifying philosophy. Its appeal to the faithful shifted from the rationalism identified with God the Father and Christ the Judge, to the more intuitive and compelling cult of The Virgin (which Henry Adams’ much later writings such as
Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres have characterized dramatically). Thus it came about that at a time of logical controversy and confusion, of seeming disintegration, the great 13th-century cathedrals soared heavenward by the score from the European plain, monuments of passionate aspiration, prayers in stone to Notre Dame (a theme allegorically useful in William Golding’s latest work, The Spire).

The Thomist Synthesis

Uniquely, this discordant yet creative era reached its climax in the immense intellectual labor of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), whose Summa Theologica finally resolved the ideological crisis by rebuilding church doctrine on a stabilizing foundation which combined the insights of Christian revelation with the complex, encyclopedic philosophy of Aristotle. Imagine the effect of this fresh synthesis upon the most aware minds of that age, especially on those in the fine arts! For centuries Platonic orthodoxy had disdained the sense world as illusory; but now Aquinas, following Aristotle, recognized reality as consisting of two ultimately real constituents: form and matter. Thus the senses were vindicated at last as the bearers of valid knowledge, and art received a powerful impetus to treat the reasoned and revealed Thomist doctrines of the church. Born in the same year when Aquinas began his commentaries on Aristotle, Dante became not merely one of the first but without doubt the greatest of writers to benefit from this revolution in western thought. His art assimilated all these diverse elements, to embody them in his Divine Comedy as a poem which is both a cathedral in words raised in Platonic adoration of a heavenly lady, plus a splendidly organized edifice of rational thought based squarely on Aristotle through Aquinas.

In his 1963 The Failure of Theology in Modern Literature, John Killinger aptly remarks: “Probably more credit than is necessary is given to Thomas Aquinas for Dante’s theology and not enough to such figures as Augustine, Boethius, and Albertus Magnus; but certainly much of the Commedia appears to be a literary paraphrase of the Summa Theologica of the great Dominicans.” Among examples listed, are the idea of having Virgil (symbol of Reason) as guide through the Inferno and much of the Purgatorio; the concept throughout of the Primum Mobile that motivates all things to movement by love; refutation of the Platonic doctrine of the plurality of souls (Purgatorio, IV); the entelechy of souls (Ibid., XXV); important discussions of the dual nature of Christ in Canticles II and XIII of the Paradiso, or of the Trinity in its Canticles X and XXIV; evident allusion to the seven sacraments in Canto XXIX of the Purgatorio, especially the treatment of baptism in its Canto IX; “substance” and “accident” in sacramental thought in Paradiso XXXIII; reiteration of the older doctrine of the Seven Deadly Sins, especially hybris; and the pregnant discussions of free will in Canticles XVI, XVIII, and XXI of the Purgatorio and Canto XVII of the Paradiso. You might say that Dante wrote a literary analogue on the Summa, were it not that other, more popular qualities abound in his Commedia.

Fineness of Detail

Evermore, the poem has been the illustrator’s delight (notably William Blake and Gustave Dore) because it is filled with pictures etched in acid, particularly those in the Inferno. Through the caverns of Hell roar rivers of blood. The devils douse each other in pools of boiling pitch. Or through forests of thorn trees the suicides run naked and screaming, pursued by hounds and harpies. Thieves are tormented by serpents, are transfixed by them and then transformed into them. Out of the void below rises an intolerable stench. And at the last extreme and lowest point of Hell, Satan as a foul, three-headed monster with his jaws and claws rends the flesh of history’s most loathsome traitors: Judas, Brutus, and Cassius! For pictorial imagination Dante’s endowments may profitably be contrasted with Milton’s. In depicting Hell, the English poet uses broad, exaggerated strokes — and achieves imaginative sublimity. Dante, on the contrary, gives an exact or minute delineation — and presents unflinching realism. Where Milton is abstract and indefinite, the Italian poet is concrete and detailed. For each of these visionaries you can add: symmetry, balance, antithesis, climax — and sometimes for both, tediousness, prosiness (in philosophical passages), obscurity, even grotesqueness. But who can say whether Dante’s terza rima style actually surpasses Milton’s blank verse?

Anyway, Dante is not only the sternest; he is the tenderest of poets. Francesca da Rimini has caught the world’s sympathy as she draws her breath in pain to tell her story, for “a sorrow’s crown of sorrows is remembering happier things.” From the Mount of Purgatory the hymns and prayers ascend in lyrical passages, one after another. The Gate of Purgatory turns on its hinges to the murmur of the Te Deum. Morning begins with the Lord’s Prayer, and evening is greeted with the Compline Hymn, last service of devotion. Such softer, lyrical accents are ideally appropriate to the mood of atoning mercy and hope of blessedness. Above it all, in Paradise there is ecstasy! The beatific revelation literally is out-of-this-world. We can forgive Dante for being less convincing in presenting this highest joy — “The Love which moves the sun and the other stars” — than he was in his descriptions of Hell’s atrocities and Purgatory’s milder torments. After all, he had only his own earthly experience to draw upon, supplemented by what he heard or read in others’ fortunes.

Every line, each detail has multiple meaning. The action of the poem begins on Good Friday of the year 1300, at which time Dante who was born in 1265 had reached the middle of the Scriptural threescore years and ten, nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita. It ends on the First Sunday after Easter, making in all 10 days. The story of the progress tripartite marches along hand in hand.
hand with implications as to the human spirit much as Dante himself advanced through these regions under the guidance of Virgil, of Cato, and of Beatrice. Indeed the reader soon finds that Virgil here stands for philosophy and natural religion just as Beatrice represents theology and revealed religion. Moreover, according to the thought common in Dante’s time, the physical order reflects and expresses the spiritual order which is the ultimate reality. Since the poem professes to be an image of the entire cosmos, physical and spiritual, it too is structured in terms of that order. The abstract form of that order is expressed by a numerological system based on three, the symbol of the Trinity; this is raised to nine (3x3, symbol of earthly perfection, as embodied for instance in Christ), and lifted to the level of ten (symbol of divine perfection and completeness). The Divine Comedy is thus divided into three sections—the famous Inferno, Purgatorio, Paradiso—each of which contains thirty-three Cantos. The total ninety-nine is raised to one hundred (10x10) by the addition of an extra Canto in Inferno. Each section is likewise subdivided into three parts, further sectioned into seven units (symbol of the Christian mystery). These seven are raised to nine by the addition of two other units differing in kind from the first seven, and this is raised to ten by the addition of yet another category on an entirely different plane of being. The structure of the poem thus reflects the nature of the universe as it was understood in Dante’s day: an orderly, closed system surrounded by God.

As T.S. Eliot, a prime mover in the modern Dante revival, suggests—begin with the surface attractions; but no creative reader will remain there. Actually there are four levels of meaning on which the poem was conceived and written, stated Dante himself in the celebrated letter to his patron Can Grande. The literal action of this other-worldly journey is fundamental; but every event in it has significance on a moral plane, giving mankind insight into the conduct of his personal life; then on an allegorical plane, describing the dissensions and potential remedy of man’s life-in-community; and finally on what the author labeled the anagogical plane, wherein the soul is shown apart from all earthly concerns, moving toward God, its eternal destination. Indeed, then, e’n la sua volontade e nostra pace, “in His will is our peace!”

Not that these things are difficult in themselves,
But the deficiency is on thy side,
For yet thou hast not vision so exalted.
(Paradiso, XXX, 79-81)

This fourfold method, while setting up the rich, multidimensional symbolism of the greatest epic, does not in itself explain the magnitude of Dante’s achievement. What makes great literature great? In the last analysis our interest must concentrate on exploring the powerful mind that included and used and transcended the technique of presentation, on the fertile imagination that envisioned in musical cadences the names and shapes which characterize the entire range of man’s responses to the dilemmas and temptations of his mortal pilgrimage. Par excellence, a masterpiece will communicate spiritual attitudes! Even for those readers unable to share the articles of Dante’s faith, or for those who find his scholastic thought supplanted by the empirical methods of science, there remain these penetrating, endlessly suggestive images of the human situation, which disclose new profundities of idea and interrelationship with each re-reading. Here, ultimately, Dante’s greatness rests: in the grandeur of scale and depth of understanding with which he brings an universe of forms and meanings within the focus of one sustained and well-ordered vision. Such is the emergence of Dante in the final twilight of the Middle Ages and the dawning half-light of the Renaissance: the first personal poet, already mightier than any to come after him. Translators, commentators, critics, and researchers will come and go—as in all good scholarship—but the Commedia goes on forever!

Compare the present literary scene with the accomplishment of Dante, for example. His Commedia, which remains perennially one of the most exciting artistic achievements of all time, is a supreme example of the ability of the Christian poet to combine theology and the creative impulse. In a perfect fusion of theme and method, story and allegory, the threefold panorama of Inferno, Purgatorio, and Paradiso unfolds before the reader as an incomparable blend of the Italian and the eschatological, the local and the universal, the timely and the timeless. Faith and culture reinforce each other and speak with an almost unbelievable univocalism.

(Theilmann, p. 17 and 18)

The majority of poems one outgrows and outlives, as one outgrows and outlives the majority of human passions: Dante’s is one of those which one can only just hope to grow up to at the end of life.

(T.S. Eliot, Selected Essays, p. 212)
It was good to see Bill Naughton’s “All in Good Time,” one of the great hits in London — not because it is a great or good play but, on the contrary, because it is probably the most unimportant play that has been written in our time. It has craftsmanship, but I could not think of any compelling urgency why anyone would want to sit down to write this play. However, after one has been exposed to the scatalogic dramaturgy of LeRoi Jones in his one-acter “The Toilet,” or to the irrational terror of Harold Pinter’s “The Room” and “A Slight Ache” with the banalities of everyday pounding at you with a menacing gesture and literary pretension, Mr. Naughton’s irrelevancy came as a great relief, if not as a surprise.

The entire show was shipped from London to Broadway with the inimitable atmosphere of the low-low middle class in a small-small place in the North of England. The non-problem is the wedding of a young couple with the ensuing result of their unconsummated marriage and how through a great deal of misunderstanding the wings of their souls make their bodies finally respond. Leaving the theatre one has the feeling that this middle-class couple will live happily ever after.

The play has all the popular ingredients needed: a touch of humor and whimsicality, characters you meet everyday or know so well because everything about them is life-born cliche. But these characters are sure-fire types of standard comedy and, though their problems are boring and the way they tick uninteresting, you begin to like them in the third act against your better taste and dramaticurgetic knowledge. It is the “togetherness” of the ensemble that makes all the difference.

Whatever weakness The Association of Producing Artists, now playing at the Phoenix Theatre, may have, they have shown a consistency and relatively high level in their productions. And what is so important about them is their daring to present a repertoire that has a literary profile and theatrical vigor. They put on Shaw’s “Man and Superman” with the rarely included “Don Juan in Hell” discussion, and it was a Shavian production par excellence. Ellis Rabb, the founder of this group, gave Jack Tanner the living spirit of Bernard Shaw himself, the man who talked about people and ideas with tongue-lashing clarity, but could not save himself from becoming the victim of the world’s wiles.

The other play this group produced was a dramatized version of Tolstoy’s “War and Peace.” The tremendous canvas this novel presents was reduced by the adaptors (Alfred Neumann, Erwin Piscator, and Guntram Prüfer) to a minimum of action, didactic in its purpose, enlightening in its story. Behind the fate of sixteen figures grows the monumental lie of war with scene after scene which, in an epic approach, were tightly interwoven. Peter Wexler skillfully designed a scenic image in which the people were moved like figures in a chess game by a narrator in modern dress who sometimes overemphasized the “message” of the play. But the entire presentation proved the high potentiality that lies in repertory theatre per se and in Ellis Rabb’s group in particular.

The most impressive example of how repertory theatre functions was shown by the Moscow Art Theatre, the oldest theatre group in existence, which started its activities in 1897. It made its director, Stanislavsky, world famous and has been associated with the works of Chekhov from its very beginning — and is still doing Chekhov to perfection. The Moscow Art Theatre came to the New York City Center for a four-week stand. It presented “The Cherry Orchard” and “The Three Sisters” and proved that its actors do not play parts, but live an experience of human beings belonging to a certain world of mind and feeling — be it Chekhov’s or Gogol’s or anyone else’s. Although the Stanislavsky style has undergone changes, the company has essentially preserved its realistic approach and never tries to update any of its plays. Their production of Gogol’s “Dead Souls” proved the main point of the repertory idea, the metamorphic ability of the actors to create different characters with all the nuances of difference.

We cannot expect to learn it overnight. This is probably why Kazan and Whitehead failed with their Lincoln Repertory Theatre and were forced to relinquish their posts. Two young New Yorkers, Herbert Blau and Jules Irving, who successfully conducted a workshop in San Francisco for several years will take their places. Theirs will not be an easy task since they must transfer their concept of a workshop with all its experimental freedom onto a higher, more precarious plane in a far more competitive atmosphere in which the critical eyes are as merciless as the scope of their activity will be widened and demanding. They are expected to be as commercially acceptable as any other Broadway show without losing sight of experimentation and the higher aims of a literary theatre. They will be asked to whip a company of individualistic actors into an ensemble that is able and willing to become a homogeneous entity. They will move into a brand new theatre on Lincoln Center, our cultural supermarket, with all the hazards of a not yet lived-in, played-in theatre. I suppose Messrs. Blau and Irving will not be in an easy nor enviable position. The hopes and prayers of all those who love the theatre for its own sake are with them.
There may be some who believe because they have been told to believe, because some authority has told them that they can—and must—believe. And there are many who try to believe and who try to suppress their doubts, only to feel guilty when they realize that they cannot simply believe. They cannot live in what Tillich calls a medieval castle, secure from the attacks of doubt. And there are yet others who can only doubt, yet in the split-level houses of their lives they wish desperately to believe.

What, then, can we say about doubt and the Christian? The story of Thomas in the Gospel for the First Sunday after Easter may be of help to us. The account is a portion of the Fourth Gospel, that traditionally ascribed to St. John. It is generally agreed today that this Gospel stands apart from the other three, the Synoptic Gospels. Its author was seeking to combat a misunderstanding of who Jesus was, a misunderstanding which he was convinced could dissolve the meaning of Jesus’ life, death, and resurrection. There were those who came of Greek background and rejected the human Jesus. They spoke of his human form as having the appearance only of humanity. He was the Son of God—but not really a son of man. God could not suffer; God could not die and rise again; therefore the Son of God could not do so either. Possibly the eternal Son was temporarily united with the human Jesus at his baptism, but disappeared before the agonies of the cross. Against this John insisted that the eternal Word of God became flesh and dwelled among us; he died, and from his side came out blood and water. Or, in the words of the same author in the Epistle, “This is he who came by water and the blood, Jesus Christ, not with water only (of baptism) but with water and the blood (of the cross).” He was the incarnate Son of God, the eternal Christ come in true human form—incarnate, crucified, dead, raised, glorified by God. But men see him differently—so at the center of the Gospel is the story of a man born blind. If men are blind, if they live in darkness, they cannot really see him. They misinterpret his actions; they cannot understand his words; they are offended by his cross; they reject him. Or, if their eyes have been opened by faith, they live in his light; seeing him, they see the Father; knowing him, they know the truth; hearing him, they obey him; abiding in him, they abide in love; believing him—and believing in him—they have life.

Men might see him physically, but not really see him. They might have sight, but not insight. Seeing is not believing; rather, believing is seeing.

This central theme of the man whom the eyes of sight could see but the Son of God whom the eye of faith alone can see—this is vividly represented in the story of Thomas. And our concern about doubt and the Christian focuses upon him.

Note, first, what Thomas is not. He is not the kind of person of whom we spoke who would squelch his doubts. He would heed no demand to stop doubting. There were authoritative witnesses of the resurrected Lord. The other disciples, his companions, told him, “We have seen the Lord.” But he would not bow to their authority. He had to know, to see for himself. He would not flee from his freedom to think and decide for himself. He sought no escape from freedom in order to escape from the anxiety and meaninglessness of the previous days. He knew that any castle secure from all doubt was not built on the solid rock of reality. Perhaps he knew that all the disciples had doubted the reports that Jesus had been raised from the dead. In St. Luke’s words, what was reported “seemed to them like old wives’ tales, and they did not believe.” Or, as St. Matthew recorded, “when they saw him they worshipped him, but some doubted.”

Doubt cannot be forced to bow before authority. To do so is to stifle curiosity, to deny man’s freedom to choose. Scientific research, intellectual investigation, social protest and reform, as well as theological discussion, are impossible in a convention-bound authoritarian system or society. They are possible only when men assert their freedom to question authority: textbook, teacher, and specialist; President, House Un-American Activities Committee, and Supreme Court; church, Bible, and theologian. And above all, religious growth is impossible when faith is made the acceptance of truths, propositions, or creeds because they have been said to be true by some authority. Doubt is not the antithesis of faith; in fact, as Thomas experienced, it may be a part of faith.

Some commentators have suggested that Thomas was above all a pessimist, more a man of despair than a man of doubt. It was he who said, on hearing of the death of Lazarus, “Let us go with him and die with him.” It was he who had asked the question of Jesus, “Lord, we do not know where you are going; how can we know the way?” Now Jesus had died; Judas was dead. Thomas had not died. Rather, he had found a worse death, the death of hope, the end of all meaning and purpose. The awakened joy and faith of the other disciples simply sharpened his own mood of death and despair.
He was not an intellectual skeptic who sought visible proof; he was a despairing man who needed hope. The assertion he made, "Unless I see, I will not believe," represented an attitude of radical questioning of a man who had gazed into the abyss of meaninglessness. In effect he said, as did Kierkegaard, "The thing is to find a truth which is true for me, to find the idea for which I can live and die." Or, as Luther knew so well, and wrote in a sermon for this text, "It is not sufficient simply to believe that Jesus rose from the dead, for that produces neither peace nor joy; I must believe that he rose for my sake." Thomas was bearing his own cross; in his own way he was crucified with Christ.

The new life with Christ, the life of faith—like the resurrection itself—does not come like the automatic happy ending of fairy tales. It does not grow on the fat diet of theological certainty, moral self-satisfaction, and spiritual pride. It is nurtured by humility, the consciousness of sin, a sense of failure and inability not only to understand but also to become what we ought to be. It is nurtured by despair and doubt. The life of faith is the way of the cross that crucifies our glib and confident self-assertion. God brings life only out of death, hope only out of despair, victory only out of defeat. To paraphrase Tennyson, "There lies more faith in honest doubt and real despair than in half the creeds." Thomas' despair about life showed his passion for life; his doubt was a venture—a venture of faith.

Though in doubt and despair, Thomas did not forsake the company of the disciples. According to the account, he was with them the Sunday after Easter when they gathered again in the upper room. Again, the doors being locked. Christ in his risen glory came and stood in the midst of them, greeting them in familiar fashion. Then, addressing Thomas, he invited him to see, to touch, as he had demanded. "Put your finger in my side, if a test in necessary," he seems to say. But Thomas needs no proof. Without touching him, immediately he makes a confession of faith, "My Lord and my God." Once Thomas had demanded physical proof for spiritual truth; now when it was offered to him, it was not necessary. And the theme of the Fourth Gospel is driven home in the words of Jesus, "Have you believed because you have seen? Blessed are those who have not seen and yet believe."

For all of us, then, faith and doubt exist side by side. The Christian life is in constant tension between faith and doubt, between light and darkness, between believing and being offended. Sometimes faith is triumphant; sometimes doubt. Neither can be eliminated as long as we are human. Doubt cannot be suppressed, cannot be ignored. But faith can include doubt; it can say, Yes, I believe, in spite of the No of doubt. Faith can be doubtful about anything—doctrines, symbols, myths, ethics, churches, historical stories, or even about the proposition that God exists. Faith can be doubtful even about itself. Men of faith have their greatest doubts when they look at their own faith. They have no faith in their faith. Faith never has certainty when it looks at itself, but only when it looks at its object, which is also its source. We know then that even when we do decide to follow him, it is because he has first chosen us. We seek to obey him and he gives us power.

On Second Thought

The streets of New York seem to sprout sidewalk preachers, steadfastly proclaiming salvation while half their audience smiles and half listens soberly hoping to find a hope, and the patient policeman keeps the tiny crowd from blocking traffic. One, a woman preacher, was being proudly attacked by a teen-age girl who hoped to achieve status in the eyes of her admiring friends. To every sophisticated argument of the girl, the woman had only one rejoinder: an angry shout, "God saves!" A friend asked me: "Was she casting her pearls before swine?" I neither knew nor asked which one he meant.

There were no pearls there, and neither the girl nor the woman was a swine. The girl was in great need, fighting in desperate fear to keep her individual head above the morass of finitude, refusing to surrender to the impending conviction that she is nothing and counts for nothing. She cast no pearls, because she threw out her words in contempt. She hoped to become something by proving that the woman was less than her nothing.

Worse, the words that God saves, or even that He has saved, are no pearls by themselves. They were not spok-
A sincere student of music never fails to find new facets of beauty and meaning in masterpieces and near-masterpieces, no matter how often he has heard them.

I have no patience whatever with those who dredge the depths of their supposedly impressive learning and speak of some acknowledged classics as out of date, trite, and utterly devoid of appeal to sophisticated men and women of our age. “By this time,” they tell us, “Beethoven’s *Fifth Symphony* has outlived much of its usefulness. We have heard it so often that it has begun to weary us.”

Then there are those who cannot muster courage enough to inveigh against Beethoven’s *Fifth Symphony* but consider themselves free from all danger when they spout fire and brimstone against, let us say, Antonín Dvořák’s *Symphony from the New World*. Only they customarily call this work the *New World Symphony*, which is not the correct title.

Not long ago I heard Dvořák’s fine composition ecoriated in a way that made my blood boil. “Our time is too valuable,” said a group of hoity-toity Dvořák-baiters, “to be wasted by listening to the *New World Symphony*.” For one reason or another they had never learned that the composer did not give such a title to the work. Maybe knowledge of what Dvořák himself called this symphony would have induced them to open their prejudiced ears with a little more eagerness, curiosity, and appreciation. Who knows?

Call me a dolt, a curmudgeon, or a pedant if you like. Nevertheless, I confess in all sincerity and without bending the knee to hypersophistication that I discover something new in Beethoven’s *Fifth Symphony* and in Dvořák’s *Symphony from the New World* every time I listen to, or read the scores of, these works.

Thoughts about what I choose to call the hypersophistication of some so-called devotees of music invariably bob up in my mind during the Lenten season, when, as has been my custom for many years, I restudy Johann Sebastian Bach’s *The Passion of Our Lord According to St. Matthew* and *The Passion of Our Lord According to St. John*. How often I have heard these two masterpieces decried as old-fashioned and boring! I have long since stopped counting such inane denunciations, just as I have long since ceased to pay serious attention to those who have acquired and fostered the sickening habit of fulminating against Handel’s *Messiah* as an oratorio that has become boringly hackneyed.

But another question keeps coming to the surface. Is Bach’s *St. Matthew Passion* a greater masterpiece than his *St. John Passion*? Many scholars equipped with far more learning than I can ever hope to acquire have answered yes. Although I have profound respect for their erudition, I must admit in all conscience that I do not know and probably never will know. To me this question is altogether irrelevant.

Permit me to bore you with a frequently repeated little tale. Once upon a time someone asked a famous conductor which of Johannes Brahms’s four symphonies he regarded as the greatest. “The one I happen to be conducting,” was the reply.

Therefore if you ask me which of Bach’s two passions I prefer, I must answer by saying, “The one I happen to be listening to and studying.”

To me it is poppycock pure and simple to say that the purely musical aspects of the *St. Matthew Passion* reveal greater maturity than one can find in the *St. John Passion*. It would be exceedingly difficult to prove such a statement. In fact, I consider it altogether impossible to do so. You may have more than one good reason for preferring the *St. Matthew Passion* to the *St. John Passion* or for placing the *St. John Passion* above the *St. Matthew Passion*. I have no such reasons. But I refuse to argue or quarrel with you if you have them. Nor would I ever engage in a tilt with you if you were to tell me that in your opinion Bach’s *Mass in B Minor* is a greater work than the two passions, or vice versa. Preferences, you see, are fine. Music thrives on them. But no one has the right to say that preferences or predilections represent the sum total of absolute truth. Although I refuse point-blank to wrangle with anyone for preferring this or that masterpiece to another masterpiece, I do object to professing the top of my bent when hypersophisticated individuals declare to the top of their bent that many monumental works of the past have outlived much of their usefulness.

Sometime ago courtesy compelled me to listen with much forbearance to a disquisition on Beethoven’s *Fifth Symphony*. “This work,” said the learned speaker, “has become somewhat moldy from age.” Nevertheless, I shall point out a few striking characteristics. Note the trip­lets at the very beginning of the first movement! They hit you between the eyes!” *Triplets* indeed! Had the perpetrator of this foul disquisition ever looked at the score? Could he read music? Could he count? Where had he seen *triplets*? His so-called scholarship was completely askew. So, by the way, is the so-called learning of those who sneer when someone tells them that it is always possible to discover new facets of beauty and meaning in great works that came into being a long time ago — works like Beethoven’s *Fifth Symphony*, Dvořák’s *Symphony from the New World*, Bach’s two passions, and Handel’s *Messiah*. 
Perhaps no time in the history of the architecture of public buildings has been so challenging as the time since the close of World War II. The unspeakable horror of the bombings in human dimensions have been detailed and retold a thousand times. Even the loss, in terms of architecture, has been rather thoroughly recorded. The "before and after" pictures have filled many books.

The interpretation of this latter took thousands of pictures. The evaluation has, however, taken a longer time and, it is only now that studies of the completed schemes can begin to tell the full story of the soul-searching work which many of the architects labored over so thoughtfully and with a fresh approach to the liturgy of the church.

A case in point is the marvelous restoration work done by Dr. Rudolf Schwarz of Cologne for the Church of Our Lady in Trier. This rather mediocre church had been erected originally in the middle of the thirteenth century. During World War II it was severely damaged. The restoration of the bomb damage was done largely through a special fraternity called "Builders of Our Lady", directed by the architect Matthias Hemgesberg.

After the walls of the building had been thoroughly and safely restored and large sections of the roof replaced, the reconstituted interior was to be designed on the basis of an architectural competition. Two architects from Trier, Thoma and Marx, were invited; as were also the Cologne Cathedral architect, Dr. Willy Weyres, and the winner, Dr. Rudolf Schwarz. Out of the excellent designs of all these people, the proposal of Dr. Schwarz was finally given preference.

Inside the beautiful polygonal form of the main nave, which was correctly oriented, Dr. Schwarz created a very distinctive direction for the eye by constituting all the elements of the "chancel" into a "holy island." This "island" creates the sacred space in a most interesting fashion.

The altar was moved forward to the extreme front edge slightly ahead of the two main east pillars. To the left and right of the main altar ambons were affixed as pulpit and lectern to the great piers of the chancel. The high altar is placed on two steps which lead westward into the circular space for communion while, running away toward the east, it is bound up with the sacramental altar. This space can be used from both sides so that it can serve the main altar as well as small gatherings in the east chancel. Around the sacramental altar there is seating so that small groups can easily be served at Holy Communion.

The church is connected to a lovely baptismal chapel and the portal of the church forms a beautiful "break" between the church and the chapel. Ordinarily the way between the two is completely unimpaired but there are great sheets of glass, as well as portals of the same material, which close off the chapel and yet leave the view of the main church and altar area open.

In spite of the great antiquity of the building and its almost total restoration one feels the touch of the master architect, Schwarz, in giving a truly modern "interpretation" of the feeling about the modern liturgy.
Books of the Month

Toward That Brave New World

If book reviews with a Savonarola flavor are not to your taste, read no further. This is an angry report, simmered through years of growing hostility to the inhuman use of technology on human beings, and brought to full boil in the last month by a reading of four books:


Hilled Black. *They Shall Not Pass* (Morrow, 1963, $4.95, 342pp.).

Myron Brenton. *The Privacy Invaders* (Coward-McCann, 1964, $4.95, 240pp.).


There is a conspiracy abroad in the land, a massive and growing conspiracy, to transform each of us into a completely inscrutable object. In government, in schools, in business, the snoops are on full salary, clothed in the respectable garb of science, and armed with a frightening array of weapons. Their goal is "the open society," but open in nothing like the sense which Karl Popper intended. Vance Packard catches their intention better with *The Naked Society*. They wish to strip us from every shred of privacy, to spread on the record every detail of his life, and by audacious "brain watching" to place even the secret thoughts of a man's heart in the public domain.

Hyperbole? Reviewer's license? If you are inclined to think so, read either Packard or Brenton. Both books are carefully constructed descriptions of what goes on today: of spying credit agencies and government investigators, of lie detectors in industry and wire-taps everywhere, of privacy slaughtered on the altar of some nebulous higher social good. Or you might begin with Martin Gross' 75-cent anti-conspiratorial companion.

Gross has thoroughly examined the phenomenon of psychological testing. He offers the reader a comprehensive inventory: types of tests, where they're used, how they're used. If you haven't already had a chance to expose yourself to these tests, chances are good that you will. Psychologists and pseudo-psychologists have smelled the big green. They have detected the witching lust in each of us to know more about others than they care to reveal, more even than they know about themselves. They have fallen all over one another like hungry prostitutes in the race to satisfy this lust in anyone from a corporate personnel manager to a seminary admissions officer. They have touted their wares with a threat and a promise. Keep out the misfit! And we can spot the misfit for a nominal fee.

And so new job candidates, candidates for promotion, and candidates for seminars (law schools, according to Gross, have displayed more sense) must make up little stor-
Two New Books About the Bible

Prof. Markus Barth’s Conversation With the Bible (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston) is a helpful book. Because of the distinctiveness of its approach as a kind of introduction to reading and studying the Bible, it is a fine addition to the abundance of books in the same area which have been appearing lately. The book has an emphatic theological interest. Barth is concerned with more than descriptions of “the faith of Israel,” or “the message of the New Testament.” Beginning with these and attempting always to work out of them, he is equally engaged in the question of the on-going meaning of the Bible, its importance for men today. This is the fundamental value of the book. Barth writes his book as an invitation to his readers to get in on the conversation taking place in the Bible. The author’s choice of the idea of “conversation” to group his discussions about has some happy and some not-so-happy aspects to it. It has the advantage of setting forth the tremendous importance of the “word” in the Bible. Barth is able to make use of an abundance of material from both testaments to illustrate the living discourse and dialogue going on in the Scriptures. This he does in an oftentimes exciting way. The conversation going on in the Bible is many-sided. In the Old Testament we listen in on the exchanges between God and His specially chosen spokesmen, prophets, priests, and the like. We hear God speaking to Israel and the people responding to God. In the New Testament we hear the conversations between Christ and God, between the Son and the Father. And this intimate conversation within God Himself is expanded to include many other listeners and responders in the various writings of the New Testament. Surely the notion of “conversation” preserves something of the living character of the Word over against the legalist as well as the rationalist approach, both of which from their opposite poles end up with a dead letter.

But the idea of conversation breaks down at certain important points. Is the Word of the Bible really best described as “conversation”? During the past few years, at least, the idea of conversation or dialogue has come to acquire (especially in churchly circles) a special kind of meaning. An “ecumenical conversation,” for example, presupposes that everyone will have an equal right to speak and be listened to. But do we have this kind of conversation going on in the Bible? Often the latter depicts the one on the speaking end as judge, and the hearers as the judged. Only the judge has the right to speak, and every mouth must be stopped before Him. Sometimes God, the offended Lord, is said to have a “controversy” with His people. What kind of conversation is going on in the protests of the suffering ones in the laments of the Old Testament? The problem with describing the Bible as “a conversation between lovers” is that it tends to flatten out the separation between the lover and the loved. It passes too rapidly over what had to happen to make the conversation between man and God, and God and man, possible in the first place. It is significant that the atonement plays a relatively small role in Barth’s whole description of the Bible as “conversation.”

Somewhat along this same line is Barth’s polemic at a number of points against the Lutheran concern to distinguish between Law and Gospel. He finds unfavorable “the distinction between two sorts of words that God has addressed to man” (p. 43). In place of this Barth prefers to speak of the one word of gracious judgment, and makes the strong implication that Lutherans must learn to use more of the Scripture than Romans and Galatians. But it must be asked of Barth what room he has, in subsuming all of Scripture under grace, for the prophetic denunciations or the condemning ring of much of the Gospels. One can still argue that Luther was able to account for large quantities of the Scripture under the realities of judgment and grace.

All this serves to indicate that we have two Barths at work in this book. There is Barth the exegete and Barth the theologian. Perhaps the great worth of this book is that it represents a challenge to biblical scholars to stick their necks out on theological issues. For it is only too easy to rest when we have settled the problem of the text. Barth’s willingness to pass on to broader theological issues should be an incentive for others to attempt the same.

For whom is this book written? It occurred to the reviewer in studying the book that it will have particular interest for those who teach Bible at a college level, and possibly also some involved in teaching at various levels in the congregation. Just about every problem encountered in teaching the Bible today is dealt with somewhere in this book. The work should consequently find potential readers among a wide variety of individuals.

With the publication of E.A. Speiser’s Genesis the first volume of the Anchor Bible has come off the press, a series which has been widely publicized and awaited. This first volume is surely no disappointment. The work done on Genesis in the way of introduction to the problems and nature of the book, as well as the translation, notes, and comment, is clean, crisp, and, from a critical point of view, extremely well-balanced. The work is the product of a mind which has long lived with and carefully weighed the vast literature and historical materials relevant to any discussion of Genesis today. Prof. Speiser moves with amazing perspicacity through the most complicated problems confronting the expositor of Genesis. These include the problem of history and ancient Near Eastern mythology, documentary sources and oral tradition, and the problems peculiar to the patriarchal narratives. His first-hand knowledge of extra-Biblical material results in incisive judgments at numerous points. This means that the Genesis volume will take its place as an independent work which will doubtless become a standard reference in the study of this first book of the Old Testament. One can place it next to Gerhard von Rad’s commentary on the same book. The two supplement each other well, von Rad supplying the more directly theological material absent from the Anchor discussion.

Presumably the subsequent volumes in the Anchor Bible series will follow the format of this first volume. To this reviewer this is one of the most attractive characteristics of the volume. By the simple arrangement of the material the reader knows exactly where he is at any time. The format presents first the translation, then the grounds and bases of the translation, and finally comments on the unit as a whole. Speiser’s principles of textual criticism and translation are carefully worked out, as he describes them in the introduction. He follows the Septuagint in a number of instances, but only in connection with a respectful treatment of the masoretic text. The comments are generally brief, treating selected problems of the text at times they tend toward quite intricate discussion. So, for instance, the comments on Cain and Abel (pp. 31-33) consist of a treatment of two special linguistic problems.

Genesis makes us wonder what sort of readership these volumes are assuming. In the forward by the general editors (W.F. Albright and D.N. Freedman), the series is directed to “the general reader with no special formal training in biblical studies.” But a perusal of the volume shows that this general reader will quite frequently be taken into extensive discussions of a textual, linguistic, and historical nature. It will require patience and not a small amount of frustration on the part of the non-specialized reader to get through to the end. Yet, if he can do so, he will be introduced, as well as one can, to some of the exciting materials illuminating the first book of the Bible.

WALTER E. RAST

WORTH NOTING

The Prophets on Main Street

By J. Elliott Corbett (John Knox Press, paper, $2.00)

There will be those who say that this book goes too far; it puts words in the mouths of the prophets. That it does. The Prophets on Main Street is more than arbitrary use of the message of the prophets, because the author does not merely up-date the prophetic utterances without a real concern for their original intention and their socio-cultural context.

Careful introductions preface each selection, providing for the initiate a brief overview of the biographical background of the original prophet, the historical situation to which he spoke, and the author’s reasons for the application to which he puts their message today.

The recast prophetic messages which speak to the Christian churches of the United States
— to both leaders and laymen — form the heart of the book. Readers may agree with the rewritten prophecies as little as the prophets' hearers concurred with their analysis. It is unlikely that ministers will accept such recastings as that of Amos' message:

I am not a called preacher who must depend for his security upon these who hire him; who must please the people of the pews, but not necessarily the God of the heavens. My calling is of God, for I am only a poor shepherd and the pruner of fruit trees. But the Lord took me from following the flock, and the Lord said to me, "Go, prophesy to my people of America." (cf. Amos 7:14-15)

Unfortunately the author is better at analyzing the evils of the present than he is in recasting the promises of God (of which he does very little). "You are my witness...and my servant whom I have chosen" (Is. 43:10), becomes, "I have never had a chosen people except those who chose to serve me." This is no longer the assurance of God's care, but a new judgment! This strong word of the book satisfies; in other ways it leaves one remembering that as we become more massive in population and as space declines, we are "representative" and not "participate" less in our government. The representatives become first administrators, then a type of "elite" cast up by the party system. An "elite" is not bad to Miss Arendt if it is chosen in the proper way. But she would like our present system, controlled to a large degree from above, to be reversed and built up from the bottom. Local groups would select representatives and they others until a full governmental pyramid had been erected. In this way a "political elite sprung up from the people" could be created, with the power both to govern and to reconcile equality with authority in mass society.

Prof. Arendt has written a challenging book, drawing mostly on Classical and European thinkers. The book might have been deeper and some of its applications clearer had she also made use of Eastern and contemporary American political thought.

H. SAMUEL HAMOD

World Communism: The Disintegration of a Secular Faith

By Richard Lowenthal (Oxford, $6.00)

The initial direct public confrontation between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, in the spring of 1960, resulted in a substantial change in the approach and the quantity of literature on the subject of Soviet Communism. Up to this date, most of the writing had centered on Communism as a single variable in international politics. The category of "monolithic, international movement" was assigned to it as late as the campaign for President of the United States in 1964. As the so-called "Sino-Soviet rift" has obtained more and more visibility, scholars and more off-hand observers have gained the confidence to throw off the inhibitions of official American policy and the old and simple categories. The changed approach now sees Communism as a proliferated phenomenon to be identified by national origins. The terms Chinese Communism and Yugoslav Communism are now familiar.

As with any change, many observers were ready, after 1960, with new categories to explain the new situation. One of the most popular of these was the concept of "national interest." The thesis here is that Communism as an ideology had merely been an expedient which Russia and China had used to cover up national aims. The expedient had worn thin so now it was to be discarded. The confusing factor in this explanation was the fact that the debate or confrontation continued on ideological grounds.

Richard Lowenthal manages a significant contribution to the understanding of the phenomenon of "national Communism" without a retreat to simple categories. In fact, the book attempts to develop the complexity of the explanation. Of special significance in this respect is the considerable attention that is directed to the experience of Yugoslavia and the similarity of this confrontation with that between the Soviet and Chinese Communist Parties. Also of importance is the fact that Prof. Lowenthal relates the Sino-Soviet confrontation to the distinctly ideological debates connected with the Soviet program of de-Stalinization. It is his thesis that not only are there conflicts of national interest involved in this dispute, but also that in the process of bringing Stalin's name into disrepute, the Russians disrupted ideological continuity and created a vacuum which Mao was better suited to fill than Khrushchev.

Of some interest and value to the specialist in Communist affairs are Prof. Lowenthal's interviews with Yugoslav Communists. A gap in knowledge concerning the attitudes of the various national Communist Parties' at the time of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 is partially filled by the data in this book.

Despite the somewhat grand pretensions of the title, The Disintegration of a Secular Faith, the book is a substantial contribution to the understanding of "national Communism." The generalizations that are drawn are well-documented.

AL TROST

Correction

In the last line of Anne Springsteen's poem entitled "Churchill," which appeared in the March issue, a typographical error made nonsense of the last line. The final stanza of the poem should read:

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

April 1965
A Minority Report

Apostle to Moderns

By VICTOR F. HOFFMANN

In Preface to Bonhoeffer (Fortress Press), John D. Godsey of Drew University calls Dietrich Bonhoeffer a loyal churchman, a famous theologian, and an unrelenting critic of Nazism. To be sure, Bonhoeffer has forced large sections of the church to recognize the Twentieth Century and to take it seriously.

Dietrich Bonhoeffer was born in Breslau, Germany, on February 4, 1906. His father was a well-known neurologist who occupied the first chair in psychiatry at the University of Berlin. His family lived in a fashionable Berlin suburb where young Dietrich was able to enjoy the cultural and intellectual advantages of middle class living.

A good student, Bonhoeffer decided upon the ministry as a career and with the ministry in mind he pursued his education at Tuebingen and Berlin. At the age of twenty-one he wrote a doctoral dissertation on Sanctorum Communio. Another work, Act and Being, won him the privilege of lecturing in systematic theology at the University of Berlin. By this time he had also spent a one-year internship in a German-speaking parish at Barcelona, Spain. And before taking up the lectureship at Berlin, he spent a year at Union Theological Seminary in New York City as a Sloane Fellow. While lecturing at the University of Berlin, he also served as chaplain to students at a Berlin technical school, handled a boys' confirmation class in the slums, and maintained an active interest in the Youth Commission of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches and in the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work.

In 1933 he left Germany for London, writes Godsey, "in protest against Adolph Hitler's Nazi regime and its deleterious influence upon the church." In 1935 Bonhoeffer heeded the request of the Confessing Church (a firm and persistent critic of Nazism) "to return to Germany to establish and direct a clandestine seminary for their ministerial candidates."

In 1939 he made his second trip to the United States and to Union Theological Seminary. War broke out and he returned to Germany a second time. This time he joined the underground resistance movement "dedicated to the overthrow of Hitler's maniacal military dictatorship and to the re-establishment of peace." Arrested on April 5, 1943, Bonhoeffer "spent most of his imprisonment in Berlin's Tegel Military prison." By September, 1944, the Gestapo had "linked Bonhoeffer to the resistance movement" and acted accordingly. Transferred to Buchenwald, he was finally executed at Flossenbuerg, a Gestapo camp in southern Germany, on April 9, 1945.

Godsey considers Bonhoeffer and his life to be important because he really demonstrated that he understood the world to which he had been born. Bonhoeffer operated as a mature and realistic theologian in a "world come of age." In Bonhoeffer's terms there simply could not be a "return to the domination of the medieval church," nor to "more clericalism." He would not tolerate a "separation of God from the world," nor a "division of the world into two spheres, one sacred and the other secular." Godsey hits upon a rather important point when he says: "Bonhoeffer believes it is God's will, revealed in Jesus Christ, that has forced the world to become mature, that has forced man to recognize the de-divinization of the world and its gods, that has called man to an acceptance of his free and autonomous responsibility for the world. In short, it is God himself who demands that we be 'worldly'."

In the next place, Godsey considers Bonhoeffer to be important because he has discovered "the universal meaning of Jesus Christ." According to him, the reality of the world and of God has been opened to us through Jesus Christ: the Lord of the Church and the Lord of the World, God and Man, God in the World. Because Christ has entered the world as the reality of God in the reality of the world, the sacred is found in the secular, the revelational in the rational, the super-natural in the natural. Just so the Christian has entered the worldly. According to this way of thinking some basic propositions can be nailed to the wall. The Christian dares not withdraw from the world. He must indeed talk about the secular meaning of the Gospel. Through Christ the Christian has been led into the very center of the world. No creature, no created being, can be understood apart from references to Christ.

From this position the famous theologian "recalls the Church to discipleship" under new rubrics. The Christian disciple lives worldly in this world. But while living worldly, he lives other-worldly. The Christian knows something many other people do not know: to live without the knowledge of death and resurrection is to live in "false worldliness." Thus the Church and the Christian live in the concretized revelation, that is, they live according to a "Christ existing in a community."
**Sights and Sounds**

**Something Else to Fret About**

By ANNE HANSEN

Are you a happy, carefree person without a single worry? I doubt that there is such a man or woman in our troubled day. But if by some miracle you are looking for a new cause or a new direction for your worries, let me recommend the long-awaited report of the National Cultural Manifestations Sampling Board. I must confess that I had never heard of the NCMSB until I read Roger Angell's entertaining, tongue-in-cheek discussion of the origin and the work of this organization in *The New Yorker*. By chance I came upon Mr. Angell's account just after I had read an ominous article titled "The Hazards of Increased Leisure." We have accepted, and even grown accustomed to, many hazards in this age of nuclear weapons, uncontrollable population explosions, and driving on freeways. But now, apparently, we must face a grim new challenge: "The Crisis of Responsibility in an Age of Cultural Excess." According to the NCMSB, "the facts are here. The only question is whether we have the courage to face them." Have you? I am not at all sure that I have. I ask myself, "What now, O Great Society?"

Evidently our so-called cultural explosion has not yet been felt by motion-picture producers. Here are several new films which do not in any way make even a slight contribution to any form of culture: *Sylvia* (Paramount, Gordon Douglas) is a cheap, sordid, tasteless concoction which must be classified as one of the worst pictures of this or any year. *Baby, the Rain Must Fall* (Universal-International, Robert Mulligan) drips psychological overtones and downright nonsense against a thoroughly unpalatable background. *Strange Bedfellows* (Universal, Melvin Frank) and *Dear Brigitte* (20th Century-Fox, Henty Koster) are billed as "sparkling comedies." Actually both are cast in a familiar Hollywood mold—slick, glossy, and at best completely mediocre. No "cultural explosion" anywhere within sight or sound, believe me!

John Ford, the veteran director who has won six Academy Awards, has made many outstanding pictures. In spite of a star-studded cast and a king-size budget *Cheyenne Autumn* (Warners), adapted from a book by Mari Sandoz, must be written off as a dismal failure.

*The Pumpkin Eater* (Royal, James Clayton), based on a novel by Penelope Mortimer, presents a study of a neurotic woman's frantic search for happiness and contentment. Anne Bancroft portrays the tormented wife with fiery intensity and extraordinary conviction. Her performance in this role won for her the Best Actress award at the 1964 Cannes Film Festival. James Mason and Peter Finch head an excellent supporting cast. Photographed in strikingly effective black and white, the films make frequent use of flashbacks. Abrupt, out-of-sequence cuts sometimes tend to be a bit confusing. *The Pumpkin Eater* is not recommended for children.

*The Luck of Ginger Coffey* (Continental, Irvin Kershner), adapted for the screen by Brian Moore from his own novel, brings us the penetrating, compassionate, and poignant story of a man's humiliating defeat and his ultimate awakening to a true understanding of his weaknesses. Brilliant performances by Robert Shaw and Mary Ure, a refreshingly literate screenplay, and uncluttered realism combine to invest *The Luck of Ginger Coffey* with warmth, charm, and appeal.

The last film on my list has real and lasting value for us and for generations to come. *The Finest Hours* (Columbia, Peter Baylis) is in every sense of the word an extraordinarily fine picture. This absorbing and inspiring documentary, based on the late Sir Winston Churchill's book *The Valiant Years*, makes use of excerpts from famous speeches and from government-agency and newsreel films to recreate the highlights in the career of a remarkable man. It pictures momentous events in a crucial period of world history. *The Finest Hours* is a fitting tribute to the memory of a great man.

With the exception of familiar and well-established programs, much of the day-by-day fare on television has been anything but inspiring during this season. Fortunately, we have had a number of noteworthy special programs. *East Europe: Satellites out of Orbit* (CBS) took us behind the Iron Curtain to see the changes and divergent policies to be found in Rumania and Czechoslovakia. *The Hollow Crown* (CBS) was the first of a two-part study of English monarchs from William I to Queen Victoria. *Walter Lippmann 1965* (CBS) was the sixth annual television visit with this famous columnist and political analyst. Then there was a delightful version of Rodgers and Hammerstein's musical fantasy *Cinderella* (CBS). On NBC we had *The Journals of Lewis and Clark*, which traced the epic journey of sturdy pioneers, and *Oswald and the Law: A Study of Criminal Justice*, which did not measure up to the high standard of excellence one expects to find in an NBC White Paper. ABC presented *I, Leonardo da Vinci*, a fascinating report on the life and work of a great genius; *Who Has Seen the Wind?* the second in a series of UN dramas devoted to the work of this great body; and *Inger Stevens in Sweden*, a delightful tour of the country in which Miss Stevens was born.
Any attempt to specify or pinpoint the various loci of the activity of the Holy Spirit in the world, in the Church, and in the individual, in time and in eternity, in the past, the present, and the future, is fraught with a clear and present danger—the temptation to localize and define something which is often inexpressible and always fluid, dynamic, and mysterious. Where the Spirit is, there is life—and life in all its fullness and richness cannot be dragged into a laboratory for dissection and analysis without losing something of its very essence. So it is also with the Spirit. He will not be drawn into the laboratory of systematic theology without great labor and probably ultimate partial failure. One must therefore always be aware of the fact that there is more here than can be contained in any single human statement. The flaming, eternal winds of the Spirit still blow where He listeth and man must be content with hearing the rustle of His passing and trying to determine what He has done.

The questions raised by the Spirit and His activity in Creation multiply as the years of His doing pass from age to age. What is His relation to the creation of the universe? What does He do in the ongoing creation and preservation of life? What is His relationship to the creativity of the human spirit—to Isaiah and John, to Dante and Milton, to Michelangelo and Bach, even to Picasso and Beckett? Perhaps the ultimate answers to these questions lie in the presently hidden glory of the day when the glass through which we now see darkly is broken by His own hand.

Luther’s position—at least about 1522—is well stated by Regin Prenter in Spiritus Creator: “When Luther, retaining the Augustinian terminology of inspiration, describes the work of the Holy Spirit as the infusion of the true love to God and then defines this love as a real conformity to Christ in His death and resurrection, it is because for Luther the work of the Holy Spirit always means a relationship to the living and present Christ. The love which is infused by the Holy Spirit is not an element in the soul but a real relationship to the truly present crucified and risen Christ. This is the contrast between imitation of and conformity to Christ. In the piety of imitation the believer is related to Christ as an idea. The believer himself is the active one who is struggling and seeking to realize the ideal which Christ represents. The activity of the piety of imitation corresponds to an idea of Christ; the passivity of the conformity-idea corresponds to the living and acting Christ.”

Krister Skydsgaard has remarked that “the Church is the working place of the Holy Spirit on earth. It was born in the miracle of Pentecost and will live until Christ comes again to establish the Kingdom in all its visible glory. It is the ‘place’ and the ‘organ’ of the Kingdom of God here on earth.”

Skydsgaard then goes on to say: “The crucified and risen Christ living and immanent through the Holy Spirit in the Word and Sacrament freely and mercifully enters into His created and fallen humanity and acts as Lord. In atoning and redeeming and destroying the work of the devil He creates the new world with that ‘one new man.’ He does so even here and now to the Ephesians—that one letter of the New Testament which more than any other deals with these things.

“In this basic view much of Roman and Evangelical theology can join in a common ‘yes.’ But the ways separate the moment there is talk of how this is realized in the Church.”

And yet there are welcome signs of thaw and spring. It is probably too early to evaluate the contribution Vatican II will make to a solution of our problems concerning the Church. But it is already evident that some of the walls built by the Council of Trent are beginning to crumble under the warmth of new understandings of ancient insights. Faced jointly by the much more chilly damnatus of a “Gottwidrig” world, Roman Catholicism and Protestantism must now engage in a fruitful dialogue in the assurance that the healing of the Body of Christ, by divine grace, may now become the Holy Grail of our broken times. Living under the imperatives of our late hour, the Church may once more stand united before God on behalf of the world and equally united before the world on behalf of God.

Perhaps it is the ultimate mission of the post-modern Church to make broken man once more sensitive to the Paraclete, the eternal Bystander, the Executive of the living God. Preached and lived by a Church aware of her task and destiny, she may speak of the Almighty Power of the Father, the Redemption by the Son, and the insistent whisper of the Holy Spirit by whom everything in life and time becomes an offering to the Holy Trinity.

And perhaps, too, a theology of the Holy Spirit and the Holy Trinity will lead us to an answer to our ultimate need—a theology of obedience to the Holy Spirit so that we may know, as seldom before since Pentecost, an imperative vision of the Holy Trinity which may release in our darkening time new springs of compulsion and compassion for the broken hearts of men.