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A New Approach to Old Problems

The Cresset is not a religious or theological — much less a denominational — journal. It is "a review of literature, the arts, and public affairs" which attempts to reflect, in its contents, the interests and concerns of people who live and work in the environment of a university which is still deeply rooted in the liberal arts tradition. Most of our editors and a large percentage of our writers, as well as a majority of our readers, are, however, Lutheran by tradition and/or conviction and it is therefore impossible for us to pretend that we are not interested in what is going on within the Lutheran denominations, particularly within The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

The Missouri Synod meets in convention this month in Detroit. Once again, as in so many of its recent conventions, it has to face the fact that there are differences among its members which go beyond mere words and formulae to the very heart of what its clergy and people believe about God, about His written Word, and about His Church. A church body which has historically refused fellowship with other church bodies which do not agree with it in these matters can hardly, in good conscience, refuse to come to terms with the fact that it lacks agreement on these matters within its own fellowship. And it must make an earnest effort to resolve these differences within the framework of obedience to its Lord and charity toward the brethren.

In the past, agreement has been sought by prayerful wrestling with the doctrine of the Word. Efforts along this line have, so far, proved more divisive than fruitful. We therefore respectfully suggest that, at least for the time being, another path toward unity be explored and we suggest that one hopeful route might be a restudy of the doctrine of the Church.

Such a path has been opened up and outlined for the Synod by a monumental "Mission Self-Study and Survey" which has been prepared for presentation to the convention by Dr. Martin L. Kretzmann.

This document begins where the apostolic Church began, with a definition of the Church as God's "sent" people — people who do not so much "do mission work" but who are themselves the mission of the God Who was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself. Such an understanding of the Church, or of any denomination within it, permits it to be simultaneously ecumenical in the fullest sense of the word and fully confessional in its trusteeship of the reconciling Word which God has spoken to man in Christ through prophets, apostles, and evangelists. More than that, it places upon every man, woman, and child who bears the name of Christian the responsible privilege of being a Christopher — a "Christbearer" — to his time and place, both within the institutional structures of the Church and in the daily round of his life as husband or wife, parent or child, employer or employee, friend, neighbor, and ordinary human being.

It is impossible to summarize the whole report — itself written with a maximum economy of words — in one editorial. But we commend it to our brethren, not as a means of side-stepping the issues which have caused so much dissension and heartache among us, but as a promising means of bringing these issues into the focus of that unity of spirit in the bond of peace which already exists among us and, thus, of creating a new atmosphere for speaking the truth in love to each other on issues which, in the past, have tended to generate a hardening of attitudes and a suspicion of motives which should have no place in the fellowship which is ours as brethren in the Beloved Community.

Notes Toward a Theology of Controversy

The editors of this magazine, the editor of the Confessional Lutheran, the editor of Lutheran News, the editor of the American Lutheran, the editors of the Lutheran Witness and the Lutheran Standard and Through to Victory and Arena and Spirit and the just plain Lutheran, together with an uncounted number of editors and clergy and laity of the Church have one great, decisive characteristic in common: we know in part and we proph-
esy in part. This characteristic is the presenting symptom of that moral perversion which we all share as children of a fallen race, a perversion which drives us to do the evil which we would not do and to leave undone the good which we would do. But to complicate matters we share a second great, decisive characteristic: we have been called to speak in the name of the living God and to act as His hands in a world which is His creation but which lies under the dominion of the Prince of Darkness.

These things being so, we must expect to find ourselves in controversy with each other — controversy reflecting both our bent toward evil and the Spirit's slow, painful bending of our wills toward the good. We are obliged to confess that these controversies ought not to be. We are equally obliged to concede that they are unavoidable. And so we need to work toward some theology of controversy which, if it can not edify the Church, will at least prevent it from being torn apart.

We offer as one preliminary step toward such a theology the renewal of a discipline, so long and so generally neglected among Protestants, of a contemplation of death and of that moment when we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ. It has been our experience that it is within such a discipline that one comes to the surprising and crushing recognition that the petition, "Forgive us our trespasses," is not so much a confession of those sins of which we are ashamed as it is a rephrasing of the prophet's confession that "all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." It is not so much in the moment when we are angry at our brother that we stand under the judgment of God as it is in that moment when, in the greatness of our heart and in the full conviction of our "rightness," we offer him forgiveness without feeling any need of his forgiveness and God's. For this is the ultimate, invincible pride, the pride of the impenitent thief who railed at his fellow-thief and at his Savior, forgetting that he was "in like condemnation."

A corollary to such a theology would be that we would all, on the one hand, speak and write with greater love and restraint and that we would, on the other hand, reject the counsels of those who, in their proper concern for peace in the Church, would attempt to silence those who speak and write with a passion that sometimes overreaches the limits of professional responsibility and Christian charity. Let us grant each other the dignity and the tragedy of our humaneness and accept each other for the spiritual schizophrenics that we all are. To do so would set us on good Scriptural and confessional grounds, for like the demoniac each of us must confess, "My name is Legion, for we are many," and with Luther each of us must see himself and his neighbor as a man simultaneously saint and sinner.

Meanwhile, let the controversies continue while we wait with such patience as the Spirit may give us for the day when that which is in part shall be done away. But let them continue as lovers' quarrels, rather than as barmoor brawls. Let each of us speak and write to the other, as John Donne tried to do in his own preaching, "as a dying man to dying men." And let us recall from time to time the counsel of Oliver Cromwell: "I beseech you in the bowels of Christ, consider that ye may be wrong."

Our Apologies

An article which was published in our April issue under the title, "Birthday Homage to Dante," included extended quotations from an essay by Dr. Frederic E. Faverty which appeared in the December 23, 1956, issue of the Chicago Sunday Tribune Magazine of Books. No indication was given that these quotations were from Dr. Faverty's essay.

The editors accept responsibility for this failure to observe the proper courtesies and apologize to Dr. Faverty and to the Chicago Tribune.

The Dominican Flare-Up

Secretary Rusk does not see any connection between recent events in the Dominican Republic and the war in Viet Nam. Senator Dodd (D.-Conn.) is sure that some master strategist in Moscow or in Peking has his hand in both situations. We have no way of knowing who is right — the Secretary or the Senator — but, being of a naturally suspicious nature, we find it hard to believe that the timing of the Dominican revolution was altogether accidental.

Assuming some connection between the two situations, President Johnson is to be commended for acting speedily and with vigor to put out the fire in the Dominican Republic. Whatever theory of international relations we may be operating on, we can not ignore the fact of our paramount responsibility for maintaining the security of the Western Hemisphere. Certainly we can not afford another Cuba in the hemisphere, particularly not when it is obvious that the people of the Dominican Republic want no part of any Castro-like regime.

It is unfortunate, of course, that the means that had to be employed to abort this attempted take-over were unpleasantly reminiscent of our Marine diplomacy of the Coolidge era. And it is understandable that our recourse to these means aroused concern and criticism among our sister nations of the hemisphere, particularly among those with democratic regimes. We can only hope that gradual clarification of the dangers which prompted us to employ these means will justify the course of action which we took.

What happened in the Dominican Republic seems to confirm the predictions of those who have prophesied outbursts of "brush-fire" wars which would force us to commit troops and conventional weapons in many isolated places with minimal risks that we would use the weapons that we have stored away in our nuclear arsenal. This is a nasty prospect to have to face, for it threatens us with a condition of almost constant involvement in places where we would rather not be under circumstances which will invite a maximum of criticism.
from other countries. The nature of these flare-ups will require us to move quickly, with little or no consultation with friendly powers and without going through such channels as the United Nations or the Organization of American States. And there will always be those among us, like Senator Morse, who will fault us for failing to observe the procedural niceties.

The answer to such criticism can only be that, in such situations as these, action deferred is inaction, and we have had quite enough of that. Our power carries with it the responsibility for its effective use in the cause of freedom, and against a cynical and treacherous enemy the niceties can go hang.

Politics and Poverty

Despite all of the joking about it, President Johnson's vision of the Great Society has captured the imagination of the American people, especially the young people. Millions of us, if we can trust what we read in the papers and what we hear in conversation, are willing to enlist in the war on poverty, which is perhaps the key to building the Great Society. There is, in other words, a great deal of idealism about, waiting to be converted into action by wise and equally idealistic leadership.

It is our impression that top-level federal administrators of the various Great Society programs are men of integrity and realistic idealism who really want to do a job. But the job will have to be done on the local level, and we seem to hear from afar the sound of a great squealing of pigs who have sighted a feed-trough. There is, we fear, a very real danger that what was conceived as a set of programs to create a new and better life for millions of our people will end up as a giant political boondoggle providing a new and better life for a handful of tin-horn politicians, particularly in the big cities.

If this happens, idealism will be converted into cynicism and there will be at least two easily prophesiable results: 1) on the level of practical politics, the Johnson administration may face a voter revolution which will completely reverse the President's overwhelming victory of last year and 2) the already sizeable group of cynics among us who mistrust the ability of government to carry through reforms involving the expenditure of large amounts of money may win large numbers of recruits to their views.

It is not, in the long run, important to the nation whether a particular President is re-elected. It is of primary importance to the nation that its citizens be able to trust government to accomplish socially desirable goals without allowing the implementation of those goals to become an occasion for fattening the faithful of any political party.

Our favorite mayor, Dick Daley of Chicago, keeps saying that good government is good politics and good politics is good government. We agree with him. And at this stage in the war on poverty we are still willing to trust him and other powerful local leaders to put that adage into practice. But we have enough knowledge of the workings of politics on the local level to know that it will be exceedingly difficult to keep the cheapest kind of partisan politics out of these programs. We are only one of many who shall be watching with a cold and critical eye to see what actually happens.

What Time is It?

There is this to be said for the man who "wouldn't give you the time of the day," that he actually may not know what the time is. A nation which has been able to orbit men in space and plunk space vehicles down on a dot on the moon has still not been able to come up with any uniform pattern of time, particularly in the summertime. As a result, people are late for speaking engagements, travelers miss connections, and nobody is really sure when the reduced rates for evening telephone calls go into effect.

At the moment, sixteen states and the District of Columbia go on Daylight Saving Time the last Sunday in April and stay on it until the last Sunday in October. Minnesota goes on D.S.T. on May 22 and stays on until September 6. In sixteen states summer time is a matter of local option. The rest of the states ignore D.S.T. altogether. The situation is, in other words, not much better than it was before the adoption of the pattern of standard time belts in the late nineteenth century.

Chief opponents of D.S.T. are the farmers, who insist — with apparent justification — that cattle never get the word on time changes and insist on following their own system of solar time. Their argument has merit, but hardly enough to offset the arguments of the great majority of us who do not tend cattle but do travel from place to place upon our lawful occasions. We would like to know whether, at the end of the trip, we are likely to be an hour early, an hour late, or right on time. The present patchwork of time patterns allows us no such assurance.

Our own preference would be for uniform and compulsory D.S.T. across the nation from the first Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October. Failing that, we would be willing to do without D.S.T. altogether. In either case, the determination of the nation's time pattern is a legitimate concern of the Congress, which is constitutionally vested with power to regulate interstate commerce. Perhaps in its present mood of enthusiasm for building the Great Society it might be induced to take this small but much-needed step if enough frustrated citizens let their representatives know that they want action now.

Meanwhile, the best temporary solution to our present problem might be to state all times in terms of Greenwich Mean Time. There is no way of knowing for sure what the time may be in the next county seat town east of us, but we do know what time it is in London — or at least we can figure it out with less trouble than we have to take now to find out what time our neighbors in the next county have locally opted.
A Consoling Thought

The original function of newspapers was to supply their readers with information. Later, to build or keep circulation, they took on the additional function of entertainment. Still more recently, they have gone in rather heavily for inspiration. And now we think we see them moving into still another area. Judging by a recent news story in The New York Times, papers may be starting to offer their readers consolation.

The cloud no larger than a man’s hand which we take as a portend of showers to come was a headline in a recent issue of the Times which read “Not All Beavers Build Good Dams.” Below it was a subhead: “Some Old Fellows Don’t Like Work and Are Careless.” And down in the bowels of the story, which was apparently supplied by the National Geographic Society, a Mr. Leonard Lee Rue, billed as a long-time student of beaver behavior, was quoted as observing that he has seen dams where “the entire mass of material looked as though it had drifted there.”

We have not been a long-time observer of beaver behavior, but we have nursed a long-time inferiority complex over against the beaver. “Look,” we have frequently told ourselves, “here is this furry little creature who has none of your compelling reasons to be out there doing an honest day’s work, but there he is—felling his trees and building his dams and generally making full use of the limited talents God gave him. While you, you bum, sit sharpening pencils and staring out the window and daydreaming about Tahiti. No wonder the entire mass of material in this magazine looks as though it had drifted there. Go to, thou sluggard, observe the beaver.”

Thanks to the Times and the N.G.S. we shall henceforth console ourselves with the thought that “Beavers don’t live up to their public image. Some are clumsy tree-cutters and careless dam builders. Worst of all, a few are not eager to work.” Instead of chiding ourselves for failing to have the next six issues clearly planned in advance, we shall remind ourselves that “Contrary to popular belief, beavers cannot control the direction of fall of trees they are cutting. Most severed trees plunk conveniently into the water because they were growing toward the stream.” And at certain particularly hectic times of the month we shall cheer ourselves with the recollection that “Occasionally a beaver is pinned beneath a falling tree.”

We need more stories like this in the daily newspaper. Never mind the horoscope and the race predictions; it isn’t the future that alarms us, but the past. Tell us we haven’t made too much of a botch of it—at least no more so than the average beaver—and we will make it through the day. We’re not trying to be Prometheus. What was getting us down was this constantly being one-upped by little furry creatures of the wild.

Mission Completed

With this issue, the Reverend Dr. Adalbert Raphael Kretzmann concludes a quarter-century of service to The Cresset as its art editor. At his own repeated and insistent request he is being relieved of the duty of getting out a monthly column on the promise that he will, from time to time, do a piece for us on some topic which he considers particularly interesting and timely.

We resist the temptation to cast this editorial in the form of an obituary, not only because Dr. Kretzmann is very much alive but also because, judging by past performance, the record of his life and labors is still far from complete. He is, among other things, pastor of St. Luke’s Lutheran Church in Chicago, one of the truly monumental churches of the denomination; a guiding figure in the Chicago Bible Society; member of the board of directors of at least two insurance companies; a much-consulted expert on church and liturgical design; and a preacher of national reputation. Why his schedule of activities has not killed him long ago we do not claim to know. We are merely glad that he is still with us.

To his work for The Cresset Dr. Kretzmann brought a sensitivity not only to the arts but to their function in the life and worship of the Church. In his travels he had seen at first hand many of the buildings, paintings, and works of sculpture which he described in his articles. There was thus in all of his writing a note of authenticity which was a major element in its appeal.

To his colleagues Dr. Kretzmann (who is not, by nature, a man who suffers fools gladly) was a model of patience and forbearance. We remember with particular gratitude a succession of three months, some years ago, when each of his columns was, in one way or another, set upon by the gremlins which infest composing rooms. We waited in daily expectation for the bristling note which we had every reason to suppose he would dash off—but which never came. They don’t hardly make art editors like that no more.

We think we have found a worthy successor to Dr. Kretzmann. He is Professor Richard H. Brauer, acting head of the department of art at Valparaiso University and curator of the Sloan Galleries of American Paintings. Still comparatively young, Professor Brauer has had a remarkable career as a practicing artist and as a teacher of art on the secondary and university level. He will take over his assignment in our September issue.
Of the disasters which Nature visits on man and which the insurance companies call "acts of God," one, surprisingly, has immediate, visible and long-range benefits. Such disasters as fire, tornado, or earthquake are instantaneously destructive and can and do cause great loss of life. Normally, however, these disasters are limited to one or a few buildings or to restricted geographic areas. While members of the community and others may come in to help the victims clean up, most of the rebuilding must be done by the individual. The speed with which these particular disasters strike allows no time for any preparation.

One type of disaster, however, has beneficial side effects which compensate for the property damage it causes. This disaster is a flood, caused by a river overflowing its banks. It may be difficult to convince someone who has just fought the rising waters of the Mississippi that good side effects were present, but, having lived through three floods, I have had an opportunity to observe these benefits at first hand. I grew up in a small town on the Illinois river and these floods occurred while I was a school boy.

In its favor as a disaster, a flood causes little, and in most cases no loss of life. The advance warning of impending trouble is at least a couple of weeks so that ample time is available to protect life and property and there seems to be something therapeutic about being able to contemplate one's inevitable fate.

The other advantages of a flood, if one can speak of them as such, accrue from the community spirit which grows as the water rises, the neighborly helpfulness during the flood, and the general cooperation in the clean-up after the water has receded. A flood also gives a man a sense of perspective and a better sense of values. True, men will fight the rising waters in an attempt to save their property, but, when the flood is inevitable, most men begin to realize that suffering loss is not unbearable.

When men are fighting a flood and then living through it there is no difference among them. Barriers of class and color disappear and there is no distinction between rich and poor. The fight against the river is an all-hands affair and the result of this mutual effort is a marvelous community spirit. It is one of the few opportunities most men get to understand what the brotherhood of man can really be.

Closing ranks in the community began, as I recall, a couple of weeks before the flood, when hundreds would gather each night at various spots along the levee to stand and watch the water. The rise was not visible, but many planted sticks along the levee which they notched each night in order to observe the rise in a 24 hour period. Favorite topics on those nights were the possible height of the crest and what the water level would be on certain buildings in town.

The real fight began about ten days before the crest was expected, as men worked around the clock filling sandbags and building up the levees. All ages and types of men fought side by side. The visible enemy was at their fight, a difficult enemy to hate because a large river is fascinating and its inexorable rise is almost mesmerizing.

When the levee broke or the river overflowed, the town filled slowly with water. Everyone was prepared by having a boat tied to the back porch and the furniture safely up on blocks or stored upstairs. Those who needed help got it immediately from their neighbors. Within two days the town was covered, only an island or two visible above the murky waters.

The most water we had in our home in any of the three floods was two feet. But the gas was still on, and we fared well by living upstairs and doing the cooking while wearing boots in the kitchen. For kids it was a paradise, playing in our boats, building rafts, or rowing to the store for groceries. Most stores built their own levees and stayed in operation. After supper the family would climb into a boat for a tour of the town. Everyone owned a boat or a canoe and clusters of boats gathered in the streets while everyone visited with everyone else. Sharing a common disaster made everyone the best of friends and community spirit was at its highest.

When the waters receded and the clean-up began, one neighbor helped another to scrub the floors, get the furniture off the blocks, and spread lime on the yard. These good side effects of the flood (not counting the direct benefit of a new layer of good top soil on lawns and gardens) lasted for years.

If you ask someone who lives in an area which is occasionally visited by floods why he doesn't move away, you seldom get a satisfactory answer. However, it is my opinion that deep inside he realizes that a flood is not only the disaster that the outsider sees, but that it also brings certain blessings which only the insider knows.
The New Morality

By W. J. FIELDS
Lutheran Campus Pastor
Iowa State University

Writing in the Christian Century, Dr. Hobart Mowrer, research professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois, says: "On college and university campuses throughout the nation there has been a recent upsurge of interest in the problem of student values. This has been prompted by a growing concern, on the part of both faculty and students, over such matters as sexual behavior, drinking practices, dishonesty in examinations, disregard for property, poor work habits, and the prevalence of emotional instability."1

This "upsurge in interest" seems to have been stimulated to a great extent by popular writers and much of it might be discarded as sensationalism. One author, for example, interviewed a hundred young people in Greenwich Village, New York, and from this interview wrote an article about the "twisted age."2 (The title, by the way, obviously a pun, was outdated before the article appeared, because young people have moved on from the dance that was called "the twist."). Any scientific student of human behavior would know that one hundred young people are much too small a sampling from which to draw general conclusions. Furthermore, one hundred young people from New York City would not necessarily be typical of all young people in the United States, any more than one hundred young people from any other one geographical location would be. And certainly a hundred young people in Greenwich Village are not even necessarily representative of New York City's young people, let alone the rest of America's youth. Conclusions based on such research dramatize and, because of widespread distribution, leave distinct and widespread impressions, but do not necessarily reflect facts.

Nearly every magazine of sizeable distribution has featured articles about one phase or another of the so-called "moral revolution" that is taking place in America. College students seem to be the special objects of these studies, perhaps because the campus finds large numbers of one age group in close proximity, thus making surveys convenient. Students themselves, however, are not always believing everything that they read about themselves, just because it is in print. One university campus paper had this to say: "Some say sexual permissiveness, on the campus as everywhere else, is increasing. These authorities, many of them sociologists, claim a 'revolution' has taken place in American sexual standards. This is the message that is spread from coast to coast on television, in magazine and newspaper articles. And it does boost newsstand sales."

"But somehow these articles often miss the point, and the desire for more readership may confuse the search for a balanced presentation." Continuing then about sex behavior the article states: "... increased pressure is being put on young people to participate in premarital affairs, although actual participation is lower than generally believed."3 (Italics mine) This, it should be noted, was written by a university student.

Nevertheless the "new morality" is descriptive of a phenomenon of our generation. Some have said, as the student just quoted, that we are in the midst of a social moral revolution. Our generation is examining and re-evaluating old values and traditional patterns of behavior and, in accord with the revolutionary feel of our times, is ready to discard them.

Aspects of the "New Morality"

The term "new morality" seems a bit nebulous. Its use has become popular, but precisely what it involves and means is not always clear. Someone has said that the "new morality" is nothing more than the old immorality in new dress. Sometimes one gets the feeling that the "new morality" is more a mood than a behavior pattern, that it involves not so much moral codes as the philosophy behind moral codes.

The one concept that seems to be prominent in this "new morality" is that of freedom. People insist that a part of their right as American citizens is the freedom to do as they please without legislation or taboos to hamper them. Hemingway's edict, "Right is what you feel good after; wrong is what you feel bad after," has become their one-sentence manifesto. They feel that their "natural right" is the "pursuit of happiness" and that any interference with the attainment of happiness, as they want to pursue it, is a violation of natural law. This is part of what analysts of the current American scene like Vance Packard have called the "hedonism of our age." This philosophy fails to understand that, to be deserved and kept, freedoms and rights and privileges must carry with them also responsibilities, and that absolute freedom of expression is the worst kind of servitude there is.

Another aspect of this "new morality" seems to be the contention that morality is private in character. One has the right to pursue happiness wherever he can find it. If in the process no one is hurt, then whatever anyone decides to do in private is no one else's business. What this thinking fails to understand is that in the end there is no such thing as "private" morality. "No man is an island." We are social beings and all behavior affects society to a greater or lesser degree. We live as in a sandwich — with someone to whom we are responsible and someone for whom we are responsible.
Factors Causing the "New Morality"

Many reasons have been given for the development of this new moral climate in the Western world. In an essay read at a meeting of The National Council of Family Relations, Dr. Oscar Feucht quoted C. Eugene Conover as listing the five following major factors: 1. Existential philosophy — with the contention that moralisms threaten personal responsibility and the authenticity of self; 2. Depth psychology — with the avoidance of moralistic attitudes toward patients; 3. Anthropology — with its desire to remain objective in order to understand world cultures on their own terms; 4. Protestant theology — with its analysis, e.g., of many educational materials which show too many moralisms and not enough emphasis upon our relationship to God; 5. Educational philosophy of John Dewey — with its objection to transmissive teaching and its leaning toward self-determination and self-expression.4

For our purposes there are several other factors that should be mentioned and which are perhaps even more significant. One of them is the advance of scientific thought in our generation. Many matters which in generations gone by could be explained only in terms of reference of God are today explained by natural causes. As a result, the popular assertion of many a college student is, "Who needs God?" With a shrug of the shoulder he can dismiss God because in all his academic pursuits he has never reckoned with the God-factor. He has never understood the prayer ascribed to the astronomer Kepler: "Almighty God, these are Thy thoughts I am thinking after Thee." A lack of awareness of the immanence of God encourages a lack of responsibility to God. All this can well lead to a sort of moral anarchy, as Waldo Beach comments: "The lack of a common mind on campus is simply the faithful reflection of the anarchy of Western thought in general, which has no center of devotion or commonly accepted axioms and which is all in pieces, too."5

The advancement of science has brought many technological advances in every area of life and living. This has several implications. For one thing, an age which because of progress discards past-generation methods of doing things can be counted on to give careful scrutiny to moral standards carried over from the past generation. It will, properly or not, seek new standards for a new age. This is inevitable. Then, too, technological advances have brought with them increased personal freedoms. The easy availability of the automobile, for example, and the development of the oral contraceptive (eliminating the fear of pregnancy) place youth today into an altogether different situation from last generation's young people. By freeing its youth from many restrictions of the past our generation has created an increased need for them to rethink their value systems.

Another important factor influencing changing standards is the international cultural exchange that is taking place today. The world is rapidly shrinking. International students from every country are intermingling with students on American campuses and American students are studying abroad. This brings varying cultures with their particular mores and value systems into close contact with one another. In great degree many of the international students are not Christian and their ethical codes are not Judeo-Christian. In the exchange many "foreign" ideals and approaches of thought are easily absorbed.

One more factor that may be more significant than any other is the inconsistency that young people find in their parents. They know that their parents expect them to abide by certain standards. They have heard teenagers discussed ad nauseam and they have heard themselves characterized as rebellious, but at the same time they have watched an adult generation flounder for lack of moral fiber. They see an inconsistency in what they are expected to be and what their elders are. They wonder, therefore, whether society isn't making absolutes out of what should be relative, and whether there is in the end an absolute standard of right and wrong.

It all adds up to the same thing. Always we come back to one aspect or another of the basic truth that we have left unfilled a moral gap and that the current generation is seeking guidance for filling that gap.

Challenge to the Church

In its own way the "new morality" is throwing a challenge at the church. It is saying in effect, "We are no longer satisfied simply with arbitrary conduct codes that we are expected to follow. You must do more than give us codes; you must give us reasons for following those codes. You must do more than merely offer us precepts against certain forms of premarital sex conduct; you must tell us why. You must do more than merely offer us precepts against certain forms of premarital sex conduct; you must tell us why. You must do more than merely offer us precepts against certain forms of premarital sex conduct; you must tell us why. You must do more than merely offer us precepts against certain forms of premarital sex conduct; you must tell us why. You must do more than merely offer us precepts against certain forms of premarital sex conduct; you must tell us why. You must do more than merely offer us precepts against certain forms of premarital sex conduct; you must tell us why.

In some ways this "new morality" contains factors that are not all bad. The use of the term is perhaps unfortunate. Another phrase, like the "search for morality," might be more descriptive and accurate. In any event the "new morality" is concerned about more than external behavior. It is asking basic questions and demanding basic answers. It is showing evidence of the need to understand why certain behavior patterns are desirable or required. This squares well with Biblical and Lutheran ethics. Simply to abide by rules, no matter how pietistically or religiously, is not in itself morality (some of the "best behaved" and most "conforming" people I know are in penitentiaries) and it is certainly not Christian morality.

Without question the religious and moral tone of
America has been influenced by a general Protestant (rather than Lutheran) approach to ethics. Puritanism with its strict legalistic codes has had a tremendous influence on our society. In the Lutheran approach to ethics rules have never been as important as motives. Luthers have always asserted the proposition that it may be just as wrong to do the right thing for the wrong reason as it is to do the wrong thing for the wrong reason, and that there might even conceivably be times when it is right to do the wrong thing for the right reason. Christian ethics must always go beneath the surface — beneath rules to reasons, beyond regulations to standards.

Because of this the Lutheran concept of ethics understands that it is not always easy to divide human behavior into categories of absolute right and absolute wrong. Properly understood, even the Ten Commandments are not absolutes. They are rather expansions of the general commandment to love. The fifth commandment, for example, “Thou shalt not kill,” protects human life and well-being, and at times it may even be necessary to “violate” this commandment in order to do what it is meant to do, namely, protect human life and well-being. Christian ethics is more than observing rules. It is a process of becoming, of growing into the fullness of the measure of the stature of Christ. There are many circumstances in life when the ethical choice is not between an area of black or white, but between two shades of gray.

Thus when in our generation the search is on for a solid basis on which to build sturdy and meaningful principles of morality, the Lutheran church does not feel uncomfortable, but rather espouses the optimistic hope of being able to fill the gap.

The “New Morality” in Sex

This is as good a place as any at which to digress to one specific aspect of the “new morality.” Interestingly enough, whenever the phrase is mentioned, or wherever morals are discussed, the first thing that comes to mind is “sex.” This may be very symptomatic of our age. Thinking in the area of morality has become so superficial that “sin” is thought of only in terms of overt behavior, the violation of a set of regulatives. And it is precisely this superficiality that the current generation is questioning. Dr. Lester Kirkendall, family sociologist at Oregon State University, has observed that whenever he discusses morality with young people their first concern usually is with premarital sex, but that their questions soon proceed rather rapidly to standards and values in general.

Since, however, sex so readily comes to mind whenever morality is mentioned, one could hardly deal adequately with the general topic without giving some attention to the specific.

The Church Overemphasizes Sex

No one would deny the observation that there is an overemphasis upon sex in our culture. The blame for this has been laid in many places, all the way from por-

nographic literature to the movie industry to advertising agencies. Very few people have suggested that in its own way the church may have overemphasized sex, too, and thus must share some of the blame. To be sure, the church has not overemphasized sex by the promotion of sex, but it may have overemphasized it by its approach to sex. For too long the church conveyed negative and prohibitory concepts of sex. “Thou shalt not” was the guideline. If there were any “thou shalt’s,” any positive directives, for the handling of the sex drives and powers, they were extremely limited.

Desire and Lust

Indeed, the impression was often given that the sex drive itself was wrong. The words of Jesus, “Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her in his heart” (Matthew 5,28), have often been used to leave the impression, inadvertently perhaps, that any longing for sex gratification is lust. The church has had a difficult time defining lust and distinguishing between legitimate sexual desires and lust. The two are certainly not to be equated. Sexual desire is normal to one’s being; lust is the inordinate centralization of sex in one’s thinking. Perhaps an analogy might be made with drinking. The thirst for a glass of beer on a hot day or the desire for a cocktail before dinner is not in itself wrong. The over-emphasis upon drink, however, the constant obsession with it, makes one an alcoholic. In similar fashion one might make food the center of one’s existence. When sex is pulled in to the center of one’s thinking and being, it becomes lust.

Luther understood this when he said about temptations in general, “You can’t keep the birds from flying around your head, but you can keep them from building a nest in your hair.”

In the church, too, sexual aberrations were often made particularly heinous, as though violations of the Sixth Commandment were in themselves more serious than violations of any of the other commandments. Above all, the worst “sin” of all, so it was often made to seem, was to “get caught.” Many an old church record noted the fact of illegitimate births. Some girls pregnant at the time of their marriage were unquestionably reminded of their immorality and in some instances pastors have insisted that the bride-to-be sign a confession that she had sinned. (This was not necessarily true if she had had premarital relationships; only if she became pregnant. The only logical conclusion in this procedure would have to be that the wrong lay in becoming pregnant.)

The Church and the Kinsey Report

There is another way in which the church must shoulder some of the blame for confusions in this area. Very often the much publicized Kinsey report has been blamed, in part at least, for the new openness and license in sexual matters. The Kinsey report did open the
way for a new freedom in the discussion of sex. But educators — and churches — didn’t know how to use this new freedom. They weren’t ready to fill the gap with a wholesome, constructive approach and positive, educational program. The permissive atmosphere was created — the field was open. But the schools and the church failed to move in. The movie industry and magazines did. They capitalized on the atmosphere of openness that the Kinsey report created. Thus, if for no other reason than by default the church is partially at fault for much of today’s undesirable emphasis upon sex.

**Popular Attitudes Toward Sex**

In our country, social scientists agree, there are extremes of thinking in the matter of sex. There is on the one hand a far right, puritanical view. There are some people who regard sex *per se* as “dirty,” “nasty,” “wrong.” Needless to say such attitudes spawn many inhibitions and obsessions and repressions.

On the other hand there is a far left position which favors sex for sex’s sake. This is true not only among unmarried people, but among married people as well. Evidence for this is found not only in the prevalence of prostitution, but also in the existence of “social sex” and of “key clubs” among married couples.

Both the puritanical and the lax approach to sex are equally bad, because both catapult it to the center of existence. The first tries to deny that it is there; the second assumes that it is everything. A negative approach overemphasizes sex as much as a “free” approach does; both give it more emphasis than it should have. Sex is a part of the totality of life, a significant part, but certainly not the totality.

Studies show that, generally speaking, current sexual behavior among young people may be divided into four categories: 1) chastity; 2) the double standard; 3) sexual permissiveness with affection; 4) sexual permissiveness without affection. The studies further show that most young people would reject as a pattern of behavior the promiscuity of (4), and that (1) and (2) are decreasing. The third pattern, sexual permissiveness with affection, is growing in prominence. Young people are asking, “If we love each other, why wait?” “If both are desirous of fulfilling the needs of the other and if no one is hurt, what is wrong?” “What makes physical intimacy with your spouse innately wrong five minutes before the public ceremony and altogether right five minutes after it?”

As it deals with sexuality in a society that is becoming increasingly permissive, the church needs to rethink positively and realistically the relationship of the sexes to each other and the expression of their sexuality with each other. This lifts the matter, though, beyond genital sex to the total area of maleness and femaleness, of sexuality in general.

**Sex is Good**

It needs to be said that the Christian (not necessarily the traditional) approach to sex is positive. The Christian approach begins with the conviction that sex is good, that it is God’s idea, not man’s. Almost the entire creation, plant and animal kingdom alike, is bisexual. People are born, not simply with a neuter gender, but as males or females. Differing from each other both physically and psychologically, they complete and complement one another. This complementation reaches its ultimate in marriage.

In the process of maturation sex drives become strong and yearn for expression. This is as it should be. It is natural that men and women be physically attracted to one another. Something would be radically wrong, either psychologically or physically or both, with the young person not at all interested in the other sex.

**Sex Drives and Christians**

Strong sex desires and drives are as normal for Christians as for non-Christians. Christians, too, need to find a realistic approach to the responsible handling of these drives. The answer is not necessarily as simple as traditional approaches might assume.

To begin, it needs to be clearly understood who Christians are. Christians are people who live their lives under the forgiveness of sins. By their baptism they have been adopted into the family of God. They have been pulled in under the umbrella of God’s mercy and undeserved love. They are living their lives under the Gospel rather than under the Law, under mercy rather than judgment. They are Christians not because they avoid certain sins, for example, sins of sex, but because in Christ they have forgiveness of all sins, including those of sex. It would not be correct to say that Christians do not engage in premarital sex intimacies. Christians do. This does not make it right. However, by definition Christians are not people who are free from sin. They, too, stumble and fall. The difference between Christians and non-Christians may not necessarily be evident in their external behavior, because their difference lies not in the fact that the one group is moral and the other immoral. The difference is on the “inside,” in their attitudes and motives, in their loyalties and commitments. Christians have become new beings in Christ.

The question then follows, “What is a moral sex life?” This question can not, however, stand in isolation. The question must always become the larger one, “What is a moral life?” That includes sex. Any definition of morality includes sex, but it does not equate sex behavior with morality. And that returns us from our digression to the thesis of this article — the “new morality” as viewed by a Christian.
Establishing the Basis
For All Morality

We said earlier that the Lutheran church does not feel entirely uncomfortable as she faces the "new morality." It would seem that, emphasizing as she does the new life under the Gospel, she avoids the pitfalls of two extremes: a puritanical approach with mere moralisms on the one hand and an antinomian approach with complete moral irresponsibility on the other. She might therefore even have a unique contribution to make toward the moral climate for which the "new morality" is searching.

Under the Gospel

Living under the Gospel, Christians are freed from bondage to the Law — and to laws. With Christian motivations they can never be legalistic about morality, and they cannot absolutize ethics into codes.

Ultimately there is only one rule of Christian ethics: the law of love. "Love is the fulfilling of the law" — love to God and love to one another. In the final analysis these two are one and the same, because the only way we have of showing our love to God is by loving one another. Jesus indicated that. The first commandment is to love God; the second is "like unto it," to love the neighbor. Furthermore, Christ said, "Whatsoever you do to the least of these my brethren, you have done it unto me."

What we need, of course, is a definition of the word "love." We must understand that love is not to be equated with sex. Love and sex may exist apart from each other. Neither does love, in the specific Christian connotation, have anything to do with liking. It is possible to love a person whom one finds it difficult to like. Nor is love an emotion. It is rather an attitude that is concerned about the rights, privileges, welfare, and well being of the other. It is the state of mind that always wishes for and works for what is best for the other person. It is not self-centered, but outgoing. It is not concerned with satisfying self, but with satisfying others. It is more concerned with pleasing than with being pleased, with serving than with being served. Its mood is active, not passive. It is ready to sacrifice, to discipline self for the sake of others. I Corinthians 13, with its definition of love, is foreign to much of the thinking of our generation which in its "new morality" is insisting on individual "rights," "freedoms," "pleasures," above all else. Being concerned with self is turning love toward one's self, and self love is really a negation of love. In its "search for morality" the twentieth century needs to learn the Christian concept of love. It would find here the answer to much of its search.

Christian Compulsions

It is at this point that a great deal of the church's thinking on this issue until now has stopped. Most articles about the "new morality" written from the Christian point of view stress the fact that lists of can'ts and cannot's are meaningless for our age and that our behavior patterns must be built on love. The March 5 issue of Time reported a conference of nine hundred clergymen and students meeting at Harvard Divinity School to study the significance of the "new morality" for the church. It, too, came up with nothing more than proposing "an ethic based on love rather than law" and "approved the new morality's concept of 'guideposts' rather than 'hitching posts.'"

This is all very well, but it also leaves matters very much up in the air. We find ourselves in the position expressed by a university professor whom I engaged in conversation on this topic on a recent plane flight. He decried the fact that the church was giving no positive leadership in this area and was allowing an entire generation of youth to flounder about in complete confusion.

Somewhere along the line generalities need to be translated into specifics. No generation of people exists for long with everyone establishing his own behavior patterns indiscriminately. Principles are important and necessary. As a matter of fact no one lives without principles. Everyone has them. Even the person who would like to recognize no moral limitations to human behavior patterns, no moral responsibilities to anyone but himself, and who would like to be part of an "anything goes" generation, even he has certain principles and standards by which he is regulating his life. They may be profligate, but they are standards nevertheless. The question is not, "Do we need standards of behavior?" The question is rather, "What are those standards going to be?"

One's behavior is always a result of what he believes. A man's indicatives determine his imperatives. His strength (or weakness) of character is determined by his inner commitments and dedications. That person must be genuinely confused who has no inner resources and motivations on which to build his moral life. To look only to one's environment or culture to establish one's ethical conduct leads to complete turmoil, because thinking and behavior in every area of moral activity runs the gamut from hedonistic laxity to legalistic rigidity. The "strong" person is motivated by principles and standards that have been built into him, rather than by pressures and influences from the outside.

The Christian's commitment is to Jesus Christ. Baptized into the name and life of Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life, they are people for whom Jesus Christ has become Lord. They spend their lives living out this lordship of Jesus Christ. Rather than being "conformed to this world" they are "transformed by the renewing of their minds." They let that "mind be in them which was also in Christ Jesus."

Looking to the life of Christ Christians see how in His humanity He was driven by divine compulsions. It is interesting to note how often He used the word "must" in connection with His actions. It began when He was a pre-teen in the temple. "Did you not know that I must..."
be about My Father’s business?” His entire ministry was motivated by “I must work the works of Him that sent Me.” “I must preach the Kingdom to other cities also.” To little Zaccheus sitting high in the sycamore tree: “Hurry up and come down, for today I must abide in your house.” Of His last trip to Jerusalem the evangelist says, “From that time forth began Jesus to show His disciples how He must go to Jerusalem and suffer many things . . . and be killed and be raised again the third day.” And the most beautiful one of all: “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

Throughout His ministry there was much to deter Him, but neither the attitudes of His closest friends, nor the moral climate of His times, nor the corruption in the organized church, nor the lack of standards in people He met, nor the strength of specific temptations He faced — none of that determined His course of action. He was driven by compulsions from above and from within.

There was no alternative for Him. He “had to” work the works of Him that sent Him.

But as Christ felt compelled to do some things, there were also other things that He did not do. He did submit Himself to the will of God: He did not “fall down and worship” Satan. Because He did reach out in love He did not nurture grudges. Because He did think first of others, He did not think first of His own desires and satisfactions. Moral choices inevitably mean at least two possibilities from which to choose. If there are some things that a person does, then at the same time there are other things that he avoids. If he speaks well of a person, he avoids speaking evil about him. If he espouses temperance, then he avoids excesses. If he believes in the permanence of marriage, he avoids divorce.

One’s principles determine one’s moral obligations and compulsions. Christian principles are based on love, not law, on “guidelines” not “hitching posts,” to use the jargon of the “new morality.” A Christian therefore recognizes that there must be some moral principles, moral laws, that become determiners of his behavior. The “laws” however are evangelical “oughts” and not legalistic “rules.” For example, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” becomes not a “joy-killing” prohibition, but a principle that safeguards the strength of the home and the security of family life. It is a principle that a Christian wishes to follow because of the high estate with which he regards marriage, the dignity he places on another person (he loves her too much as a person to use her as a thing), and the self discipline and character he is trying to develop. His principles have determined that there are some things he does not do. He may not be able to reason this all out logically when his passions become aroused in the back seat of a car, but even then, perhaps especially then, when reason is obliterated by desire, some of his basic “ought’s” and “ought not’s” come through and hopefully take over.

Again, the Christian wants to make honesty and absolute dependability a way of life, not simply because he might get caught if he steals or cheats, but because in Christian love he understands the property rights of others and the principles of stewardship that make him a responsible caretaker for God of his own and his neighbor’s property. Christian love means he is reaching out in concern for others rather than for his own benefit, at no matter what the price. And so as he sits in the classroom need for a passing grade becomes a powerful temptation, and as he agonizes over an income tax return the prospect of saving fifty dollars looks very appealing, but the “ought’s” and “ought not’s” come to the fore.

So in every area of his life he realizes that some “thou shalt not’s” become essential if he is to develop a life of self control, discipline, and character. He understands that to live his life entirely without prohibitions may result in a life of license, but certainly not in one of character. To be able to say “no” at the proper time may be becoming a lost art, but it is one that desperately needs recovery lest we run down the road to complete moral chaos. Discipline, self control, will power are still strengths; promiscuity, intemperance, unbridled satisfying of all passions and desires are still weaknesses.

St. Paul was saying just this when he wrote: “The works of the flesh are plain: immorality, impurity, licentiousness, idolatry, strife, jealousy, anger, selfishness, dissension, envy, drunkenness, carousing, and the like.” He proceeds then to mention what he calls “fruits of the Spirit,” that is, characterizations of a Christ-filled life: “love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self control.” Then he adds two significant statements. First, those who belong to Christ crucify, that is, stifle, the flesh with its passions and desires. They learn to say “no” to them. Secondly, those who live by the Spirit now walk in the Spirit. They have some “ought’s” that motivate their lives.

Christians may not always be able to explain fully, so that it makes sense to others, what it is that compels them, why they try to live disciplined lives, honest lives, moral lives, involved and giving lives. All they know is that in their new creation there is an “ought to” that is deep within them, a “have to” described already by St. Paul: “The love of Christ controls us . . . He died for all that we who live might no longer live for ourselves, but for Him who died and for our sakes was raised.” No longer for ourselves . . . but for Him . . . and for others . . . at no matter what the cost.

4. Oscar E. Feucht, “Family Life Education in the Lutheran Church with Particular Reference to Sex Education,” a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, at the University of Denver August 25, 1965, pp. 5-6, in which he cites these five points from C. Eugene Conover, Moral Education in Family, School, and Church, Westminster, 1962.
6. In a taped radio talk over WOI, Ames, Iowa, October 20, 1964 while he was speaking on the campus of State College of Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa.
The Popularity of Yeats

By W.G. FRIEDRICH
Professor of English
Valparaiso University

Although it seems paradoxical, it is correct to say that William Butler Yeats (1865-1939), the most admired modern poet, is also one of the most esoteric poets of European literature.

In his autobiography, Yeats reports that, in his youth, having been deprived of the religion of his childhood by Huxley and Tyndall, he had made a new religion, almost an infallible church of poetic tradition, of a fardel of stories, and of personages, and of emotions, inseparable from their first expression, passed on from generation to generation by poets and painters with some help from philosophers and theologians.

Yeats continued to read widely. As T.R. Henn has said in his The Lonely Tower,

It will be necessary for the future editor of Yeats to have read in detail much esoteric literature, including the Kabala and Boehme; Spenser, Swift, Berkeley, Burke; Balzac, Lionel Johnson, Dowson, Sturge Moore, Gogarty, Dorothy Wellesley; Plato, Plotinus, Julian, Vico, Gentile, McTaggart, Croce, von Huegel, Spengler, Whitehead, a fair amount of nineteenth-century French poetry; Japanese and Chinese translations; portions of the Upanishads; some theosophy and Rosicrucian literature; the Irish patriot poets of the nineteenth century; the poems of Michelangelo and Mallarme. He will need a working knowledge of statuary and of mosaics, of Egyptian, Greek, and Byzantine art, of painting from Michelangelo to Edmund Dulac, of Calvert and Wilson, Blake and Claude.

But, in order fully to understand Yeats' poems, the reader has another hurdle to overcome. For, soon after their marriage, Yeats and his wife discovered that she was gifted with automatic writing. By means of this writing, or at least in part by means of it, came A Vision, a prose work published in 1925 and later modified and revised by Yeats. The whole story of the composition of this work will probably never be known, but Yeats himself apparently believed that it contained the philosophy of the Spirits whom he called the Unknown Instructors in one of his poems, and that it gave him a rich source of private symbols.

A Vision is a very difficult book. It gives Yeats' very subjective interpretation of what he considered the significant events of history. The important thing for the student of Yeats' poetry is, however, that in doing so, A Vision also becomes a great source of private symbols which Yeats uses in his later poetry.

A full understanding of many of Yeats poems requires then, not only an acquaintance with the esoteric works cited by Mr. Henn in the passage above, but also an acquaintance with at least the basic ideas contained in the very difficult A Vision. Fortunately the student who wishes to become acquainted with some of the more esoteric aspects of Yeats' poetry may do so with the aid of such works as the collection of essays by Hall and Steinman entitled The Permanence of Yeats, Richard Ellman's various studies of the poet, and above all, John Unterecker's A Reader's Guide to William Butler Yeats.

But if Yeats is so esoteric a poet, why is he so popular a poet — why does he have so many admirers outside the ivory towers of college professors and even outside the university classrooms where students are required to play academic crossword puzzles with modern poetry?

The first answer is that many of Yeats' more esoteric poems can be read and enjoyed without any knowledge of his seemingly far-fetched allusions and his private symbols. As a matter of fact, the more obvious meaning of a poem of his may be more exciting than the meaning which is added to the poem by his private symbols. A good example is the famous poem entitled "The Second Coming."

Turning and turning in the widening gyre
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

Surely some revelation is at hand;
Surely the Second Coming is at hand.
The Second Coming! Hardly are those words out
When a vast image out of Spiritus Mundi
Troubles my sight: somewhere in sands of the desert
A shape with lion body and the head of a man,
A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun,
Is moving its slow thighs, while all about it
Reel shadows of the indignant desert birds.
The darkness drops again; but now I know
That twenty centuries of stony sleep
Were vexed to nightmare by a rocking cradle,
And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,
Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?

Scholar after scholar has written pages and pages in explication of this poem, for the poem leans heavily upon two private symbols which Yeats later developed in great detail in A Vision, the primary gyre and the antithetical gyre. But the basic meaning of the poem is easily grasped by any intelligent reader. The poet feels that we are living in a centrifugal age; our society is fall-
ing apart; wars are breaking out everywhere; “the best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity.”

In the second stanza he expresses his belief that the Christian era is obviously over; that “Surely the Second Coming is at hand.” The vision he has of that second coming is a horrible one indeed: a rough beast with “A gaze blank and pitiless as the sun / Is moving its slow thighs” and finally it “Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born.” Hardly an optimistic view of the future!

A further reason for Yeats’ popularity is that the important symbols in many of his poems are well-known natural symbols. Since time immemorial, the rose has been a natural symbol for beauty. Any intelligent person who reads Yeats’ “The Rose of the World” will recognize immediately, although he may not understand the allusion to Usna’s children, that the poem celebrates the beauty of woman.

Who dreamed that beauty passes like a dream?
For these red lips, with all their mournful pride, Mournful that no new wonder may betide, Troy passed away in one high funeral gleam, And Usna’s children died.

We and the labouring world are passing by:
Amid men’s souls, that waver and give place
Like the pale waters in their wintry race,
Under the passing stars, foam of the sky,
Lives on this lonely face.

Bow down, archangels, in your dim abode:
Before you were, or any hearts to beat,
Weary and kind one lingered by His seat;
He made the world to be a grassy road
Before her wandering feet.

Another reason for his popularity is that many of the personal poems Yeats has written are also truly universal. To know the story of Yeats’ unrequited love for Maude Gonne makes the following poem more interesting, but the reader need know nothing of that story in order to get the universal meaning of the poem.

When you are old and grey and full of sleep,
And nodding by the fire, take down this book,
And slowly read, and dream of the soft look
Your eyes had once, and of their shadows deep;
How many loved your moments of glad grace,
And loved your beauty with love false or true,
But one man loved the pilgrim soul in you,
And loved the sorrows of your changing face;

And bending down beside the glowing bars,
Murmur, a little sadly, how Love fled
And paced upon the mountains overhead
And hid his face amid a crowd of stars.

The popularity of Yeats is also due in part to the apparent sponaneity of his poems. Yeats was, as a matter of fact, a very careful craftsman who spent a great deal of time improving and polishing his poems. He was always anxious, however, to have these poems seem unlabored, for, as he said,

A line will take us hours maybe:
Yet if it does not seem a moment’s thought,
Our stitching and unstitching has been naught.

Another thing that explains the popularity of Yeats is the quality of much of his poetry which, for want of a better term, shall be called liturgical. Every teacher who has taught Yeats knows, for instance, that when the following stanza from “Sailing to Byzantium” is read aloud, even out of context, the effect is that of an incantation; although they may not entirely understand the stanza, the students seem to feel that they are standing on holy ground.

O sages standing in God’s holy fire
As in the gold mosaic of a wall,
Come from the holy fire, perne in a gyre,
And be the singing-masters of my soul.
Consumed my heart away; sick with desire
And fastened to a dying animal
It knows not what it is; and gather me
Into the artifice of eternity.

But the main reason for Yeats’ popularity is no doubt the fact that many of his best poems deal, not with esoteric matters, but with such universal things as love, friendship, youth, old age, and death — those things to which the greatest poets have always addressed themselves.

Some of Yeats’ finest poems of this kind are those he wrote in his later years on the passing of youth and the coming of age and death. Many examples might be given, but the following closing stanza of “The Tower” must suffice:

Now shall I make my soul,
Compelling it to study
In a learned school
Till the wreck of body,
Slow decay of blood,
Testy delirium
Or dull decrepitude,
Or what worse evil come —
The death of friends, or death
Of every brilliant eye
That made a catch in the breath —
Seem but the clouds of the sky
When the horizon fades;
Or a bird’s sleepy cry
Among the deepening shades.
The Theatre

New Wine In Old Bottles

By WALTER SORELL

The day I am writing this report, eleven musicals, five comedies, and three serious plays are featured on Broadway. A new play, “And Things That Go Bump in the Night” by Terrence McNally, went bump all right; it was unanimously and scathingly panned but keeps its doors open by selling all tickets for one dollar. The house is packed — which only proves that there is a theatre audience after all if you only make it financially feasible. The producers probably have strong beliefs about their initial mistake. This is the wonderful thing about theatre people: they believe in what they are doing, even if it wasn’t worth the doing from the very beginning.

The two new entries on Broadway which have some merit are the hilarious farce, “The Odd Couple,” by Neil Simon and James Baldwin’s “The Amen Corner.” Simon’s skill in writing effective scenes loaded with the funniest gags is unquestionable. Art Carney and Walther Matthau are odd, indeed — two divorced men roommat­ing, householding together, and experiencing the blessings of too much proximity. This odd union out of misery and compassion is, of course, doomed to go through too much proximity. This odd union out of misery and compassion is, of course, doomed to go through the ordeals of incompatible companionships until they finally reach the point of separation. What can be funnier than two “males” married to each other and going vicariously through all marital difficulties again? The ladies enjoy it no end, the gentlemen get a kick out of it. It is perhaps a tasteless, but theatrically effective, idea which Mike Nichols, the director, made into a gem.

“The Amen Corner” is James Baldwin’s first play; it had a successful run on the West Coast. When it was written twelve years ago — in the good old days — James Baldwin was not yet militant. The world seemed calmer. But the troubles were there and the same — some impoverished Negroes in Harlem acutely felt the barrenness of their lives. The basic idea James Baldwin had was that religion is an escape for too many Negroes living in misery and despair, that it is opium, an evasion of living. Baldwin is not a great playwright. He is too often rhetorical and elementary; he puts people onstage, but does not yet understand how to make them live. They are far more poster figures than human beings. However, he has moments that ring true and he has something to say in this play which is full of compassion with the anguish of people herded together in a ghetto called Harlem.

The only scene of real dramatic strength comes at the very end when Bea Richards as sister Margaret, pastor of the Tabernacle of Truth and Love, a store-front church in Harlem, sees her life collapse. Her prodigal husband returns to die; her son leaves her and her church; and her congregation is in a rebellious spirit. This scene is moving and also foreshadows the waxing anger in James Baldwin’s second play, “Blues for Mr. Charlie.” Perhaps his third play will prove whether he has a sense of the theatre. Topical themes too often cloud the real ability of a dramatist.

Several new writers were introduced on off-Broadway stages lately. The courageous firm of Richard Barr, Clinton Wilder, and Edward Albee work for the new playwright knowing only too well that he must see his work in order to be able to grow. Not all promises are fulfilled, and not all entries are promising. There is a great deal of suffering in self-pitied style going on in Kenneth Pressman’s “Hunting the Jingo Bird” and a good pint of Pinter went into Charles Nolte’s “Do Not Pass Go.” Joseph Morgenstern’s “Lovey” seems to be the most promising of these plays. In it an unhappy couple goes South to get their simple-minded Negro maid to a hospital where her daughter has been a patient for many years. The dialogue is fluid and the characters well defined. Mr. Morgenstern may write a memorable play one day.

This was achieved by Herbert Lieberman’s first play, “Matty, Moron and Madonna,” in which the author brought a vital theme — the search of a boy for the real love of a mother — to life. His over-eagerness has misled the author to lose himself in too much detail. There is an unnecessarily huge cast and too much extraneous action to prove the point. But the figure of the possessive, unstable, almost demonic mother is as strongly drawn as the boy who pines away in his yearning for maternal love. Matty visits a woman with a saintly kindness taking care of her moronic son, and Matty envies the Mongolian idiot for the love he receives.

Fortunately, not all new plays are written in the forced style of newness, with elliptical sentences and thoughts, groping for no answer to the mere statement that life is full of perversion and torment. Also, by now, too many plays try to get today’s civil strife into the dramatic action, if only peripherally. Harold Willis, another new dramatist, wrote a high-pitched play storming incessantly through clashing conflicts. “A Sound of Silence” is its title and it deals with a Southern white family whose daughter invites a young Negro clergyman to spend some days in their home. Mr. Willis tries to uphold the traditions of the South without ignoring the needs of today.

Many new voices have been heard lately — although what they said was neither enlightening nor startling.
From the Chapel

The Occasion of Choice*

By MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN
Graduate Professor of New Testament Exegesis
Concordia Seminary (St. Louis)

What you are today, I once was. What I am just now, you may soon be: middle-aged and scarred. The former is inevitable but hardly to be desired; the latter is desirable but it can be avoided.

You can arrange to blend into your background and become part of the smooth surface of conformity. You will, in fact, be expected to do just that; and your friends will compliment you when you do. They want you to adjust, as they say. You will hardly believe me; and in a way you really should not, because what I say at my age should not be believable at yours. Yet you ought to hear the whole story, because in one respect I know more than you do: you know only what it is to be young, while I know what it is to be both young and older. In any case, I will not lie to you to make you feel good. You will be old much longer than you are young, and I would rather that you believed me for that stretch of your life which is much longer than youth.

From this very moment of your commencement you will continue to face the threat of personal moral disintegration. The fiber of your life will be exposed at every step to the corrosive forces of what is called “the normal thing to do.” The devil is no fool. He comes to you in the little things of life, attempting to persuade you that it may be just as well to do what comes rather naturally everywhere around you.

It may be that twenty-five years from now you will endure an existence which, if you could foresee it now, you would call intolerable. In a distinguished commencement address of some years ago, Milton Mayer, one of our most brilliant journalists, made an observation that I should like to use here: In twenty-five years you will probably be taking your wife, or your husband will be taking you, out to observed an anniversary — if you love each other, and especially if you do not! You will go to a fairly good restaurant, and be seated near a window. If a hungry man should be walking by just then, what will you do? You will probably call the waiter and ask him, please, to pull the shades.

You may become middle-aged and corrupt, just like that. Worse still, you may be content with such decay. That is why I want to talk to you this afternoon on the subject, “The Occasion of Choice.” Let me begin by calling your attention to two heresies which pervade our civilization that the concept of character in terms of moral strength is given little serious thought, except possibly in our armed forces, where this item is often a matter of life and death. It reveals the general loss of a very elementary insight; namely, that you and I have been created to use the occasion of choice as a way of fending off disintegration and moral decay.

For what is character from a moral point of view? It is the organization of life around a central loyalty that has moral worth and validity. Perhaps it will be helpful to use an analogy at this point. We shall find it in the structure of an archway. Before stones are made to hold together in this particular form, they are just a pile of rocks. Then a stonemason organizes them to create an

* This address was the commencement address to Valparaiso University's Class of 1964.
It is, in fact, quite
put a strong keystone conviction to work
with moral principle appears as an enviable but waste­
consuming desire for personal advancement. They were
one, consideration; namely, 
men of character, you see.

The central conviction of your life can, of course, be
utterly selfish. It is possible for an individual to adopt as
the controlling factor in your use of the occasion of choice
the desire for selfaggrandizement. There are many who
do just that. Your friends may quite well be among them.
Let me say at once that this is the shortcut to
disaster.

In this connection there comes to mind a little scene
from Henrik Ibsen’s Peer Gynt. Those of you who are
students of drama may well remember the incident of
two visitors observing what goes on in a mental institution.
As they note the unusual behavior of the patients
one of the guests is moved to comment that these people
are, of course, beside themselves. The reply is prompt
and vigorous:
“Beside themselves? Oh, no; you are wrong.
It’s here that men are most themselves.
Sailing with outspread sails of self,
Each shuts himself up in a cask of self;
The cask stopped with a bung of self.
And seasoned in a well of self.
None has a tear for other’s woes,
Or cares what any other thinks.”

Such people are ill because they organize their lives
around a principle that has no moral worth or validity.
They are utterly self-centered. Many persons may not
be quite ill enough to be institutionalized. In fact, they
may well have a job, but use it for little but self. If this is
the course you will choose to follow, I shall be safe in
my prediction that you will be as corrupt as are large seg­
ments of our contemporary life, where preoccupation
with moral principle appears as an enviable but wasteful
interest. None has a tear for other’s woes, no care for others’
trials. It is the course you will choose to follow, I shall be
safe in my prediction that you will be as corrupt as are large
segments of our contemporary life, where preoccupation
with moral principle appears as an enviable but wasteful
interest. None has a tear for other’s woes, no care for others’
trials.

If the occasion of choice is to be used as an opportunity
for development, then your keystone conviction must
be one of selflessness. On the level of civic performance,
one might name George Washington as an example of a
man who made service to the Nation the overarching
concern of his life. He did not hesitate, therefore, to be
taken from the earned pleasures of retirement to head
our Nation in its formative years. We could also point to
Abraham Lincoln, whose decisions, especially during the
War Between the States, were guided by one, and only
one, consideration; namely, “How does this choice af­
fect the strength of the Union?” The point we are trying
to make is that these men stand out in our history as
men who seized the occasion of choice to decide the is­sues
of life at the hand of interests which lay outside any
consuming desire for personal advancement. They were
men of character, you see.

Character, as you may well have surmised by now, is
made in the manufacture of daily duty. It consists of
making the right choices over and over again according
to a basic conviction. Such repetition develops strong
habits. If you want to escape disintegration and moral
decay, the time to start developing good habits is now,
this very instant. Plato already, as you may recall, ob­served
how much more difficult it is to break bad habits than
to follow strong choices from the very beginning.
If you will here and now, today — it is, in fact, quite
late already — put a strong keystone conviction to work
in the organization of your life, you will be taking the
occasion of choice as an opportunity for personal develop­
ment in terms of habit.

Jewish rabbis have a quaint way of describing our
dilemma in this matter. They tend to speak of two
impulses in man: a good one on the right side and an
evil one on the left. The latter gets a running start on
life; for it is not until age 13, when a boy becomes a bar
mitzvah (“a son of the commandment”) that the noble
impulse begins to make itself known. Surely, this is their
way of expressing a difficulty we face in using
the occasion of choice.

You are particularly fortunate in being graduates of
this institution. For here is a university established to
have Biblical truth penetrate and pervade every aspect
of instruction and guidance; and it is this very religion
which provides the most noble central loyalty of all­
namely, the habit of sacrifice. Our Lord has asked us to
imitate Him in this habit of losing our lives so that we
may find it.

It will be well at this juncture to remind ourselves that
we are part of a redeemed community, a group of people
which has been called out to manifest a new quality of
life. You will possibly not mind my asking whether you
have ever taken a close look at the virtues of life as they
are listed in the New Testament. If so, you may have
noticed that they are relational in their thrust. That is
to say, they cannot be practiced except toward someone
else. How would you forgive, may I ask, if you stay all
by yourself? How do you practice patience except to­
wards another? How do you put up with each other if
you should want to live in isolation? How do you prac­
tice long-suffering except within that community which
is sustained by this very quality in God?

There is a great distinction between the theology you
have been taught here and, let us say, the religion and
philosophy which pervaded ancient Greece and has af­
sected so much of our Western culture. The Greeks, too,
talked about virtues. They listed four cardinal ones:
wisdom, courage, fair play, and moderation. Wisdom is
a quality of life that one can practice alone. In fact, the
Greek often sought to be alone in the pursuit of individ­
ual excellence. He set out to rise above others in the
sense of wanting to be separated from the common herd.
But at this institution you have been taught that sacri­
fice, losing one’s life in the service of others, is the key­
stone that holds together the archway of life. From here
on out you have the occasion of choice to practice this
themselves talk much about freedom; but for them, alas, enemies of our religion and of our Nation. These have conspired to deprive us of our liberties. In that case, you will reveal thereby that you do not care to implement the concept of sacrifice. But if this is what you choose to do, you will destroy yourself.

This opportunity of choice is threatened today by the enemies of our religion and of our Nation. These have conspired to deprive us of our liberties. Of course, they themselves talk much about freedom; but for them, alas, it is no more than the right to do what one must do. Some weeks ago I listened to a televised news program which introduced seven European church representatives as guests of the evening. One of them was asked to state what job he had back home in Germany. He replied, that he had the task of attempting to reorient those young people who had managed to escape from behind the Iron Curtain. He was quite frank in describing how difficult it was to get these young men and women to realize the significance of having the occasion of choice. This visitor went on to observe that his wards tended to wait around, hoping for someone to tell them what to do.

This kind of total regimentation, we might note, has not been possible until the twentieth century. It is our age that has developed the means of mass communication and the devices for psychological manipulation which enable a handful of people to restructure the minds and souls of millions of individuals in such a way as to make them feel as though they were “the quotient of one billion divided by one billion” (Koestler). The prospect of having this evil spread among us is one that we must fear and resist; for it sets out to remove the occasion of choice.

You have been trained at this institution to exercise also the responsibilities of citizenship. You should know that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. There are vocal minorities within our own Nation attempting to deprive us of this very occasion of choice in order to reduce us to robots or parrots. It may be well that we alert ourselves to this fact of our common life and assume the responsibility of choosing to direct our habits toward the preservation of the occasion of choice even at a high cost to ourselves.

Sometimes I get the impression that we do not fully appreciate what it is that we have in our open society. Others have made the same observation, notably Dr. Charles Malik, Ambassador to the United Nations from Lebanon. Serving as president of the UN Assembly some years ago, he remarked:

You Americans have in your traditions certain invaluable beliefs about man and society, human destiny and the nature of God — beliefs that you should feel free to export and teach others. But many of you have taken too much for granted. Therefore, the great deposit of belief and conviction and interpretation of life which have come down to you, you simply do not honor enough. You are a bit diffident. The Communist world will force you to articulate yourselves. Asia and Africa are going to ask, “What do you believe?” My deepest fear — if you want me to put it bluntly to you — is that you don’t know the infinite values that you have at the basis of your own civilization, and you don’t believe in them enough to put them strongly to the rest of the world.

Possibly, you will find it meaningful if, in conclusion, I remind you that such privileges as the occasion of choice are so universally desired among men that we need not ever attempt to impose our will on any one in this respect — not on any one at all! Men know that they have not been created to live on the level of the ant and the bee. They want to be persons, not things, and not digits. They long, therefore, to enjoy what we already have in what we have been calling the occasion of choice. They await it — to embrace it! It is already yours — to have, to use, and to give! God bless you!
The campaigns for better lighted streets at night and the tremendously effective lighting of our big cities has almost taken the romance away from the lighting of another day.

Gone is the religious zeal of the ministry of the city of Baltimore, which was the first city to light its public streets with gas lights about one hundred years ago. They held a solemn meeting and protested turning "night into day," feeling very sure that if the Creator had wanted His people to be about at night He would have furnished them more light than the meager moon. The same type of meeting and the same type of protest took place in London, Paris, Berlin, and New York.

Among the early street lights, most of them were attached to the walls of houses at prominent intersections and served more as landmarks, for "light houses," than for any truly worthy illumination. When you went out at night you carried your own lantern (or if you were wealthy enough, a servant carried it before you) to guide your steps. Such light was very meager and very unsatisfactory according to present day standards.

Interior lighting was hardly more adequate. Many of our readers felt quite nostalgic about Marcel Proust's descriptions of the man fumbling for matches in order to see what time it was during his sleepless night. Repeatedly we are reminded in Goethe's conversations with Eckerman that, when twilight descended, they had to bring in the two candles in order to help the men with their notes. Only the palaces and great castles could afford the luxury of the crystal chandeliers in which dozens of candles burned.

Even the best illumination of streets in past centuries had to content itself with the wooden or metal arm projected from the wall. Many of the citizens of midwestern cities can still remember the lamplighter going through the streets at dusk in order to set a flame to the wick of the gas mantle which has had a tremendous comeback in popularity.

Many of the lighting fixtures of the larger cities became quite artistic during the nineteenth century. As the lighting was removed from the walls of houses, it became an independent pillar supporting the light along the streets of the sleeping cities. In Venice they took the form, which is seen at the left, of beautiful hand-carved triple lights; in Paris they became five-globed candelabra; in Bad Homburg they became beautiful fixtures running along the houses of its interesting narrow streets.

Today, as the great airliners approach the runways of our Municipal Airports, whole cities lie beneath you garlanded with the jewels of light that are our modern-day answer to darkness and crime on our city streets. And, yet, there will always be a place for the lonesome symbol of the living light in the single candle. The light of the modern metropolis is pure machinery — so wonderful, in fact, that we scarcely think about the miracle at all except when there is a power failure.

---

On Second Thought

"Institutionalism" is one of the derogatory watchwords of the day. We decry the fact that a "church" strives to build itself in the process of its work under God. Kindergartners are introduced to the complexities of the pericopes and to the mysteries of Trinitarian dogma, so they will grow into competence in our worship according to our forms. Mission goals are set in terms of new congregations formed in our denomination, or in souls won from any source to membership in our church. Budgets are proposed as God's will, to provide the means for our growth and our specialized training.

I am happy for the realization that the church in the world is an institution, an organization of men. How else shall we work in a world of men, except through such administration and planning as men are capable of doing? Our church is just as much concerned with programs for its own growth as Mutual of New York, just as much in need of defending its policies as Playboy magazine, just as much concerned with proving its superiority as Tareyton cigarettes, just as anxious to find a separate stance as the Democratic party.

With that realization I can work untroubled. I can watch our follies and know that I am as inextricably foolish as any other. I can even decry the folly with no feeling of pressure to propose a solution. I can know that we are just as forgiven under redeeming grace as the Democrats, Mutual of New York, or Tareyton cigarettes.
The Music Room

Variety In Music

By WALTER A. HANSEN

For many months I have been reading the wonderful lectures which Martin Luther delivered on the basis of the Book of Genesis. It is necessary for me to examine every word in these remarkable discourses with the utmost concentration and care. In fact, I must scrutinize Luther's Latin with such punctilious attention to every detail that much of the language he uses makes its way into my own flesh and blood.

I could write at great length about the abundance and the depth of Luther's learning in the domain of theology, about his skill and courage as a polemicist, and about his fabulous acquaintance with the Bible. But in this column I must deal with various aspects of music, and today Luther provides me with something important to discuss.

No, I am not going afield; for the great Reformer's mastery of what I choose to call the fine art of avoiding verbal monotony actually hurls me headlong into a brief discussion of the tremendous importance of variety in music.

The more intently and assiduously I read Luther, the more I marvel at the refreshing variety he was able to put into his way of writing. One could argue, I suppose, that much of his ability to do this was instinctive. Yet one must ascribe a large measure of his uncanny skill in this regard to a thorough acquaintance with numerous literary masterpieces. He set great store by the poems of Vergil, who, as you know, was a master of colorful, incisive, meaningful, and richly varied speech. Luther knew the writings of many other famous authors. In fact, much of the great literature of ancient Greece and Rome had become part and parcel of his very being.

Luther had a huge vocabulary — a vocabulary that rushed on and on like a mighty cataract. Although he knew the power of repetition, this realization did not fling him into humdrum verbosity. Naturally, he had to dwell on the same subjects many thousands of times. But he knew how to repeat with the utmost skill and how to vary with amazing deftness. Believe me, this is no random statement of mine. It is based — if you will pardon me for saying so — on a somewhat extensive acquaintance with much of what the Reformer wrote in Latin and in German.

*Varietas delectat* ("Variety gives pleasure") is an old Latin saying. Although some have ascribed it to the nimble-witted Roman poet named Horace, you will not be able to find it in his writings. But this is neither here nor there.

It is immeasurably important to spice music with artistically disciplined variety. Although I could discuss the so-called variation form at some length, I do not propose to do so at this time. It would be profitable to deal in detail with such masterpieces as Bach's *Passacaglia and Fugue in C Minor*, the *Chaconne* in one of his works for solo violin, his *Goldberg Variations*, Beethoven's *Diabelli Variations*, the many series of variations we have from the pen of Mozart, a part of Beethoven's *Symphony No. 9* and movements of his *Eroica Symphony* and his Pastoral Symphony, Brahms's *Variations on a Theme by Paganini* and *Variations and Fugue on a Theme by Handel*, Schumann's *Etudes Symphoniques*, Richard Strauss's *Don Quixote*, the variations in reverse in Vincent d'Indy's *Istar*, masterfully constructed works in this form by Max Reger, and numerous other compositions exemplifying the art of writing variations. But I shall forgo this pleasure in order to stress as briefly as possible the value and the effectiveness of variety in other ramifications of the tonal art.

Singers and instrumentalists must learn how important variety is. Unfortunately, many of them never realize that monotony stultifies and slays. But just as Luther never goes overboard when resorting to rich variety of expression, so those who sing and play must always be aware of the inestimably great importance of restraint. Away with those whom I like to call expressionmongers! They "tear a passion to tatters," as Shakespeare says, when they sing, play, or conduct music by Bach. They strive to paint the lily, to refine fine gold. They transplant Bach into the 19th century and present his music as if it had been composed by Schumann. They are guilty of the same grave offense when they lay violent hands on the works of Mozart. They make me ill. They know nothing about restraint, historical evidence, and well-founded tradition. Their special passion for variety goes hog-wild and slaps good taste in the face. Such variety is baneful.

There are composers who create concoctions as dull as ditchwater because they know nothing whatever about the importance of tastefully disciplined and decorously restrained variety. Their harmonic progressions remind one of sick cows, and whenever they put their hands to contrapuntal writing, they look for all the world like senile nanny goats. Has no one ever told them to study Bach's chorale harmonizations?

Every truly great singer, performer, and composer pays careful attention to the wonderful magic of artistically controlled variety. If this were not the case, music would have much in common with a sloppily kept henhouse, which none but dreadfully uncouth chickens would care to call their homes.
The Compleat Clergyman

Luther is once reputed to have said that, next to prayer, the most effective weapon in attacking the diabolical was a good joke. If so, then the Christian Church is much the better for Charles Merrill Smith's essay on How to Become a Bishop Without Being Religious (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1965, 131 pp., $3.50), for he has provided an always devastating, frequently hilarious satire on organized middle-class American Protestantism. Smith is the pastor of a large Methodist parish in Bloomington, Illinois, and in his volume he advises the well-behaved ecclesiastical climber how to achieve success. It is obviously not a course provided by the usual theological seminary.

Crucial to professional success is the proper demeanor, the development of a clerical stance. The successful preacher need not be religious, but he must certainly be pious, that is, he must fulfill the image of the pious preacher developed by middle-class American church people. Since clothes make the man, Smith offers some excellent advice on clerical attire designed to develop the proper clerical stance. "Who would turn for spiritual counsel to a man in a Tweed sport coat?" he asks. "And how many of the saintly Christians in your flock would believe that the prayers of a preacher wearing chartreuse socks could possibly carry to the heavens?" He provides a full chart outlining proper models and colors of automobiles in accord with the changing parishes of the upwardly mobile young preacher. But the clerical stance required for ecclesiastical success calls not only for proper externals; it also calls for the development of a series of personal inhibitions. "Your pleasures, then, should not be of a rigorous nature. It is a pity that croquet is no longer popular for it is the ideal recreation for the clergy. No one gets very excited about it, no one swears over a poor shot, it is inexpensive, and it doesn't work up a sweat." The one acceptable clerical fleshly sin is gluttony. "Not only will your people permit it, they will urge it upon you at every opportunity, to the accompaniment of coarse humor about how preachers like to eat."

The arts? A judicious mixture of Lloyd Douglas novels, the Saturday Evening Post, and representational art (including Warner Sallman's "Head of Christ" and perhaps a still life) will turn the trick. "In your early pastorate a small felt banner reading 'God Bless Our Home' and perhaps a wooden plaque with the Lord's Prayer burned into it will complete the objects d'art necessary to clinch the image. By your third church, though, they should be omitted lest you be considered a bit bucolic."

The clerical wife is also important. Appearance is crucial. She must be neither beautiful, stylish or sexy, nor homely and frumpy. "A good, plain-looking wife whom you like and about whom you can think with affection but without passion is an inestimable aid in directing your primary devotion to your church and its duties."

Protestant clergymen are primarily preachers. How can one be effective in the pulpit? "The first rule for the popular preacher to remember is that style is of enormous importance while content makes little ultimate difference in the congregation's enthusiasm for one's efforts in the pulpit. About 1000 parts style to 1 part content is a good proportion. Fundamentally, preaching at its best is one of the entertainment arts."

Conducting public worship is fundamentally an exercise in nostalgia. The successful leader must recognize that while members of his congregation think they want to worship God they actually like to worship themselves. Smith provides a splendid analysis of Protestant hymnody including the defects of "A Mighty Fortress is Our God" and the real merits of "Blessed Assurance," "Sweet Hour of Prayer," and "The Old Rugged Cross" from this point of view.

The successful pastor builds up his congregation. He does this by recognizing that the key to parish success is money and by developing a practical theology of fund-raising based on the doctrine of salvation by works. He must also always remember that the local congregation is a status-conscious social organization. The good pastor chooses his new members wisely; a millionaire is worth two college professors with the Ph.D. or eight grade school teachers. Factory workers and most colored people confer negative status on the church, he suggests, and should be avoided or at most tolerated.

But how does the aspiring young man break into the denominational big leagues and ultimately reach his goal? There are several paths. The large urban or suburban parish is one route. Rising through the denominational administrative hierarchy or spending a few years as president of a denominational college are other ways. Yet, the author warns, the field is competitive; elective assemblies are unpredictable, and not every ardent and conscientious practitioner of the art discussed in this volume will make it; but it is a cinch that anyone who fails to heed this advice will never get close to the top.

This is splendid satire. The author's style is deft, his satirical shafts are invariably on target, and he manages to successfully sustain his tone throughout the entire volume. These are substantial achievements. Readers will react in various ways. A few will come to the frightening realization that the volume could actually be used as a manual for clerical success. Others, deeply committed to the targets of Smith's satire, may be shocked. A few of the more sophisticated, aware of the criticism of organized Protestantism and of parish life so characteristic of the past decade, may find the book dull and may feel that the volume is too late and merely flogs a dead horse. Most readers will, I think, find it hilarious.

One final disturbing thought. What is Smith really after in this satire? Is he, like most satirists, criticizing that which he loves and to which he is committed? Or has he really abandoned hope for the parish as the most practical organization form for the realization of Christianity? Whatever Smith's motives, this volume can give aid and comfort to the latter point of view. And if the satire hits home, if the geographical parish and organizational church are really outmoded, then Protestantism had best search with renewed vigor for new forms within which the Christian faith can be expressed.

KENDALL BIRR

A View From the Other Side

If the war in South Viet Nam were a simple struggle between the defenders of freedom, democracy, decency and the forces of totalitarian enslavement, the making of American policy would be a far simpler task. But we know this is not the case. We have seen pictures of guerrillas being tortured; we have read too much about the Diem regime to be idealists; and the rapid succession of Saigon governments suggests musical chairs, not political principles. Yet we carry on, more in desperation than in hope.

But what are the convictions that sustain us? Just what is the touchstone of our policy? Is it the military-strategic consideration, the belief that South Viet Nam stands at the head of a line of dominoes? Is it something less tangible, like national pride or stubbornness? Or is it a humanitarian concern for the people of the beleaguered land?

Humanitarianism is, unfortunately, the
poorest of all foundations for international policy. It is a short step removed from the arrogance of "the white man's burden," it leads to dangerous overextensions of our strength, and it finally provides no real direction at all for the hard task of making policy, where lesser evils must always be chosen and unalloyed good is never an option.

These are reflections upon reading an unusual book: *Vietnam: Inside Story of the Guerrilla War*, by Wilfred G. Burchett (International Publishers, 1965, $4.95, 253pp. with photographs). Mr. Burchett traveled extensively through the territory held by the guerrillas in South Viet Nam, and talked at length with leaders of the "Viet Cong" (a less accurate designation, he contends, than National Liberation Front). He literally stood on the other side, and he brings us a perspective that no ordinary Western journalist could provide.

Lift no eyebrows. We have not been "taken in" by the writings of someone soft on Communism. Burchett is not soft on Communists: he is one. When he smuggled out greetings to his wife, they were sent to Moscow. The extreme solicitude displayed by the guerrillas is eloquent testimony to the value they place upon him and his ability to state their side of the case. And International Publishers is not exactly the publishing house of the Republican Party. But so what?

So, of course, we must read *grano salis*, no doubt with a larger grain than ought to accompany a *New York Times* dispatch. Nevertheless, truth does not finally depend on who says it. And there is a great deal about the South Viet Nam struggle that is not being said in the more conventional channels. There are nagging questions that arise when one reads our more "official" accounts, such questions as these: How could the guerrilla operation be so successful without substantial popular support? How does one explain the extraordinary courage displayed by so many of the Viet Cong? What are the issues as perceived by the people of South Viet Nam themselves?

There are flaws in Burchett's account, too. He seems to muddle cause and effect in discussing the "strategic hamlet" concept and popular reaction. His exonation of outside influence, notably Hanoi—is plausible but not completely convincing. And some of the long speeches which he records as inter­

dhandouts.

Yet Burchett knows this area intimately, has had long experience in reporting wars and revolutions, and—dare we add such a trivial consideration?—writes well. If there is nothing to be feared from the contention of truth and error, every genuine believer in a free society must be grateful to International Publishers. There is much to be feared from not having at hand any view from the opposite side.

WORTH NOTING

**Thomas Aquinas and John Gerhard**

By Robert P. Scharlemann (Yale, $6.50)

A scandal of long standing in the intellec­
tual culture of the Lutheran churches in America has been a surprising lack of interest in their seventeenth-century philosophical and theological roots. This is especially re­
grettable in the case of those Lutherans who continue to reiterate the theological formulation of seventeenth-century Lutheran scholasticism without bothering to inquire more closely into its nature and dynamics. It is particularly embarrassing for such Lutherans, who pride themselves on being theologically explic­
tic, to discover their inability to muster sufficient precision in conversation with Roman Catholics trained in Thomistic scholasticism. Whatever one may think of scholasticism as an adequate mode of theological formulation for Christians in the twenti­
eth century, there is no doubt about its impor­
tance for ecumenical conversations between Lutherans and Roman Catholics. In such enterprises Robert P. Scharlemann's *Thomas Aquinas and John Gerhard* will prove a valu­
able resource.

In this study Mr. Scharlemann focuses upon "one central issue" of "the theological view of man" at the "specific focal points" of Thomas' concept of caritas and Gerhard's concept of fides. Scharlemann analyzes those two views of man in terms of what Thomas and Gerhard have to say about the "pure creation" before the fall; the fall and its conse­
quences for the "image of God" in man; man as the recipient of God's gracious action in the "new creation." Scharlemann finds that the theological formulations of the two men are directly comparable in many respects. Gerhard describes man as a "rational ani­
mal" whose final end is "the beatific vision in which the mind knows and the will loves God" in terms which do not differ signifi­
cantly from St. Thomas' treatment. Scharle­
mann finds, indeed, that Gerhard, who shows familiarity with the works of St. Thomas, follows the scholastic tradition in his account of the entire finite world. Gerhard even speaks in much the same way as does St. Thomas of the effects upon man's finite nature of God's gracious renovating activity in the work of sanctification (though Gerhard focuses almost entirely upon God's work of justifi­
cation). This difference in focus, of course, reflects a difference in historical situation of the two teachers of the Church, but along with it a radically different way, of treating the relation between the finite and the infinite. Scharlemann shows how this difference in view affects the very conception of theology itself.

For St. Thomas theology is a *theoreti­
cal science* which treats in comparatively smooth continuity the relation between nature and grace by making use of the Aristotelian doctrine of "form." St. Thomas "mode of conceptualization" is styled by Scharlemann as "formal-objective." For Gerhard, on the other hand, theology has a dual character. As orderly exposition of the content of Scripture it is a *theoretical science*. In its appli­
cation of Scripture to public and private "use" in the Church, however, theology is an *acous­
tical science*, and its "mode of conceptualization" is "dialectical-personal." That is, it centers upon the sinner's hearing of the Word which God addresses to him. Along with this difference in mode of conceptualization goes a difference in the *order of relation* between names, concepts, and transcendent realities.

In Thomas "the gap between the finite and the infinite is spanned by concepts; in Ger­
hard it is spanned by words. In Thomistic scholasticism, words are the bearers of concepts; in Gerhard's scholasticism concepts are the derivatives of words." Scharlemann is also able to characterize "these whole sys­
tems as they relate to other wholes." Thomas' system is "self-expanding," Gerhard's is "self-transcending.

Perhaps, Scharlemann suggests, the *fides­
external and the *caritas-external require another: *Fides* is concerned to show that even the worst possible is still redeemable. The *caritas-external can provide the sober corrective which prevents *fides* from lapsing into unguided revolution. . . There seems to be no reason, at the outset, therefore, why there could not be a perspective which is both *fides* and *caritas*, not by simple addition of the two but as the outgrowth of a new vision.

In the meantime "it is possible to approximate a view of the one from the other and to see... through a glass darkly..."

In the opinion of this reviewer, Scharle­
mann's analysis of these two systems is symp­
pathetic, informed by a thorough acquain­
tance with the sources both primary and secondary, and marked by a precision in the use of terms which is as commendable as it is rare. A valuable continuation of this study of Gerhard's theology could well include an inquiry into the "revolutionary" impact of the "auditory science" of the infinite upon other areas of the traditional systematic. It is this reviewer's own impression of Ger­
hard that his doctrine of God was virtually unaf­
ected. But shouldn't it have been affected? How about the doctrine of the Holy Trinity?

Another much needed continuation of Scharlemann's study would be a further inquiry into the consequences, for theology and philosophy, of an "auditory" treatment of the infinite down to the present epoch of the radical historicization of man-in-the­
world. One thinks here of the theology of Gerhard Ebeling, for example, as standing in this line.

The reviewer would like to express his personal gratitude to Robert Scharlemann for this valuable work within the hope that other American scholars will join in the task of understanding and recapturing the Lutheran intellectual heritage, and of appreciating its function in the intellectual history of the western world.

RICHARD W. SCHEIMMANN

The Cresset
A Transaction of Free Men: 
The Birth and Course of the Declaration of Independence
By David Hawke (Charles Scribner’s Sons. $5.95)

Tradition has it that when John Hancock completed signing the Declaration of Independence, having used bold characters twice as large as any other signer, his defiance of British authority was further reflected in a comment to the effect that John Bull could now read his name without spectacles. But John Hancock also recognized the larger significance of the document to posterity. On January 31, 1777, three weeks after Congress finally decided to disclose the names of the delegates who had signed the parchment, in a circular letter, which was sent to all the states along with a copy of the Declaration, he wrote: “As there is not a more distinguished event in the history of America, than the Declaration of Independence—nor any, that in all probability, will so much excite the attention of future ages, it is highly proper, that the memory of that transaction together with the causes that gave rise to it, should be preserved in the most careful manner that can be devised.”

Professor Hawke has given the document such careful attention. Following all the principles of responsible scholarship, he has traced the political thought, particularly as it evolved in the mind of Thomas Jefferson, which went into the Declaration. He has accomplished his task with a clarity and ease which should appeal to the general reader.

The volume demonstrates convincingly that Jefferson’s document was an eloquent application of the Lockean, natural rights theory of government with which the colonists were familiar and which had been strengthened in their minds by a century and a half of political experience. Professor Hawke emphasizes these ideas—that the origin of government rests in the consent of the governed, that it is government’s obligation to protect the natural rights such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that it is the duty of a people to change or abolish a government that has failed to fulfill its obligation—to the point that the reader accepts as very plausible his speculation that it took Jefferson only an hour or two to write the first draft. The document, based on these familiar principles, accomplished the purpose not only of stimulating revolt against the established authority but also of preserving the attitude of respect for authority.

Beyond these purposes, Jefferson seized the opportunity to formulate an ideology that would help unify a people and contribute toward the emergence of a new nation. The goals of liberty and equality, the working out of which comprises much of the history of the United States, no longer, according to Prof. Hawke, constitute as valuable a part of the real American tradition. But he does feel that whatever idealism does survive in our day is the product in some degree of the goals Jefferson incorporated in the Declaration of Independence.

DANIEL R. GAHL

Prayers of Women
By Lisa Sergio (Harper and Row, $4.95)

This book will become an indispensable part of every Christian woman’s library. Because of the range of prayers offered in this volume (Adoration and Praise, Adversity and Affliction, Household and Thankfulness), and particularly because of the excellent selection of contributions (including queens, famous authors, civic leaders, homemakers), it carries with it a variety of prayers for the personal enrichment of women everywhere.

This set of prayers can accustom one to a pattern of daily devotion; it can be used as an inspiration for those who for various reasons have been withholding their talents and energies in the Church; and the 225 prayers offered by the many outstanding women serve as material to be used for many occasions. A short biographical note is included about each contributor.

BERNICE RUPRECHT

OPHELIA

And did she sing
as sweet roots on
bubbling rocks?

And was she silver-
quick among darts
of drowning color?

Speak flowers: did
she smile with
a warm breath

that swallowed petals?
Was ever maid lighter
bourne on willow songs

that floated downward
among the grassy places
of reflected columns

the color of wine;
shimmering, swirling, dancing,
and lost in legend?

JACK TRACY LEDBETTER

June 1965
A Minority Report

Bad Medicine

By VICTOR F. HOFFMANN

It is fashionable in these times to talk about civil rights. But, in the furor over this question, other important issues have been neglected. One of these is capital punishment, that is, the death penalty for a crime. In our context, capital punishment refers especially to the death penalty for murder.

Two state legislatures with which this columnist has had some contacts faced the issue of capital punishment this year. The Indiana legislature passed a law abolishing capital punishment which was vetoed by the new governor, Roger Branigan. In Nebraska, the unicameral legislature is still discussing the matter under constant prodding from its governor, Frank Morrison, to abolish capital punishment.

At an open hearing conducted by Nebraska state senators, Senator John Knight of Lincoln argued that capital punishment does not meet the requirements of good legislation: it does not really punish the offender; it does not rehabilitate the criminal; it does not really protect society.

According to the first contention, capital punishment legislation does not really punish the offender because it is used so infrequently. In Nebraska, murderers have been executed only four times in the last thirty years. Last year there were only fifteen executions in the entire country. The law simply is not employed that much, certainly not enough to warrant its remaining on the books.

In answer to that assertion, it has been argued, as most of our readers know, that the law is valuable as "a shot-gun behind the door when things get too bad." John Knight and company asserted that the law has not been a deterrent, either. Murder has not been stopped. Crime rates go up. In some cases, apparently, executions are often followed by a series of bizarre crimes. In addition, this legislation is not a deterrent because the law is so easily evaded. Good lawyers and money are able to save some murderers from execution. The murderers who do "get executed" are the poorly educated, the Negroes, and the "poor white trash" of blighted areas. Mr. Knight summed up his views by insisting: "Equality before the law has not been met. Perjury has made a mockery of justice. Innocent people have been executed on the basis of perjured testimony. Wardens have been haunted by this. Nebraska has executed the under-privileged. The law does not make much sense.

Failures of administration and discrimination are deeply involved."

Most of the advocates of abolition argued that, if the state really wishes to make the law serve as a deterrent, why not have public execution days? A holiday could be declared. The people could all come out and watch and then return home with an apt lesson learned well and in dramatic fashion. The whole business could be put on the telly.

In the second place, capital punishment obviously does not rehabilitate. The after-life is too late for regeneration. According to this second argument, execution is simply a symbol of society's failure and its easy willingness to give up on the criminal. The governor of Nebraska stated it quite directly: "We have let situations of murder develop and it is time that we look at the social factors that bring about murder." In defense of regenerative perspectives, the governor pointed out that Nebraska has a good record with its released murderers, that "no lifer has been committed on a new crime." Society's desire for revenge should not supplant the need for attacking the forces that make for murder and other crimes: poverty, lack of education, insecurity, alienation, estrangement, and the evil attitudes of many people.

With respect to people's attitudes a good case was made at the hearing for people's indifference to the law. Most people have never really examined their attitudes. Most of us have simply gone on in an unthinking manner tolerating capital punishment. The law becomes a kind of necessary evil that no one really pays much attention to. If people "really got around to thinking about capital punishment," they would probably look upon it as an irrelevant law, one way or the other.

In short, the general welfare is not really met by the law. The ministers on this side of the argument insisted as only ministers can that the general welfare of society can be met more adequately by the ministry of reconciliation. The Old Testament idea of a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye — the revenge motive — has been overcome by the agapic principle of Christ and the New Testament.

By implication, the ministers were asserting that society and the church as well must begin practicing the outreach. This would be a good place to begin. This would be a good place to begin demonstrating the sacrifice and love of Christ.

The Cresset
Sights and Sounds

Still a Wasteland

BY ANNE HANSEN

I doubt that any discriminating listener and viewer needs to be told that the past season on radio and television was decidedly disappointing. The official verdict on the 1964-65 programs came at a luncheon in New York City on Monday, April 26, when Paul Porter, speaking for the Peabody Awards Committee, told a gathering made up of show-business luminaries and top brass in the broadcasting industry that "the year — in programming in general — was so poor that the committee was tempted to skip the awards altogether." Mr. Porter, who at one time served as chairman of the FCC, did not pull his punches. He said that "a dreary sameness and steady conformity seemed to dominate the airwaves." Speaking specifically of television, he added that "it was a year when the intelligent adult television audience has been consistently shortchanged by networks wooing teen-agers." (Personally I think that even teen-agers were shortchanged.) Only eleven programs were mentioned as "bright spots in the broadcasting fog." All these programs were singled out for special mention in this column in the course of the season.

Since the Peabody Committee Awards, which have been presented annually by the Peabody Foundation since 1940, are highly prized by the networks, Mr. Porter's remarks quickly turned a gala affair into a wake — a wake in which red-faced executives and performers tried to conceal their anger and chagrin. One wonders whether this sharp rebuff will have a salutary effect. I am skeptical enough to doubt that it will.

Here are outstanding TV programs seen in recent weeks: FDR Remembered and The Best of the Bolshoi, both on CBS; Let My People Go, Hamlet, Terror in the Streets, and The Holy Terror, all on NBC; The General, on ABC; and the historic Early Bird inaugural program on all networks on May 2.

Paris, the fabled city of light, has witnessed an amazing spectacle in recent months. French motion-picture critics were anything but enthusiastic over the merits of Goldfinger, but the public response to this out-and-out cloak-and-dagger thriller can only be described as hysterical. In The New Yorker Genet, whose column titled "Letter from Paris" is always of great interest, relates in detail the appeal Goldfinger has had for movie-goers of every age group. Genet quotes at some length from Claude Mauriac's penetrating analysis of the phenomenal success of a film which this eminent critic for Figaro Litteraire calls "a triumph, a fascination, a madness." M. Mauriac concludes his review with the statement that "the cinema has become our mythology, and films our most personal dreams." Is he right?

World Without Sun (Columbia, Jacques Ives-Coustau) is unquestionably one of the finest pictures I have ever seen. Jacques Ives-Coustau has won worldwide fame for his outstanding contributions to oceanography and for his pioneering expeditions into the vast, unexplored worlds that lie beneath the waters of this planet. His first major film, The Silent World, was magnificent. World Without Sun is even more magnificent. M. Cousteau is a dedicated scientist. But he is also a visionary and a dreamer with a sensitive appreciation of beauty. His narration for World Without Sun is simple, lucid, and understandable even for the layman. The nation — and the world — has followed the feats of our astronauts and the Russian cosmonauts with intense interest. Now we must add the word "oceanauts" to our vocabulary.

It would be impossible for me to describe the amazing technical equipment which permitted the oceanauts to live for a month beneath the Red Sea. I can only urge you to see World Without Sun and to share in an absorbing and electrifying experience. World Without Sun received an Oscar as the best documentary of the year — an honor which it richly deserved.

It was my good fortune to hear the internationally renowned Trapp Family Singers many times in concerts. And I read Baroness von Trapp's entertaining book with great interest. This may account for the fact that I was disappointed in The Sound of Music (20th Century-Fox, Robert Wise). The real-life story of the von Trapps was bypassed for a shallow, routine plot which lacks sparkle and excitement. Furthermore, the lyrics and the music do not measure up to the best efforts of Richard Rodgers and the late Oscar Hammerstein II, a gifted team of collaborators who gave us many fine musical hits. In spite of this The Sound of Music is a wholesome, tuneful, and enjoyable film. The awe-inspiring grandeur of the Tyrolean Alps has been captured in superb De Luxe Color, and wide-screen Todd AO permits sweeping, exquisitely beautiful panoramic views of the Austrian countryside. Julie Andrews is delightful, as always; and the supporting cast is excellent.

Zorba the Greek (Cacoyannis) was widely acclaimed in the United States and won three Academy Awards, including an Oscar for Lily Kedrova as best supporting actress. But the Greeks had other words for Zorba. In Athens audiences hissed and booed, and the Pan-Cretan Union denounced the film as "monstrous and insulting." Anthony Quinn portrays the Greek with his customary exuberance, and Miss Kedrova's portrayal of the aging courtesan is memorable.

June 1965
A Dieu

My editor has graciously lent me this space for a few remarks at what is for me and for The Cresset a moment of change. With this issue — my 173rd in a period of sixteen and a half years — I hand the managing editorship over to my good friend Vic Hoffmann for a year while I go on what the Army used to call a "rest and recuperation leave."

I would not want to let this occasion pass without discharging a number of debts of gratitude which have accumulated over these years. Chief among these is the debt which I owe to my editor, Dr. Kretzmann, whose absolute confidence I have enjoyed from the beginning and whose confidence I have been concerned not to abuse. In all of the years of our association he has lent the full weight of his name and reputation and office to what I have written in the editorial columns of this magazine, without ever asking to see what I was going to say in the next issue. I find it hard to imagine that any editor and managing editor ever worked together in greater unity of spirit and purpose than we have worked.

To the departmental editors and columnists — Al Looman, Walter Sorell, A.R. Kretzmann, the Hansens, Bob Hoyer, and Vic Hoffmann — I owe an almost equally incalculable debt. In good times we tried to reimburse them for out-of-pocket expenses. In hard times we were sometimes not even able to do that. But they stayed with us nevertheless, each of them building a faithful following which, added together, gave the magazine a loyal base of readers, even in the days when our circulation was at its lowest.

And I must confess my debt to the Lutheran Church, particularly to that branch of it which has resisted my best efforts to get it to change its name to something less provincial than the Missouri Synod. If the chief mark of the Church is its willingness and ability to forgive sins, I more than most people can testify to the "Churchness" of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. For what other church body in America has, through its seminary, given a Litt.D. to an unofficial editor who once, in an excess of uncharitable judgment, accused it of making an ass of itself?

The readers of The Cresset, most of them Lutherans but many of them followers of other traditions, must be the best audience that any editor could hope to address. They have borne with us through many a journalistic and mechanical lapse, congratulating us on our occasional successes and charitably passing over our more frequent failures. With some of our readers I have enjoyed friendships by correspondence which I value as highly as many of my personal friendships.

And finally a word of especially warm gratitude to the Board of Directors of Valparaiso University. Like most private universities, Valparaiso depends upon the voluntary gifts of many people, all of whom are humanly resistant to ideas and viewpoints which clash with their own and some of whom have found in The Cresset reasons which they considered sufficient for withdrawing support from the University. From time to time, I have had personal communications from members of the Board in which they expressed their annoyance or even dismay at things which have appeared in The Cresset. But from year to year the Board has renewed the appropriation which enables The Cresset to survive — an act of faith which is almost more than one has any right to expect from any Board and which must utterly astonish those who believe that denominational universities can not possibly enjoy the freedom of expression which is supposedly possible only to the publicly-supported institution.

My year's leave of absence from The Cresset will be spent, God willing, at one of the great fountainheads of Christian and humanistic learning, Cambridge University. The chance to spend a year in the place where Erasmus and Sir Francis Bacon, Sir Isaac Newton and C.S. Lewis lived and worked is one which I had hoped for for years but had long since abandoned hope of achieving. And the prospect of returning from that year to a career of writing and teaching is one which can be fully appreciated only by someone who has spent seven lean years on the sterile steppes of academic administration.

Knowing the competence of my interim successor, I reckon with the possibility that the 1965-1966 Cresset may turn out to be sprightlier and more profound than any of its predecessor volumes. It is not a thought which I entertain with equanimity but which is offset by personal affection and professional respect sufficient to allow me to wish him the best of all good things that can happen to editors. And if I should return to find that a coup d'etat has taken place in my absence, I may enlist the support of my friends for an assignment as Minority Reporter.

And so — a Dieu! We sail August 27, at 11:00 a.m., from Montreal.