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The Role of Critics

Recent debates and controversies (over Vietnam, the John Birch Society, etc.) must have forced some of our readers to think about the role of critics in contemporary society. Obviously this cannot be a mere academic discussion for some of our social resources, futures, and predicaments are riding on the line. Radical re-arrangements of society, and even mild revolutions, seem to be looking over our shoulders as we Americans go about our controversies. The trail of imminent and radical events is still ahead of us.

Just to raise the topic of criticism is to raise the question of some basic assumptions, not necessarily complementary.

Assumption One — In analyzing the role of criticism in the midst of current circumstances, we are certainly assuming that everything is not as it should be. As critics, and as honest human beings, we would certainly become idiots if we held otherwise. Critics do not assault the acceptable. Criticisms of the status quo signify our preferences for something else.

Assumption Two — Critics assume they know what is happening in our society. They must feel, however vaguely, that they know what should be done to clear the underbrush so that all of us can get on with the business of the good life. In short, critics must be insisting somewhere along the line that they have the right answers. If they are fair and men of integrity, they must be operating with models of reconstruction in their minds which give direction and substance to their criticisms.

Assumption Three — In these processes even the most liberal and creative critics easily slip on the robes of authoritarianism. The critics may easily become as doctrinaire and ideological as the defenders of a status quo which goes back as far as twenty-five thousand years before the Garden of Eden.

Assumption Four — But the critics, doctrinaire or not, will be pushing themselves toward the humiliating restraints if they are forced to tell us about their hidden premises, their value orientations, and the perspectives from which they criticize. For example, in reviewing a book, it seems to us, the first function of a reviewer is to find the perspective and the orientations according to which the book was written and to determine at the outset whether the author was true to his claims and his self-imposed directives. It seems just as important to ask the critic whether he might simply be reacting to events. The critic should never be in the position of insisting “if my position doesn’t fit the facts, that’s too bad for the facts.”

Assumption Five — But there is the critic who fancies himself to be a gadfly, insisting that the truth will come out somehow if you probe deeply and long enough, if you agitate loudly and hysterically enough. The truth for the day of the gadfly emerges basically and substantially from the struggle, from the debate and the arguments. We question, it is alleged by the gadflies, with the idea of ending up somewhere and at sometime with some kind of pertinent answer, at least for the timebeing. On the other hand, the gadfly might also be insisting, answers or no, that agitation, disorder, the Sturm und Drang, constitute really the essence of life. The human being according to this version, like the questing child, breathes the gadfly spirt as naturally as he inhales and exhales. The survival of society depends on this posture and temperament. Life, whether for the good life or for mere survival, does not move ahead by a series of simple and neat routines. We “fuss ahead” with insights precipitated by tentative, or even impossible, answers to the questions which have been asked for an eternity.

Assumption Six— You and I as citizens of the United States are living in special circumstances. We have been docked on the shores of history at a special time. We have therefore been compelled by the dispensations of history to live in a democratic society as organized under a given constitutional system. Some of us are compelled to live according to the canons of the intellectual enterprise. As democrats and intellectuals, as humans with a sense of fairness, we speak in the majority of cases with highly tentative conclusions until the evidence is all in with full knowledge that the evidence is never quite all
in. We also live in a constitutional system, fertilized by
democratic ideas, that protects the right of the people to
speak, to protest, to demonstrate, and to assemble. So
all of us are permitted to be critics and are often encour-
aged to be critics.

Assumption Seven — As honest and rational people,
it is hoped that we take advantage of our rights accord­
ing to sensible and rational procedures. Simply stated,
this means, when we criticize, we ought to make some
attempt to find out what we are talking about. To find
out what we are talking about, as implied above, is hu-
militating for we learn often how finite we are and with
how much intellectual agnosticism we really work from
day to day. Intellectual agnosticism compels us to the
virtues of tolerance, understanding, and forgiveness.

Assumption Eight — This brings us to the next his­
torical given, the Christian faith and/or culture. What­
ever the drama of the historical Christ might mean to the
various Cresset readers, it does mean in part the drama
of seeing yourself as you are and asking some forgive-
ness for many of the things that you are. To criticize
others, individually and collectively, in the affirmation
of your own life is to recognize what you, and therefore
others, are. To love yourself and to love others as your-
self is to know and forgive what others are. To accept
the role of the critic and to participate in such human
affirmations of yourself as criticism is to accept others.
Otherwise — why bother? At least the critic might feel
that life is worth living and reconstruction is worth all
the effort.

A Quote from William Stringfellow

"To be a man means to be freed from the worship of
death by God's own affirmation of human life in Jesus
Christ. To be a man means to accept and to participate
in God's own affirmation of one's own life in Christ. To
be a man means the freedom . . . to love yourself in the
way in which God Himself has shown that He loves every
man. That is the issue which is most profoundly threat­
ening to both black men and white men at the present
time. Their reconciliation one to another requires that
they be reconciled to themselves; to love another
means first the freedom to love yourself . . . In that free-
dom is the love and unity among men which can endure
death for the sake of all, even unto a man's own enemy,
even unto my own enemy, even unto myself."

Government Intervention

In a recent issue of a national magazine (Time, De­
December 31, 1965), a case was made for governmental
intervention through a discussion of Keynesian econom­
ics.

To clear the decks immediately of all the name-callers,
Time made it clear at the outset that John Maynard
Keynes was a capitalist, not a socialist, not a communist.
Keynes really wanted to help the private sectors of our
cisions as to where, when, and how their money is spent. The system is still free enterprise, competitive and private, growing and dynamic. Paradoxically enough, the new breed of free enterprisers really does not want to be completely on its own without government. (Not even Adam Smith wanted to be on his own without the government and the state.) The free enterprisers are expecting help from government, want government to promote their interests, want government to keep growth from moving into inflation and deflation into stagnation, and want government to keep deficit spending from rushing headlong into bankruptcy.

Right now — to keep the record straight — Keynes, expansionist economics, pump-priming, and governing mechanisms within the system have probably received an assist from another form of government administration and intervention, war. World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, wars and rumors of war have helped to keep the American economic system at a high level.

The cynic will say: a bullet made and shot keeps people on the jobs and money in the bank: or shoot your way to prosperity. It is probably true, the economic system would have to do some fancy "Fran Tarkenton" scrambling and some quick reconstruction should the world go on an unanticipated disarmament "kick."

Those of us who were brought up in the thirties and depression, not accustomed to such affluence, cannot help but ask: how long will affluence last? is affluence, especially continued affluence, good for the system and for us as human beings? is it wrong to be frugal and save? is it right to spend at will almost to the point of wastefulness? (See, Mother, we are worried about paying too much for our whistles!

The facts demonstrate, nevertheless, that all of us are maximizing our preferences and economic drives nowadays and pushing the economic heights upward and onward in terms of production, consumption, and investment potentials. Even us editors, hard-nosed and tough and demanding as we are, can only eat so much, drink so much, and live only in so many rooms. The law of diminishing returns must go into operation soon. From here, it almost seems inevitable to some of us, we have now reached the summits. There is only one way to go, to the plateaus, maybe down the hill.

No matter what the optimists are saying about the Keynesian futures, some readers, we know, are arching their backs at the new O.K. words: "cut taxes — governments interfere with the economy to raise production, increase incomes, and to extend job opportunities — government pumps more money into the economy than it takes out — deficit spending is not immoral — spend your way to prosperity — unbalance the budget — don’t worry about debts."

So goes Keynesian economics. So goes Time.
And so, it appears, goes LBJ. At any rate, he is a "tinkerer."

February 1966

Neuhaus and The Middle Class

Over the years Valparaiso University has invited many prominent and interesting people to address its students such as Charles Halleck, Birch Bayh, Vance Hartke, Dean Rusk, Paul Tillich, A.R. Kretzmann, Clement Atlee, Earl Warren, Robert Hutchins, and William Stringfellow.

Every now and then a speaker is asked to address our students who says some very important things though not nearly so prominent in the headlines. One such person is Pastor Richard John Neuhaus, Lutheran Pastor in Brooklyn (Time, December 24, 1965).

In the fresh and early days of 1966, Pastor Neuhaus addressed our students on a hurried evening, complicated by his hectic schedule and some unanticipated events on our campus, but some of his remarks lingered, in some cases to haunt us and in other cases to make us wonder.

A not too tall man, slightly built, with a quiet but confident voice, congenial but not above incitement and controversy, Pastor Neuhaus spoke to our students on "Middle Class Imprisonment." And, not so strangely, most of us in his audience were and are middle class, so middle class.

Coming from inner city experiences, and flowing over with talk about the inner city, Pastor Neuhaus feared that there was too much talk about the inner city, that it was much too easy sometimes to talk about the inner city. More than that, according to Neuhaus, it is much too easy to come from the experience of the inner city with much talk about martyrdom and sacrifice and how hard life has been there. People who have worked in the inner city are inclined sometimes to talk and act like suffering saints. To quote Neuhaus, "inner city workers often try to outdo one another in the telling of horror stories." Other people look upon work in the inner city as some kind of special ministry to add to all the special ministries we already have. There can be too much special ministry. In our estimation special ministry talk, if emphasized too much, makes us all sound very deferential as if we were some kind of special people in the eyes of God bringing special kind of help, directly from God, to these poor, benighted people that God might have forgotten if it had not been for us. These people are people, not special, not unique, just people like all the rest of us.

In spite of late-found interests, continued Neuhaus, the church has not made any real progress in the inner city. "We ought not kid ourselves about easy solutions. We certainly haven’t found the answers." Still wrestling with our inadequacies, we, Christians and members of the church, have maintained "an inability to get hold of the levers in the decision-making processes" that make things go in any society. For some reason, members of the church have not been able quite to get at the "guts" of inner city life. There are "thousands of different needs that are not being met. Wealth isn’t distributed very much."
The church cannot and ought not give up for in the inner city the church is standing at the center of life. Here, as the Neuhaus commentary put it, the church can be revolutionary in its own special manner and style.

This, however, means that we must come to terms with power. Though Neuhaus did not put it in so many specific terms, he seemed to imply that the evils of the inner city, the forces restraining it and keeping it a blight-ed and depressed area, and all its potential for social infection have come from the wielders of unholy power. Such power is a part of human life. It is there in all the decisions one makes, whether for good or evil. If you are unable to make decisions, you cannot really be a human being. Consequently the Christian human being must be in the business of affirming power and executing it. Social life does not come automatically. Power-impregnated creative forces are at work within human beings and through them human beings make social life what it is. Human beings who want to be creative forces in the community cannot do so without power.

This is especially true in a democracy where the rules of the game give considerable free play to human beings and the forces of power. Democracy involves power, power-playing, and competition. In a democracy power is always on the move. It is dynamic. (In political science we like to say that democracy involves us in a brokerage of interests.)

According to Neuhaus, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod has always had difficulty in this area. As predominantly agrarian people, Missouri Synod Lutherans “don’t approach the city with enjoyment.” Often they will emphasize the obstacles to their understanding in order to get off their ethical hooks: ambiguities, complexities, complications, and so on. Missouri has not been in a hurry to address itself to these tasks and responsibilities.

In spite of that, as human beings to human beings we say “yes” to man’s quest, his vision for a real brotherhood. After all, the Christian can here be in familiar territory for, in realizing himself, man is realizing the glory of God. In the God-through-Christ-to-man relationship the Christian reaches for the creative potential through which he can exert creative power in human society. Christianity is not all negation, limitation, and restriction. Stating it concisely, Neuhaus said, “The Christian should not be afraid of the potential of man.” This should not prompt the reader to accuse Neuhaus of utopian humanism for in answer to that possible charge he insisted that the Christian must also say “yes” to the evils of man, to his sins, to his incessant pursuit for status, to the middle class, to Wall Street, and to a legion of other evils and finitudes. In saying “yes” to man’s evil, Neuhaus asserts that Christ loved this world and came for it. This was, and is, and always will be God’s holy family for which He gave the supreme sacrifice.

In addition, Neuhaus saw some dangers in over-emphasizing order and authority (Romans thirteen). Order and authority under the agency of God are important. But this is not enough. The Christian working in the community and under the orderly authority of God comes face-to-face more often with disorder and confusion and with power. In returning to his basic theme, Neuhaus repeated that, symbolically and locally, the real battle of life is in the inner city. Whatever vested interests there are in society, they are strong in the inner city. Whatever evils there are in society, they come to focus in the inner city. If the Christian speaks to the human predicament, he is obligated therefore to speak in the inner city.

The Logos, the Body of Christians, can make it here. This must be what Lutherans speak of when they speak of The New Creation in Christ. The New Creation, working like yeast (one supposes) in the community, will come close to decision-makers. There are some dangers in this. Important people in the community like to have the church and its members around and identified with them, that Christians may kind of sanctify their work. In short, Pastor Neuhaus was asking us to take seriously the empirical role of the church and its members, not to sit back in our ritualistic abstractions.

As he was unwinding to the close, he pointed out some base things for us to know, some of them repetition: 1. we cannot be more than we are; 2. we are gifted, talented, awkward, and fumbling; 3. “we are hooked on the Christ-event”; 4. our efforts are really as humble as all that; 5. nevertheless we can move with some confidence, “helping to form the new structures.”

In all this, as is his custom, Neuhaus called our attention to Nazi Germany as a parallel. It illustrates so much about the failures of our own thinking. In Germany only a few from the Christian community raised the voice of criticism. Over here, following our Lutheran traditions, we must take our day-to-day life and operations more seriously. This is the life we live. Obviously this demands a call to commitment. Certainly, somehow, Christianity is faith and grace. But it is also “ten thousand people who starve every day.” The New Creation must be a radical community, so radical the people of the community will look on the Christians “as being nuts.” It is a matter of a style of life. Yet, giving and receiving are done by a lot of people — but somewhere and somehow, we feel that it ought to be different when a Christian does them. Christians and non-Christians cannot know the difference being a Christian makes until the Christian comes to terms with human existence. Unless this is done the Christian cannot possibly know what discipleship means. Then only do Christians become a chosen people, a peculiar group:

So Neuhaus encouraged: find your task somewhere and lay your burden down in this world — with the restless, the dispossessed, with the forsaken.

So Richard John Neuhaus and the Christian Way of Life.
I don’t suppose you realized — I know I didn’t — that every year over a million men in these northern climates are thrown out of work just because of the weather. Those primarily affected are in the construction, logging, fishing, and agriculture industries. This seasonal unemployment, I understand, puts an unnecessary drain on the country’s financial resources. And what is worse, the governments in the United States and Canada are beginning to do something about it.

My authority for this is a Monthly Letter published by the Royal Bank of Canada. In this letter on the subject of winter work, they point out we must change our concept that winter unemployment is inevitable, and our putting things off in the winter represents thinking which is “out of keeping with the progress being made in almost all fields of human endeavor.” The author continues with what I consider a highly debatable statement: “Production is the keynote of national prosperity, and national prosperity is essential to individual happiness.”

To combat the effects of climate, all sorts of things are being tried, different construction materials, new techniques, new machinery, better snow plows, retraining of manpower, and a high powered advertising campaign stressing “Do It Now.”

I don’t want to wish them any lack of success in this campaign, but I am not planning on helping them either, because I believe they are on the wrong track and don’t realize what they are doing. There are some types of jobs which require this seasonal layoff. It may not do anything for the gross national product, but it is good for men. The whole pattern of life would change for these happily unemployed men if this campaign were successful, for heretofore their winter hibernation was something they planned on. In the South, they have siestas, and in the North, at least until now, we had the winter layoff.

I am not now in an area where I can observe much winter unemployment, but when I was growing up, I can recall this winter layoff was part of the way of life in our town. Those men who were in construction, fishing, and farming, and a few who worked for the railroad, took it easy from mid or late November until March. This was considered legal and socially acceptable loafing and those affected were envied by most every man in town.

For the first few weeks of their enforced “idleness,” the men kept busy around the house or in the barn, repairing, refurbishing, and building. But when these chores were over, they felt perfectly free to do nothing, except keep the coal buckets filled and the kindling cut. From Christmas time on, they had little to do except whittle and, I am afraid, if the campaign to outlaw winter unemployment becomes successful, the fine art of whittling will disappear. It may have been hard on the housewife to have a man underfoot for several months, but, if so, I never heard one complain about it.

There were a number of approved gathering places for these men, who either didn’t want to be underfoot or wanted to avoid household chores. These included several grocery stores, a respectable pool hall, and a restaurant or two. Most of these places took on a club-like atmosphere during the winter months, and each had its own clientele of loafers.

The favorite spot, of course, was around the stove, where upended apple boxes and barrels made for comfortable seating. A highly philosophical conversation went on all day and was stopped briefly only when a non-loafer came in to buy something, for it was standard practice to inspect every customer rather thoroughly.

I heard many of these conversations, while standing in the background, because my grandfather often made the rounds of these gathering places. While he was not a regular at any of them, he was accepted because he was a carpenter by trade and thus unemployed during the winter. What impressed me most was the great fount of knowledge these men lay claim to. To me there seemed to be nothing they didn’t know and on everything they had a decided opinion. You can understand how important it was for a man to be able to discourse at length and air his knowledge. For where today, except at a congregational meeting, can you find a group of men, where everyone present is an authority on every subject?

When the weather let up in March, all of these men returned to their work, refreshed in body and mind. Every last man was a better man for having had that winter layoff. Their need for talk and loafing was over and they attacked their work with zeal and thoroughness.

It is this wonderful way of life government is trying to take away from us. I suppose they will be successful and it may increase production and be good for the whole economy, but if they think they are going to make a certain group of men happier by so doing, they are off their bureaucratic rocker.
On Law and Gospel

By ROBERT J. HOYER
Board of Parish Education,
The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod

So many books and articles have been written on the proper use of law and gospel that it is presumptuous to attempt the writing of another one. Yet there is evidence in the written and spoken words of the church that the distinction has not been understood. Either the books and articles have not been explicit enough to guide us, or our pervasive sin has kept us from following them. The following propositions are intended as position statements entered into the continuing conflict between sin and the Word.

1. There is law in the Bible and there is gospel. But the words of the Bible are not divided into these two parts, as though any given passage must be one or the other. Most of the written record, specifically the Word that is Jesus Christ, proclaims both the judgment and the grace of God — the law and the gospel. Law and gospel are not divisions of the Bible, they are aspects of the Word. They indicate to us the ways in which the written record, the Bible, is to be interpreted and used in our preaching and teaching.

2. Neither law nor gospel can be treated as verbal abstractions. The law is a code, but it is more. It is a description of the judgment of God under which we stand. All of us stand under that judgment whether we hear the law or not, whether we accept it or not. It is a description of a universal situation, or relationship to God. The gospel is a proposition for belief, but it is more. It is a description of the grace with which God regards us in our sin. We are covered by that grace whether we hear the gospel or not, whether we accept it or not. We may even refuse it or reject it, it nevertheless describes the universal situation of a world redeemed by God.

3. The law reveals the relationship of judgment. It can not really tell man what to do leading to a proper relationship with God. It declares that man is judged and condemned. The condemnation is an absolute. It is universal, and it allows of no distinctions between men. In this sense only it is an absolute standard — not an ethical standard of what we must do, but a judgmental standard of what we are. Now, man is so structured in his longing for status that he must distinguish between the good and the bad in order to name himself good, and the law forbids this. Therefore man rebels against the law. The ethical use of the law is that rebellion. In this sense only the law is death, because it cannot be received without rebellion. The law causes (through the rebellion in the heart of man) such things as hatred, envy, murder, adultery — all expressions of separation between man and man. (Romans 1)

4. The gospel reveals the relationship of grace. It does not set up conditions for relationship to God, it rather reveals what the relationship of mercy is. The mercy is absolute. It is universal, and it covers all men alike, because it is in a real sense pre-historical. The gospel is life because it cannot be received without agape. Its reception means that we die to our longing for status, in the mercy of God we do not need to distinguish between the good and the bad. In fact, all distinctions between men become irrelevant in the absolute mercy of God. Thus the gospel does not establish or cause a relationship between men and God; that is already there. Rather, it establishes or causes a relationship between men and men, we are freed to love all men. Hatred, envy, murder, adultery, etc. become unnecessary and inconsistent in the gospel.

5. We cannot really separate the two, as though either one could stand alone. The law without the gospel kills. The gospel without the law will still permit us to distinguish between men — the good and the bad, and we will not die to our striving for status. The law must be preached as judgment against all our self-claims; the gospel immediately points out that we need no self-claim because God has given us status in grace.

6. But the law is violated when we use it to describe the acts that make a man good, in distinction from the bad man. The law is violated when we use it to describe the act that pleases God and distinguish it from the act that displeases God. The whole purpose of the law is to destroy all such distinctions — otherwise it ceases to be an absolute standard. You cannot justify anything by law, and therefore you cannot use it to distinguish between the good and the bad. The key word in law is a universally equal condemnation.

7. The gospel is also vitiated when it is used to distinguish between the believer and the unbeliever, as though God loved the one more than the other. The gospel is vitiated when it is used as a requisite to a proper relationship with God, as though we are saved because we believe. The whole purpose of the gospel is to free us from the death of such distinctions between men. It is to bring us into a unity (John 17) of love to all men — otherwise it ceases to be an absolute truth. Everything is justified by gospel (except, of course, the rejection of that justification). The key word is freedom born in
a love which is universally equal. That freedom makes every man responsible under the justification of the gospel, and we dare not ever remove that responsibility from a man or we will destroy the gospel.

8. Jesus Christ, the Word, is the center of both law and gospel. He in His incarnate life and death and resurrection dramatized the existential situation of man over against God: both judged and redeemed. It was not "bad people" who killed Him. It was people. In a sense, it was the law that killed Him, but not in the sense that He bore the punishment prescribed by law. Rather, He illustrated and accepted the damnation described by law — hatred, envy, murder. The description blandly covers us all alike. In the sense that Jesus is the center of law, we killed Him, we killed the Prince of peace. Until we see the universal judgment without distinction, we have not understood His Word of law.

9. He lived and lives in grace, which is gospel. He does not live as a "good" man, but as a God man. It was not His perfect life that raised Him, but God. He is the "First-fruits" — He shows the life that is described by the gospel. The description (though it may be refused, rejected) covers us all alike. In the sense that Jesus is the center of the gospel, His life is ours, we live in Him. Until we see this universal life without distinction between Him and us, or between us and other men, we have not understood His Word of gospel.

10. Both law and gospel are involved in didache, the teaching of the Christian life to the faithful. The law functions when it forbids our setting up categories of good or bad either of person or act, when it forbids any implication of escaping judgment or pleasing God by our acts. In a sense, the law forbids any strictly ethical teaching, insofar as ethics does any distinguishing of good and evil.

11. The gospel functions as motivation for the Christian life, but not in any sense or implication of establishing a relationship with God. It is the gospel that such relationship is already there, as proclaimed by Jesus Christ. The gospel functions in establishing a relationship of love between us and other men, in God. That is the ultimate motivation for every good in the Christian life: the fact that God loves all men. In the freedom from competition which the gospel establishes, we are released to express that love without concern.

12. The most frequent use of the Bible in Christian education is narrative — the "Bible story." All of the above principles concerning law and gospel apply to our use of Bible stories. Both law and gospel absolutely forbid our use of any story to distinguish between "good" people and "bad" people, between those approved by God and those disapproved. This is true despite the apparent contrary usage of the author of the former prophets: the books of Samuel, the Kings, and Chronicles. The law forbids it because all of the characters in the story stand under its one universal judgment. The gospel forbids it because it is God's grace and not man's nobility which is the redeeming force. We can not use a Bible story to instruct a student in ethical behavior without violating both the history and the purpose of the story.

13. God is the Hero of every Bible narrative; God who has declared himself in Jesus Christ. The force of every Bible story is God's call to repentance at the judgment and to acceptance of his grace. The moral force of the story is the universality of both judgment and grace: we stand under an identical judgment with all men, and all men among whom we live are enclosed in the same love. When our life over against other men expresses these universalities, we are living "as God pleases," expressing his Word as his ambassadors.

14. Moralism in the interpretation of Bible stories reflects not the Word of God but the will of man. It is inserted because of man's desire to validate the ethical pattern he has chosen. This is true even though the teacher claims that his ethical pattern is prescribed by God's law, because it is the law's function to deny validity to any ethical pattern in relationship to God. It is true even though the teacher makes no claim to fulfillment of that ethical pattern himself and claims a trust in the gospel exclusively. It is the function of the gospel in the story to proclaim a relationship to God apart from the law, which is the direct opposite of moralistic teaching.

These propositions, if consistently followed, will necessitate reformation of a major part of the instructional materials of most churches. That in itself is no argument either for or against them. The only rule by which they can be measured — and must be measured — is the Word God has spoken in Jesus Christ our Lord.

---

I am opposed to the use of tax money — local, state, or Federal — in any form for the direct or indirect support of private schools of any kind. I believe that any parent who wishes to send his children to private schools should be assured of his moral or legal right to do so, but that it should be at private expense.

Albert Lynd, Quackery In The Public Schools (Boston: Little, Brown and Company) Copyright 1950, 1953 By Albert Lynd. P. 5.
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Politics and Morality

BY PAUL SIMON
State Senator,
Forty-Seventh District, Illinois

The First Annual
Adlai E. Stevenson Memorial Lecture,
Unitarian Universalist Church
Urbana, Illinois (October 22, 1965)

The Adlai E. Stevenson Memorial Lecture was established by the Board of Trustees of the Unitarian Universalist Church of Urbana-Champaign on August 9, 1950.

The theme of the lecture is to be: "Politics and Morality."

This lecture has been established in the belief that such a memorial is consistent with the concerns of the late governor, and a proper reminder of his religious and political commitments.

I confess a feeling both of pleasure and inadequacy in this opportunity to present the first annual lecture here honoring the memory and ideals of Adlai E. Stevenson.

It has been only a few months since that pleasant summer day when we were stunned by the news of his death. We are still too close to that event to judge with any finality whether the stature of the man or the relevancy of his message. But it is patently clear that Adlai E. Stevenson will be remembered long after many of our presidents are all but forgotten, and that his appeal to reason, cooperation and compassion must help guide our destiny if those things we treasure most are to be preserved for future generations.

During the years when Senator Joseph McCarthy regularly made headlines, when fear threatened to replace faith, when we were in danger of remembering only what we opposed, here was a man on the scene who could make us laugh at ourselves, who helped give us perspective, who gently admonished us to remember those ideals for which our nation has stood.

His very appointment as ambassador to the United Nations raised the prestige of that organization. Whether it was a dramatic confrontation with the Soviets over the Cuban missiles, or a complex resolution about Algeria, each of us had the confidence that at the United Nations was a man who not only represented our nation's best interest, but the world's best interest. When he died it was perhaps appropriate that it should be on foreign soil, for he belonged to all nations as much as he belonged to our nation.

In all of the tributes paid to Adlai E. Stevenson following his death, little mention was made of his contributions as Governor of Illinois. Perhaps his gift to state government is best summed up by a long-time lobbyist on the Springfield scene who told me a few years ago: "In all of my years in Springfield, no one has ever lifted the whole tone of state government as Governor Stevenson did."

I shall not impose on you a lengthy list of achievements in state government, but let me remind you of an important date in Illinois history that is now all but forgotten: May 12, 1950. On that date the Illinois State Highway Police from the northern part of the state swooped down on two big gambling casinos in my county of Madison, catching the gambling gentry and some public officials with complete surprise. It was the first time in Illinois history that state highway police has been used for that purpose. It brought to an end "the good old days" — as some like to call them — when county and municipal officials could plot with the vermin of society and arrange for this gang or that gang to take over gambling in your county or mine. The state police could not have been used in that raid had not Governor Stevenson, over strenuous objections from many politicians, placed the state police on a merit system. And once that was achieved, it became easier to do some desperately needed housekeeping. It is impossible to gauge the long-range improvement that has brought to many of our communities, but it is tremendous. Instead of endless arguments, token raids, and corrupting influences, many of our local governments are discussing things they should have been long ago: whether they should have a detention home for juveniles, whether they need a park and recreation program. In areas where gambling money flowed freely to the treasuries of both parties, happily we are relatively free from these gifts which were always given only at a terrible price.

May 12, 1950 is but one of the many illustrations that in the area of politics and morality, Governor Stevenson acted when distressingly many in public life neither talk nor act to improve the tone of government.

In discussing "Politics and Morality" there are those who say there is no connection between the two and should be none. With this I heartily disagree. That there sometimes is no connection between the two I recognize. But some type of moral foundation for our political process is both desirable and necessary. Politics is certainly not an arena in which you generally choose between good and evil. I wish it were that simple. We are faced with a dilemma that Abraham Lincoln described in 1848:
The true rule in determining to embrace, or reject anything is not whether it have any evil in it; but whether it have more of evil than of good. There are few things wholly evil, or wholly good. Almost everything, especially of governmental policy, is an inseparable compound of the two; so that our best judgment of the preponderance between them is continually demanded.

Accepting the truth of that statement, does that leave us rudderless in the seas of politics? I think not. While we may disagree on what the moral imperatives should be, there are certain things so basic that virtually all men of good will can find agreement with them. Let me suggest four rules that may seem obvious:

1. **Government policy should not be for sale to the highest bidder.**

   "Corruption" and "freedom" are diametrically opposed terms. The theory of a representative democracy is that men of opposing views come together, freely expressing their views, and in the process the public good is served more often than in any other governmental structure. Corruption means the dominance of a special interest over the public interest. Those who are in the filthy business of buying votes do not spend their money unless they get what they pay for.

   The taped conversation of three lobbyists in Springfield presents a good example. The court decision to prohibit the use of those tapes for legal prosecution may be a proper decision. But let no one miss the message of those tapes: too often your government has been for sale in Springfield. I heard no one on the Springfield scene suggest that these tapes were not authentic. What they described was three men spending $200 to $1,000 a vote — a total of $30,000 — to kill a bill. The tapes make clear that the people of Illinois, by their indifference and cynicism, have tolerated the crudest type of corruption.

   In the last fifty years the neighboring state of Wisconsin has not had a single major scandal in state government while in Illinois we have had scores of them. We need to start asking ourselves: Why? The answer is not simple but answers are available. The most fundamental answer is that the public must start becoming intolerant of the easy dollar that corrodes the very foundation of our society.

   When I say that government policy should not be for sale, this means policy changes beyond the crudest prostitution of our policies.

   We have not faced up to the question of campaign expenses and contributions, for example. President Theodore Roosevelt wanted us to follow some modification of the British system, where expenditures are tightly limited, and funds come from the government. I strongly favor such a change. A campaign for governor of Illinois, for example, costs more than $1 million for any serious candidate and most of those who contribute this money expect something in return. That "something" is not always in the public interest. Preferential treat-

   **2. Those governing have a moral obligation to spend public money carefully.**

   Government by its nature has certain inefficiencies. This is true of a state, a county, a municipality, a university, and even that strangest of Illinois governmental creatures: a mosquito abatement district.

   Those of us who govern should be aware of these inefficiencies and hold them to a minimum.

   As an extreme example, in the 1963 session of the Illinois General Assembly, $96,500 was appropriated to study the disease of race horses. When I asked the sponsor how much we were spending on cancer research, he replied he didn’t know but felt the appropriation for the already pampered ponies was very important. Another senator got up and said he had been betting on horses and was sure had some diseases, and the legislation passed and became law.

   At the federal level a few weeks ago Senator Daniel Brewster of Maryland attempted to limit federal farm support to any individual or corporation first to $25,000 and then $50,000. Both times he was defeated, despite the fact that Senator Brewster had pointed out that one Arkansas corporation had received over $16 million in 1964 under this program that was originally conceived as a help to the small farmer.

   Government spending is by itself neither automatically right or wrong. But when tax funds are used to help race horses rather than people, when tax money is used to sustain an archaic system of party patronage like we have in Illinois, when public funds are spent unnecessarily on interest instead of goods and services, then we must act. Failure to act makes honorable people question not only the unwise expenditure but the necessary expenditure, and worthy causes suffer along with the unworthy.

   **3. Government has an obligation to permit the free flow of ideas.**

   Founded as we are on the importance of the individual, we must not only respect a man’s right to walk down the sidewalk and seek a job, but also the right to express unpopular views. We are not founded on the premise that you can put an idea into jail.

   The greatest weakness of the Communist world is its unwillingness to permit the free flow of ideas. Yet there are those in our midst who would have us emulate them.

   For example, those who periodically suggest that we must have state censorship of textbooks in Illinois have a misunderstanding of the function of our government, and fail to comprehend our greatest asset. "The melting pot strength" of our country was not, as some believe, simply a breeding process by which the Swede, and the Italian, and the German intermarried. "The melting pot strength" of the United States has been that all of these
people brought their ideas, and in this cross-fire of ideas we were able to freely pick what we felt were the finest.

Stopping this free flow of ideas is not only unwise, it is also immoral. Belief in the value of each individual must bring with it the respect for his right to express his views. To do otherwise is to deny him his individuality.

4. **Government has an obligation to help the helpless.**

To some people this test of morality in government is simply one of honesty. You can vote against measures to help the racial minorities, the hungry, the mentally retarded, and those otherwise oppressed, so long as you don't steal a dollar.

While I don't favor corruption, this simple formula is far from adequate in our complex society.

Is it morally right to ignore the fact that we place the Negro into a ghetto? Are our standards of help for the mentally retarded adequate, when often they are treated worse than cattle? The questions continue, and it is unfortunately easier to dig up problems than solutions. But one answer should be apparent: ignoring these problems is wrong.

The controversial play "The Deputy" is not an accurate portrayal of history, but its basic moral is true: people who ignore great need and injustice are responsible for their existence. And sometimes those who cry "welfare state" comfort us more than they disturb us, for they imply we are already doing too much to help the helpless.

Let's look at the facts in just one important area: world hunger. The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and the Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdahl are talking about "mass starvation" in the coming decade. We know that the majority of people alive today are going to die before their time either for lack of food or for lack of protein in their food. Poverty beyond our borders is growing at an astounding rate. More than 60% of the people of the world today have a per capita annual income of less than $100.

While this alarming situation exists, we in the United States become richer and richer each year, and spend less and less — both in absolute and relative terms — to help the world's poor. Following World War II the United States spent approximately 2% of its gross national product on the Marshall Plan, which turned out ultimately to be an investment in our own prosperity. For fiscal year 1966, when the trouble spots like South Vietnam are excluded, we will spend about 1/5 of one per cent of our gross national product to help the poor beyond our borders. The Christian-Jewish portion of the world comprises less than 20% of the world population, yet has about 75% of the world's wealth.

While I fully realize the political popularity of being against foreign aid, we must recognize that we are doing less and less to help the growing number of poor, and we continue such a policy at our own peril. The division between the world's "haves" and "have nots" must be bridged. We owe our collective conscience and we owe the future a more realistic measure of response to world poverty.

And this is but one area where we have a moral imperative to do more to help the helpless, to shake loose from our middle class indifference.

Perhaps Adlai Stevenson's hero Abraham Lincoln, more than any other American, embodies the blending of politics and morality to which we look in retrospect with pride. Certainly no American document is such a moving mixture of the two as is his second inaugural address.

The speech which projected Lincoln onto the national stage more than any other was delivered at Cooper Union in 1859. Perhaps there he best summarized the admonition that each of us needs: "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Adlai Stevenson would expect no less of us.

We should expect no less of ourselves.

"In the twentieth century," writer Erich Fromm has stated, "man's character orientation is essentially a receptive and marketing one... we have become the sucklers, the eternally expectant." Our sucking still begins, as always, in the crib. Now, though, so does our marketing orientation. At the first cry of unruliness we can be plugged into the standardized social current of our time that, like electricity, is odorless, colorless, and tasteless.

Experiment In Understanding

By ANNE SPRINGSTEEN
Acting University Editor
Valparaiso University

Early in 1964 a pastor spoke to his people about a community need. He told of those patients at the state mental hospital who were ready to take their first long steps back into normal social relationships but were still living in the institution because of inadequate home and family conditions. He pointed out that the Family Care program (placing these people in private homes) was effective but there were not enough homes. He suggested that this very real need should rest heavily on the hearts of those who have been committed to mercy and compassion in the name of Christ.

Within a short time, several members of the congregation talked with the pastor individually, not knowing that there were others who had talked with him. The concern of these members was to "start something"—to find an answer for this need. One member had made some successful preliminary investigation into the acquisition of a house; another had contacted a young couple who were eager and able to serve as houseparents.

And so the first of many meetings with hospital officials was held, exploring and discussing the establishment of a "halfway house." From the outset the determination was to expand this action into an inter-denominational effort in the community. The few members of the first group extended invitations through the churches to others who would also wish to express their concern for people in this way. The meetings continued, including now representatives from six different denominations. Discussion concerned the renovation of the house, requirements of the hospital, requirements of the state, money, incorporation, constitution and by-laws. It did not take long to realize that the professionals, while anxious to encourage and assist, had some doubts about the staying power of this group. All the obstacles, all the difficulties, and possibilities for future difficulties were laid on the table. The discussions continued, and the plans began to take shape.

The project was begun because there was need. Secondary the question of financial backing and incorporation became subjects for thorough discussion and decision. The request was made for individuals and families to contribute $5 to $10 per month for the establishment of this home. It is entirely possible that service and business organizations could have been approached for substantial contributions and continuing support, but there was strong feeling that the high and proper time had come for single, one-by-one Christians to con-

front and be responsible for the needs of people in their own community. (As it happened, a number of organizations have contributed a considerable amount of money, and are continuing to do this.)

A constitution was written, debated, re-written, and approved and Christian Community Action was incorporated and ready for work. The response to the initial request for memberships and funds was by no means overwhelming, but did indicate an interest on which to build. As the constitution was being talked into reality, there was in evidence a desire on the part of the members to keep in mind the serving of two needs: one, the need of the hospital patients; and two, the need for a public demonstration of the corporate love which can be given by all kinds of Christians because of their oneness in Christ. The constitution expressed this:

To show the unity in Jesus Christ which binds all Christians together, by being a living demonstration of what the Gospel of Christ is, especially in terms of service and mercy.

This ministry of Christian mercy is to be provided primarily in seeking out and filling the needs of people previously unaided.

During this same period of "talking" time, there were working sessions being held at the newly-acquired house, a university-owned dwelling, loaned to CCA for this project. Walls were torn down and replastered, or washed and repainted; new gas lines, water lines, electrical outlets were needed; cupboards and closets were built. Most of the work was done by those closest to the need—the members of CCA. It was indeed an "awesome" sight to watch the Episcopal minister working in the basement with the greasy business of hooking up gas lines; or the Lutheran minister slinging plaster on the wall. And along with them, men, women, and children painting, washing, sweeping, scrubbing from morning to night. These people did not need this kind of activity to keep themselves busy. There was hardly a family represented whose own household responsibilities were so well controlled that father and/or mother could afford to be painting someone else's kitchen! But they worked because there was an urgency to make a home for someone else who needed one. Requests were made to the business men of the community for the materials necessary to complete the work of renovation. The response was, in most cases, an enthusiastic willingness to give
Whatever was needed.

There was no talk of how many souls would be added to any church roster; no talk about how much time would be required to make a statistical success of this venture. There was quite a bit of talk about how quickly this work could be finished so that the house would become a haven and gateway for people.

Eventually the work was completed, the house was transformed, the house-parents moved in, and the first two residents were welcomed in November 1964. In August 1965 these two young girls moved out of the house into apartments of their own, employed in the city, accepted as part of the community. They still need help—love, understanding, and occasionally money and food. They will need time to grow and learn; not all the doors have been opened—but one door has been opened for them, and they have been given a chance to try the next one for themselves.

It is evident from all this that I believe that the Christian college in America should take the lead in de-emphasizing the importance of administration. Many functions now conducted by presidents and deans should be returned to our faculties. It is evident, therefore, that the relation of administration of a Christian college to the faculty and students must be vastly more human and personal than in schools that are not under the lights of the cross.


On Second Thought

The covenant of God with his Old Testament people was not an exclusive offer of his grace. Implicit in it was the purpose that the world might know and believe. It meant that God dealt with man through his people, the Jews. What God would say to man he spoke to the Jews. And what man replied to God was spoken by the Jews.

What happened on Calvary outside of Jerusalem was within that covenant. It was man in microcosm. The Jews represent man confronted by God, God confronted man through the Jews. God in the Jew Jesus Christ was crucified by man in his own people. It is ridiculous to ask whether all the Jews were responsible for his death, whether the responsibility was racial rather than accidental, or whether that responsibility can be imputed through the centuries to the Jews today. The whole of Christian truth cries out a resounding NO to all three questions. We cannot “exonerate” the Jews without the terrible pride of self-justification, because we killed the Prince of Peace. "They" were never guilty separate from the "we." We crucified the Christ.

He came to us to live among us his unconditioned Word of grace. We could not take the judgment of that Word which lumped us all in equal guilt. We hated him for what he implied in grace, and we took him out of the city and nailed him to a cross. We must say it that way. When we do, we can know the horrid truth that if He were to try again we would do it again. It is not by our becoming better people, much less by our being a better race, that we live in him. It is always only by his unconditioned grace.

Our salvation requires a next step also. One tired Saturday night I wrote: “We hated him, we took him out of the city, and he crucified us.” I stared stupefied at the words, then realized that they were wholly right. Unless we let those words be true we have no part in him. For we are buried with Christ by baptism into death. In that he died for us and we die in him. His purpose on the cross was that we might die to live in him. We are crucified with Christ so that the life we live he lives in us. Intending the cross he called us to take up our cross and follow him.

We crucified the Christ. Unless in his death we die to ourselves we would crucify him again. We must be able to accept this death at his calling as he accepted death at our hands. “What shall I say, ‘Father save me from this hour’? No, for this purpose I have come to this hour.”

By ROBERT J. HOYER

The Cresset
Alone I Sing

Alone I sing
to the winding river
that ignores the seasons
flowing steadily
under a salmon colored sun;
my wind-shaken hovel
has been built by dreams
it has climbed the hilltop
sits alone among
a breakneck of rocks.

Talkative cross gulls
have come to my door,
the unquiet pipers,
cockles, snails; the wind
brings vague distant sounds
of bell chimes ringing
I sing to these strangers
with voice deep in sleep
as the clouds move slowly
like sheep in white fleece;
from my ark I watch
in peace without fear.

The river clings to its banks
water flows in silence;
bells drown in mist
noises fail hushing.
The sun sets low
behind silver waters;
of these heavenly streams
manned by my dreams
alone I sing
when day is ended.

By D.M. PETTINELLA
From the Chapel

Legacy For My Children

By ANNE SPRINGSTEEN
Acting University Editor
Valparaiso University

But thanks be to God, who continually leads us about, captives in Christ’s triumphal procession, and everywhere uses us to reveal and spread abroad the fragrance of the knowledge of himself!

II Cor. 2:14

You will walk away from me, young ones,
Into your own tomorrow —
But first, let me ask:

Do you think I should,
(As the saying goes),
“Give you a better world?”

You are too wise
To expect perfection.
Are you asking only
For a place
To eat your bread
In happiness and peace?

And are you waiting impatiently
To be released from the turmoil of today
Into your own tomorrow?
Are you planning then
To make your own
“Better world?”

What kind of tomorrow do you expect
From me?
What counsel?
What questions will you ask?

You know so much these days,
You see so much,
And do so much --
There is very little
That I can say to you.

I know less — — and less — — and less
About better worlds and happy tomorrows.

I'd like to bargain with God,
If he would take a monthly check,
A few evening prayers,
A Sunday morning hour —
And then leave me alone.

You would think
He would be satisfied
That He is my Father —
But no — —
He had to give me His Son too:

I know too much
About my human heart that cries,
“Get thee behind me, God!
Get out of my life!
You cost too much.
Let me buy happiness my way,
It's cheaper,
And I'm looking for a bargain.”

But once, long ago,
I was received into the Kingdom of Heaven — — —
And God will not ever
Leave me alone.

The Cresset
He expects me to invite him to dinner,
(And I would do this joyfully),
But He brings people with him —
Hungry people.

He expects me to invite him to share
The comfort of my living room,
(And I would do this graciously),
But he brings people with him —
Lonely people.

He expects me to invite him to spend the night,
(And I would do this gladly),
But he brings people with him —
Tired, desperate people.

He expects me to give him money for his needs,
(And I would do this generously)
But he brings people with him —
Hungry, tired, lonely people.

He expects too much —
There is nothing left of me!

Now I am hungry —- lonely —- tired —-

Once, long ago,
I was received into the Kingdom of Heaven —-
And this is all I know
Of better worlds and happy tomorrows.
Today I stumble and drag my feet.
I keep my eyes closed
And my ears filled with other sounds,
I wear gloves,
And avert my eyes.

I give you this legacy, young ones —
For today and tomorrow.
Did you expect more?

Pray God
Your heart will love His world!

This Man that comes to me,
This Man that turns and looks at me.
This Man that stands before me.
Waiting ----

I can no longer eat a meal
or sit in comfort
or sleep at night
or buy a trifle.

Have mercy, Lord,
Have mercy.

And yet this Man walks with me --
This Son of God cries for me
and dies
and lives in me ---
This is all I know
About today.

Pray God you will say,
"It is enough."
He stands before you
Waiting ----
Pray God
Your eyes will be less blind,
Your hands less weak,
Your feet less slow ----
Autumn Amber

TO MARK VAN DOREN

Only those hours, those sweet, sweet hours
that float amber in the late day's sun,
Only those hours bring the smell of coal dust,
black on the gold mid-western air.

Just at Autumn, the wind amid flowers
sets that darkening sky adrift; clouds run
through golden streamers, flecking rust
on leaves that wander everywhere.

Just there, in that Autumn amber
in the rose of smoke and leaves,
In just that time I remember
Amber dreams a poet weaves.

By JACK TRACY LEDBETTER

Cornwall Hollow

I
An opaque glaze of icy lace
floats lightly on the meadow stream,
While underneath, the mirrored face
Is flung headlong as from a dream.

Beyond that meadow in the star-clear night
Where bans of snow still cling to trees,
The pails hang silent in the moonlight
And sap sings heavy in the pre-dawn breeze.

The ice is melting, did you know?
But listen! underground the seasons move:
Come, push the spring ice; watch it flow,
Then spill water-bright like thawed love.

II
In thickly warming grass below the barn
A fence that needs repair runs past a stone-lined walk
Grown over now with weeds. The morning sun
Is hot, the air expands, no reason now to talk.

There's shade among those maples by the road,
But that's across the meadow from where we want to go.
Strange, I almost think we'll change our way,
There's shade: see how those topmost leaves begin to blow?

III
In Winter Dreams

Those rolling, rolling clouds of dark and light
That spread themselves across the Autumn night,
Those chilling winds that cut the tops of trees
Blowing leaves and faces as they please,
And coating winter water mirror-bright
With frosted crust that's only slightly glazed.
This whistling wind that bends through branches blazed
By orange, reds, and blues in drifting leaves
Runs heavy crested on the hill and grieves
Like eyes that stare, open wide, and dazed.
These clouds and winds I see in winter dreams;
They race and sing, then, leaping up so high,
A pale-white moon is struck; or so it seems,
And silver stars are scattered in the sky.

By JACK TRACY LEDBETTER
Magdalene: I

Hardly night. There is my demon.
My payment for the past.
Memories of depravity
Come to leech at my heart:
How I, slave to the whims of men.
Lived like a babbling fool:
How the street was my home.

There are scant moments left until
Death’s silence falls.
Before those moments pass
I smash my life before Thee
Like an alabaster vessel
Filled to its brim.

Where would I be now.
O my Teacher and Saviour.
If every night eternity
Did not wait for me, sitting
At my table like a newcomer
Fished up in the net of my trade?

Tell me the rest: What does sin mean.
And death, and Hell, and brimstone? Tell me.
For in everyone’s eyes I am joined
To Thee like twig to tree
By my infinite grief.

Dear Jesus, when Thy feet
Rest so, across my knees, perhaps
I am learning to embrace
The four-faced timber of the Cross.
Fainting, I bend toward Thy Body.
Readying Thee for burial.

Translated from the Russian by
Robley Wilson, Jr.
The Symbolic Art of Paul Klee

A picture with a concrete object...a naked man...should be fashioned, not in accordance with human anatomy, but with pictorial anatomy. Paul Klee

Art does not render the visible, but makes visible. Paul Klee

There were three main directions in the abstract art of the early twentieth century. One direction, exemplified by Matisse and the German expressionists, centered on the expression of intense feeling. Another direction centered on a concern for form in itself. And the third direction, including the work of Hans Arp and the subject of this month's essay, Paul Klee (1879-1940), centered on an intuitive search for new symbols and subject matter.

For Klee the underlying fact of life was that of change. "Motion is at the root of all growth." Move a point and it becomes a line; move a line sideways and it becomes a plane, etc. But for man, Klee realized, this changeability can give also a phantom quality to existence, "an anguish of uncertainty" and shapelessness. With a gently satirical accent Klee seems to make visible this situation in the etching, OLD MAN FIGURING.

Using only the linear element, Klee etched a series of horizontal lines which expands and contracts, creating an ambiguous earthly world of endless patternless rhythm. Into this indeterminate, grey world of formless flux Klee inscribed the head, shoulders and hands of an old man. The world of horizontal lines alternately penetrates, veils over, and is blocked out by the outline of the man. Looking at the man one finds that both the side view of the face and the three-quarter view are shown at the same time, although each view has much the same overall outline. If one concentrates on the side view the expression is somewhat active and self-confident, yet when the three-quarter view is predominate the expression is more one of self-doubt and aimless hesitancy. The fingers also seem to be groping but obviously are incompetent. The transparency of arm, collar, and nose, the upside-down ear, the two views of the face, and the interpenetration of the vague but all pervading milieu suggests the transitoriness and bodilessness of life. Man's spiritual ability to sense something more than this earthly existence is contradicted by his bodily helplessness in the flux of life. "Man is half a prisoner; half borne on wings."

In AROUND THE FISH, one can see a more involved mixture of private and general symbols. The fish in the center on a plate perhaps is the symbol for Christ, or perhaps is a symbol for the watery beginnings of life as described in evolutionary theories. From this springs man, as suggested by the arrow and the exclamation point. Then from the primitive mask one goes down and around the fish from one geometric and biological shape to another, suggesting all kinds of growth and fertility symbols, till man arrives in his development to the beliefs of Christianity. Although the exact meaning is ambiguous, the whole picture rouses associations and ideas that cut across changing time and cultures.

Klee usually started a work by developing a formal structure out of lines, tones, and/or colors. As the forms developed, subject matter associations intuitively suggested themselves to him, and he would then follow their lead and clarify the representational aspects of the forms. Klee summed up his idea of the creative work of the artist by comparing it to the living process of a tree. The roots were all the nourishing experiences, visions, understandings, feelings, beliefs of the artist. These then pass through the trunk, the artist, like the sap in a tree and become transformed into foliage, the artist's works. The foliage is a new creation and not a copy of the roots. Similarly, the artist's work should not be a mere copy of appearances but rather a symbolic interpretation, a new work of nature.

An implication for the Christian artist who wishes to follow Klee's approach is that the Christian's faith must permeate his life to such an extent that in his intuitive probings his faith automatically reveals itself in the imagery and symbolism of his art.

February 1966
The Reformation Era


The *Grimm Reformation*, out of print for some time, now is available again. The most important feature of this new edition is the bibliography, which has grown from 38 pages in the 1954 edition to 67 pages. Consequently the book is, in its present form, something like a *Handbuch*, which is so popular in Germany, and, despite the great need for it, so rare in our country. The *Reformation Era* is a basic tool of information and reference for all who are engaged in the study of Reformation history, be they students, teachers, pastors, or interested "laymen." This work can introduce the novice to the field, and then can accompany him as he delves into specific problems of the Reformation times. Since it contains a highly detailed bibliography, Grimm's book will give the reader that assistance and guidance which he may vainly have sought in the *Reformation volume of The New Cambridge Modern History*, the book to which the reader probably turned at the outset of his endeavor to familiarize himself with the Reformation. In addition to the bibliography, the book is of great value for the eight maps it contains. — As a political and cultural historian rather than a church-historian, Grimm is well aware that the term "Reformation" cannot be harnessed only by that for which men such as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, the Anabaptists, the Anglicans, and the Jesuits stood. "Reformation" is for Grimm the Protestant reformation with its religious-theological-churchly as well as political dynamics and the Roman Catholic reformation with its religious-theological-churchly as well as political dynamics. He sees both reformations in the frame-work of the profound change in the social and intellectual structure of Europe which began in the 15th century and culminated in the two reformations of the 16th and early 17th centuries. And so the author leads his reader at a sometimes highly demanding speed from the eve of the Reformation to the middle of the 17th century, that is, to that point when the political dynamics of the Reformation were exhausted, and when the religious-theological-churchly dynamics of the Reformation were replaced by Protestant Orthodoxy and post-Tridentine Catholicism. Thus Grimm avoids the artificial division of the Reformation era into the two parts of Reformation and Counter-Reformation, a division which dominates most presentations of Reformation history. The frame in which Grimm works demands of him a high amount of selectivity, as well as concentration on major issues. Notwithstanding these handicaps, the author gives a 568 page presentation of the Reformation events which is highly informative, descriptive, and analytic; in an additional 46 pages he analyzes the "Legacy of the Reformation," a chapter which demonstrates the depth and width of his knowledge, sketches with colorful yet secure lines the historical position of the Reformation in western culture. The *Reformation Era* may not be easy to skim, but once the reader has worked himself into the material, he will be captured by the author's gift of making the 16th century live, and will be amply rewarded for the time he spends with the book.

GOTTFRIED G. KRODEL

Bible and Babylon


"No feature of contemporary life has been more important than the triumph of urban culture." The N.T., although initially appearing to belong to a vastly different age, was also produced in the midst of a civilization that was urban. "The history of Greco-Roman civilization is the history of the cities." Among these cities Corinth was distinctive as a new great urban center, about as old as Chicago is right now when the letters to the Corinthian Christians were composed. The problems of the church in that cosmopolitan complex (cf. the inscription on one mug excavated from the tavern-row on the south side of the agora: "cure for hangovers") are summarized into five problems: division, of morality, of secularism, of worship, of death. Under the captions of these to the Corinthians: division (chapters 1-4), morality (5-7), secularism (8-10), worship (11-14), death (15), with a concluding chapter on 16.

Baird attempts to equate the fundamental moral and ethical issues which Paul faced with those that confront the church today. The technical exegetical and historical analysis of each section is sufficient and building toward modern American panurabia is kept very limited and is obviously weak. Although constant reference is made to the current ecclesiastical social analysts (Marty, Winter, Shinn, Herberg, Riesman) the equation between then and now does not come off.

One point that may account for the difficulty is the author's predilection despite the fine technical scholarship to remain in the realm of symptom analysis and therefore symptom therapy as he digs into the Corinthian's own problems, and Paul's response to them. Perhaps as one colleague has said — after the historian has done his necessary scholarly work the theologian still has to take his scholarship and make "theology" out of it. — Thus in the problem of division he locates three major causes of factionalism: false wisdom, pride, and false loyalty to religious leaders. For these the apostolic cure is the wisdom of God, humility, and loyalty to God. This is not inaccurate, but it is still...
a superficial reading of Corinthians; it stays up on the surface when it could penetrate more. Especially in Corinthians Paul saw that every scandal and heresy present in the congregation was rooted in the errorist's faith or unbelief in Christ himself, as expressed in Paul's own specified Christian Christology: "Christ crucified" or "the word of the cross." Thus the moral and ethical issues of Corinthian congregational problems are problems of faith and unbelief, and the apostolic activity going on in the epistles is not primarily the shipment of didache (ethical instruction) across the Aegean Sea, but the "once again" preaching of the Kerygma (the Gospel of Christ Crucified) to people who have heard it before, and may well "know it all," but nevertheless illustrate that they do not believe it. They do not let "Christ and him crucified" free them from their past, shape their present, and open them to the future.

Although Baird almost casually picks and chooses from among the current options in Biblical studies as he presents exegetical problems, stamped neither to existential interpretation nor to realized eschatology, seeking to listen to the texts themselves first and foremost, he does seem to have missed what might be called the "realized Christology" so regnant in I Corinthians. This is surely of a piece with the equally "low key" ecclesiology and typically Protestant (?) sacramental theology which he finds Paul promoting. Thus he notes that "Paul's view of baptism is only a sign of the believer's oneness with the crucified and risen Christ, not a magically operative sacrament." (184). And so it is with "the presence of Christ (which) is not primarily in the elements but in the dramatic action of the Supper — the breaking of bread, the emptying of the cup." (132).

With Paul's concept of the church in Corinthians Baird "must urge that the 'body of Christ' be taken as a metaphor." Even though every Pauline label need not be taken literal-ly, somewhere along the line there must be a literal assertion not what the church is like, but what it is. And once again if there is anywhere in Paul's writings where he minces no words about what the church is — even the torn and tattered Corinthian congregation — it is in his words to these urban Christians.

The central idea in Baird's book is fascinating: the Christian Gospel in urban culture then and now. If the panunanced man in today's secular city is looking for reality then there might be a bridge between I Corinthians and Chicago in terms of what seems to us to be the "realized Christology, realized ecclesiology, realized sacramentalism" of I Corinthians in a secular city where "all hell is breaking loose."

One blow to parochial pride is the fact that of the three contemporary Missouri synod theologians cited by Baird (Piepkorn, Seboldt, and Marty) only Marty escapes having his name misspelled.

EDWARD SCHROEDER
February 1966

Hey Say, Jesus

The Reverend Malcolm Boyd, the young Episcopal clergyman who seeks his "present-generation congregation" in the coffee houses and on the college campuses, is a very positive and "orthodox" Christian. His life is seriously and unequivocally centered on Christ. He can acknowledge no real dynamic for himself other than the saving sacrifice of Christ. The essential act of his daily living is the celebration of the Eucharist.

All this as preliminary to the mention of Reverend Boyd's new book, "Are You Running With Me, Jesus?" This book is a collection of prayers which, to say the least, are framed in language that will make many a serious and devout "pray-er" draw back. There is not much that can be regarded in the pattern of the "King James version."

. . . Lord, don't leave me alone while I'm trying to kid myself . . . .

. . . Okay, I'll try some more to be human, but it's nearly been knocked out of me for one day. Stay with me; I can't do it alone.

Please cool everybody off, Lord, including me . . .

. . . The masks are smiling and laughing to cover up status anxieties and bleeding ulcers. Tell us about freedom, Jesus.

Question: Can this kind of expression be devotional, or is true devotional language that which creates an aura of the mystical; a haze to which the spirit can soar, leaving the blood and bones in the background?

As long as there are people who are concerned about God and themselves the question will be debatable. Some of the people who have read Reverend Boyd's prayers find them exciting, real, vital, and helpful to them in their daily running. There are those, to be sure, who will think the prayers, at worst, blasphemous, and at best, an unsuitable pattern for their own particular lives. It is more than interesting to note that the greater number of prayers are petitions on behalf of someone else — a particular person in an immediate need; or are petitions which simply place before God an activity of a particular day.

Perhaps the real question is concerned with the strange shock that we "main-line" Christians feel when the words used to address the Lord of life are the same words which we use to communicate with ordinary people. Somehow then the Lord of life becomes a part of the scene, an interested participant — indeed, He is shown up for what He really is — the Lord of life!

It is possible to avoid this startling confrontation through the judicious and habitual use of a set pattern of "traditional" language. Certainly the dignity and beauty of language does not have to be denied in order to communicate, but it is possible that too much dignity and too much beauty can effectively smother any meaningful communication.

Heren then is a suggestion to those who are involved in the writing and publishing of books which are to be of help to those of us who must keep running day after day after day. There is no little danger in feeding us the beautiful words, the well-turned phrases, the classic language. We have a real temptation to make these our Cloud Nine of contentment, deluding ourselves with the belief that to be "devotional" is to withdraw and relax in the mists of sentiment. We need to be told in some well-chosen words that "devotion" is a living, breathing, "now" type of activity, and that the Lord has His say whether or not we want to converse with Him on the subject.

Reverend Boyd puts this way:

. . . my prayer life, as the state of my spirituality, is neither very respectable nor quite correct. Needless to say, I am a self-centered man. Sinfully immersed in my own welfare and concerns, attempting to manipulate God, and often lost in my own self-love and self-pity.

ANNE SPRINGSTEEN
I have attended and reviewed scores of concerts in the course of the years. Sometimes I was bored. Sometimes I was delighted. Sometimes I was edified and even thrilled.

Concerts invariably provided me with an important by-product. I am referring to the countless comments I drank in, particularly during the intermissions. Some of these remarks made my blood boil, some amused me, and some put invaluable information and understanding into my brainpan. As a rule, I kept my own mouth shut. Nevertheless, I never failed to be all ears.

I have heard Bach's works for the clavier decried as dry finger exercises. I have heard this great master's choral compositions denounced as dull and altogether unprofitable. Mozart was often spoken of as a composer no longer worthy of serious attention, and Beethoven's music was frequently dismissed as out of date. More than once I heard it said that Beethoven's *Fifth* has become trite and moth-eaten.

The statement that Rachmaninoff was a modernist always stirred my bile, and I invariably briddled up in my innards when friends and foes shrugged off Dvorak's *Symphony from the New World* as a "chestnut."

The word "chestnut," by the way, still gives me an excruciating pain. Is Beethoven's *Fifth* a "chestnut"? Are the operas of Rossini, Verdi, and Puccini "chestnuts"? Is Rimsky-Korsakov's *Scheherazade* a "chestnut"? Is Wagner's *Ring* a huge "chestnut"? Whenever the word "chestnut" assails my ears, I itch to learn how much those who are in the habit of bandying it about in season and out of season actually know about the compositions at which they turn up their omnisciently fussy noses.

How could I ever fail to clench my fists in high dudgeon when the music of Gershwin was pooh-poohed in my presence? And I needed will power in abundance when the wonderful piano works of Chopin were made light of as baubles.

If up to this point I have sounded pessimistic and hopelessly atrabilious, I hasten to beg you to be interested enough to take heart; for the picture is by no means bleak as it may seem. Long experience has convinced me, as it has shown many others, that the classics and the near-classics in music are here to stay. They have survived and will continue to survive innumerable assaults. They thrive luxuriantly on differences of opinion. How can Rachmaninoff be harmed if he, staunchly conservative though he was, is dubbed a modernist? The works of Mozart, Haydn, Bach, Handel, and Beethoven have weathered millions of storms. One cannot detract from the stature of Brahms by calling his music boring and heavy-handed. Rossini, Verdi, Bizet, and Puccini continue to be what is called "good box office." Fifty years ago it was often said that Tchaikovsky was rushing pellmell into the trash can, for many so-called connoisseurs used to predict with all the aplomb they could muster that his works would soon turn out to be little more than a flash in the pan.

Will a similar statement be made five years from now about the works of Arnold Schoenberg, Alban Berg, Anton von Webern, Karlheinz Stockhausen, Roger Sessions, Charles Ives, Walter Piston, and many others? I wonder. At the same time I must state in all candor that my present state of understanding prompts me to believe that the music composed by these men and their ilk does not have what is needed for survival. Their names and works will grace the history books, but will their output grace the concert halls?

Has the art of composing music fallen on evil days? I really think so. And I think so in spite of valiant efforts to ram a different conviction down my throat. I am congenitally disposed to welcome innovations, trailblazers, and both major and minor prophets. But something — it may be an evil spirit — tells me that for years the ability to write good music has been in the throes of a lamentable depression and that many false prophets have been rearing their heads. Today even jazz — which I dote on when it has genuine merit — seems to be bankrupt. But please remember that I am using the term "jazz" in a broad sense.

Why has this sad state of affairs come about? I wish I knew the answer. Are there cycles in music as well as in many other fields of endeavor? I think so. For my part, I shall continue to listen avidly to comments of all kinds.

Just as those who decry the works of acknowledged masters and are inordinately fond of the word "chestnut" cannot relegate good music to oblivion, so my fulminations against some of the avant-gardists and their kith and kin might be characterized as nonsense by Aristophanes if that nimble-minded master of the bon mot were walking the earth today and accidentally read what I am writing at this moment.

But the more one talks about the art of composition and its ups and downs, the better it will fare. This, I firmly believe, is an axiomatic truth. Therefore I shall continue to be all ears, and now and then I shall make bold to open my own mouth.

Why has Aristophanes bobbed up in my mind all of a sudden? I need not search long for an answer to this question, for I am convinced that a man endowed with his perspicacity and his razor-sharp wit could do much to bring the art of writing music out of the doldrums. At all events, he could try.
This season seems to go down into history as the poorest, thinnest and most dismal season — any negative superlative will suffice — that Broadway has ever experienced. Whatever was worthwhile had to come to us from England. And among the British imports was one which had startled and stunned the European theatre-goers for a whole year and had a similar effect on almost everyone (except Walter Kerr) who saw Peter Weiss's "The Persecution and Assassination of Marat as Performed by the Inmates of the Asylum of Charenton Under the Direction of the Marquis de Sade" which The Royal Shakespeare Company presented.

It is very likely the most fascinating play written in our time. Peter Weiss, a born German who lives in Sweden, has out-Brechtled Brecht in this play by writing an epic drama whose emotional power punctures the structure from time to time to remind us that it is a play only. Peter Weiss has out-distanced Beckett because he shows indirectly that hopelessness is something that one cannot live with, that there are two sides to every question and, although none may be satisfactory, we do have to help hope to change life. Essentially, the play is an evening long discussion between two intellectuals, Jean-Paul Marat, a professional revolutionary, a suffering radical who preaches ideal socialism, and the Marquis de Sade, a professional pessimist, the skeptic who does not think that anything will ever change the world, who can only foresee that man's striving for ideals can bring but punishment in form of dictators and suppression upon him.

It is a play within a play within a play since the Marquis de Sade is permitted to put on a play in an insane asylum with the inmates playing certain parts for therapeutic purposes. This is the historic fact on which the play is based (and one cannot help being surprised that such a progressive idea was put into practice between 1797 and 1811 by the Director of the Charenton Asylum). The fact that it was fashionable in Paris at that time to visit the asylum for the purpose of watching the lunatics play other than their own roles of craziness to be cured from their madness only adds theatrically to a very theatrical show.

Peter Weiss remained true to this historic framework which afforded him the opportunity to accept the madhouse as a symbol for our mad society. Moreover, mad people may say what they want because we know we can always pretend and do not have to take them seriously.

The action of the play consists of the three attempts of Charlotte Corday to assassinate Marat. In other words, there is no actual action, although the murder was a political act during the early days of the French Revolution. Again, what wonderful opportunity to have the Marquis write a play about the French Revolution and have it performed by madmen at a time when Napoleon's ambitions were as triumphant as the gloire of France. While Charlotte Corday tries to be received by Marat, a discussion between him and the Marquis bring into clear focus why the play was written.

It is an autobiographical play. Peter Weiss sees himself as the intellectual of our time, tortured by the dualism he cannot help enduring. He feels that everything Marat says is right. There is the goal of social justice, of the brotherhood of man. We must try to change our lives and the lives of the other people, he says. On the other hand, he is the Marquis and realizes how right he is: that, looking at the cyclic changes in history, one always sees the so called achievements for the betterment of man turning against him. Sade is pure pessimism, the incarnation of the skeptic intellectual. But Marat, we must not forget, is the creation of the Marquis who wrote him into this play. Thus we not only have a play within a play within a play, we also have a protagonist who lives the life of the antagonist, who is a part of him, his own invention, his inner voice and alter ego which he has finally murdered after subjecting himself to a flagellation by the very person who is about to kill his own voice of Marat. He would love to be Marat if he could, if his pessimism would not prevent him from it. What version that finds pleasure in the cruelty to the very object of love! What intellectual self-torture! How more masochistic can you get, Marquis de Sade? How more clearly could the intellectual say, Peter Weiss, that his skepticism, finally always right, must kill the voice of hope in himself?

A herald comments sarcastically on the events that take place. A grotesque trio shocks us with Brechtian songs into awareness. A mime pantomimes the pleasure of it all. The smallest part in this production is fully experienced and realized by these English players who, under Peter Brook's direction, remind us that all the world's a stage as much as a madhouse.
In The Cresset editorials (In Luce Tua) the editors mentioned some comments by Richard John Neuhaus of Brooklyn, New York on power.

In an address at Valparaiso University Pastor Neuhaus had asserted that power is a necessary part of human life. To live is to use power and to confront it under the control of fellow human beings. If a person finds himself in a position where he no longer uses power, to that extent he is no longer a human being. If he can no longer make the decisions which certainly require the use of power, he can no longer really affirm himself. He has become a slave or a dishrag or something akin. Whatever life is for a person, it does not come automatically. It comes by the use and influence of power. In the processes of power the human being is a creative force, a power, in the creation of life and the arranging of activity all about him. In these editorials, the editors wrote: “Power-impregnated creative forces are at work within human beings and through them human beings make social life what it is.”

By almost any definition, then, power is what human beings are doing all the time or are attempting to do. For example, by one definition power is “... the capacity of an individual, or groups of individuals, to modify the conduct of other individuals or groups of individuals.” In normal circumstances all the human beings we know are pushing their preferences, drives, values, objectives, and wants in power situations only to face other human beings pursuing similar ends and aspirations with similar means. Human beings will naturally seek to enlarge their jurisdictions of power, will try to consolidate their power and dig it in, and will multiply the devices by which they can defend their power positions. Because human beings are so varied in their demands and desires in our democratic society we are bound to be wheeling and dealing in a pluralistic society.

In such a society it is difficult to write out decisions when so many cross-currents are blowing down upon our notes and materials. In interpersonal power relationships decisions must be made by getting a lot of individuals with different views and postures moving in one direction, in the same direction. This must be done with a modicum of unanimity to accomplish even a minimal kind of united front for decision-making.

Without going into explicit detail about what happens in the decision-making meatgrinders (and we cannot), we can at least mention some of the techniques employed to drive or seduce people into line. Leaning heavily on some examples from collective bargaining, we may safely say that union members pledge their faith and loyalty to their leaders in negotiations because it is to their advantage to do so. Over the years union leaders have been successful in raising wages for the rank and file and in increasing their fringe benefits, pensions, and other increments. With these benefits in hand the rank and file are now able to live in better neighborhoods, substantial houses, to eat more healthy food, acquire more status symbols, to do more worthwhile things for their children, and to move up into the middle class style show. For such benefits and increments the rank and file has been willing to go along in strikes, on picket lines, boycotts, and other means of deprivation to bring management into line. With these devices labor has been working with constitutional consensus and there is power in that. The strike, the picket, the boycott etc. as a matter of fact the right to organize, have all been entrenched in the First Amendment. Labor has been able to take advantage of the preferred position of the First Amendment and there is certainly power in that.

Labor knows, and how well it knows, that it does not hold undisputed and unlimited power. It has learned that what it might have gained at the bargaining table has been wiped off the table by legislative hands. As a testimony to this fact, legislatures have passed acts like Taft-Hartley, right-to-work laws, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act. In labor’s case, after many years of moderately successful use of power, labor leaders have discovered that their production of intended effects and benefits for labor have now been hampered by some changes in the legislative environment. There is power in that.

Power is dynamic. To hold power means to ride herd on power. It changes. It moves. Power is kaleidoscopic. Every time you touch the structure of power it changes. This is abundantly true in a democratic system.

But it is hard for good people to become accustomed to power even though power-holders use them and they use power. At ministerial conferences we often hear that Christians cannot strike because love and power do not go together. What does a minister do with “whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth”? The giving of an F grade is an act of power but not necessarily an act of hatred. Whipping a child may indeed be an act of love. So good people must use power.

The Cresset
On Christmas Day I became a victim of "that virus that's going around." Consequently, I was able to see only two of the rash of films that opened during the holiday season.

I had seen The Little Nuns (Joseph Levine, Luciano Solce) earlier. This refreshing and delightful film is altogether unlike the cynical, brazenly unconventional pictures one has come to expect from Italy. It takes us into a quiet world far removed from the harsh realities of life. The acting is exceptionally good, the direction is excellent, and the photography is superb. But in spite of its warmth and appeal, The Little Nuns was not good box office here. It had only a short run.

Next I saw Thunderball (United Artists, Terence Young). And that's another story! Audiences in many parts of the world have come under the spell of James Bond, Agent 007, a character created by the late Ian Fleming. We have experienced many such manifestations of mass hysteria, and there is no reason to doubt that we shall survive this one. Since I enjoy a good mystery thriller, I have read some of Mr. Fleming's novels. The first volumes were entertaining and reasonably well written. But I doubt that discriminating readers will classify them as literature of enduring value. And I should like to recommend John le Carre's The Spy Who Came in from the Cold to those who imagine that the antics of Mr. Fleming's super-hero have much in common with the experiences of real-life secret agents. Espionage is a grim, cold, and ugly business, with very little glamor to offset the dangers and the loneliness.

It seems to me that Mr. Fleming's writing deteriorated after the spectacular success of the first James Bond movie. More and more he came to depend on the spell of gadgets and gimmicks rather than on a good plot. This is especially noticeable in Thunderball, where a thin and overworked plot has been designed wholly and solely to exploit ingenious mechanical devices. Sean Connery, the British actor who portrays James Bond, has said, "These pictures have become gaudy comic strips, each trying to outdo the previous one."

Many critics have been outspoken in their condemnation of the James Bond novels and films. The wholly justifiable charges brought against the books and the films are often summed up as too much "sex, snobbery, and sadism." O.F. Snelling, an ardent Fleming fan, attempts to explain, not to refute, these charges in his book 007 James Bond: A Report. Mr. Snelling invokes many familiar arguments to defend the behavior of the super-hero. And, of course, everything can be explained or rationalized on the basis of psychological overtones or undertones — the catchall of our age. Since Mr. Snelling relates in detail Agent 007's conquest of panting, nude, and seminude females, he has also made sure that he struck pay dirt.

Thunderball can only be described as salacious. Audience reaction to this type of film follows a definite pattern. There are those who view horror and violence with no outward display of emotion. Children often cry because they are frightened by the cruelty and violence depicted on the screen. These same scenes are greeted with loud laughter by many adults. Displays of sex and passion usually arouse snickers or guffaws. And anyone who is not blind can see the petting that goes on in darkened theaters, just as anyone with ears can hear some of the remarks exchanged in the audience. Can we really profit from a steady diet of sex, violence, and crime? Or do we lower our own standards of taste, ethics, and morals and lose all sense of compassion for the suffering of others? If statistics are a reliable yardstick, we have the answers to these questions. And we have no reason to be proud.

The third picture on my list is the highly touted Super Cinema production Battle of the Bulge (Warners, Ken Annakin), a fictional account of the last desperate campaign waged by the Nazis in the Ardennes Forest in December, 1944. This film is the target of adverse criticism from the Department of Defense, from the Federal Trade Commission, and from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who declared himself "outraged" by such blatant disregard for facts that are readily available to motion-picture producers. This controversy may have far-reaching effects. We can only hope that it will put an end to the phony war films that are palmed off as "historical."

Seen merely as a film, Battle of the Bulge is neither particularly impressive nor exciting. It is too obviously pure hokum. The photography is often overwhelming.

December really belonged to the television screen. Nothing could have been more thrilling than the successful flight of Gemini 7 and the historic rendezvous in space with Gemini 6. For the first time live cameras permitted us to see the actual recovery of astronauts and their spacecraft. The photographs of the rendezvous were magnificent, and magnificent is the only word that truly describes the entire undertaking.
Culinary Note

The business of supporting the preacher by gifts in kind was—and is—a tradition with both good and bad sides. In many cases it was—and is—an honest, loving sharing of food and other things with the pastor. Deacon Sauerbraten slaughtered several hogs each year and the preacher always shared in the results—and often it was more than the feet or the ribs. I still remember a cellar in a parsonage in western Canada that was stocked with row upon row of pressed duck, vegetables, fruits, and other good things.

On the other hand, I have often heard a pastor’s wife express profound resentment over the fact that she had to “oh and ah” over gifts of chicken necks and hand-me-down clothes. I recall that some farmers in central Illinois were regularly surprised by the faithful activity of their hens in Spring. They had more eggs than they could use or sell profitably. The result? The first batch went to the pastor. If there were still some left, they were shipped to the theological seminary at Springfield. I can still hear my good friends at the Sem come out of the dining hall cackling for weeks at a time. I recall a parsonage into which we moved more than forty years ago which was so solidly stuffed with baked beans—there must have been a sale somewhere because most of the cans were dented—that for years we couldn’t stand to look a baked bean in the eye.

I presume that by now this custom has succumbed to urbanization, super markets, and higher salaries. In one way, I must say, I regret this. The quantity and quality of the gifts were often used by our fathers as measures of sanctification. There was believed to be a close relationship between the degree of holiness and the quality of the eggs. For example, there was in my Grandfather Hueschen’s Begleitschreiben a provision that, in addition to his $300 annual salary, the Vorsteher (elders) were to supply him with wood. This was no small order; he had a large house and there was a stove in every room. Normally, on cold winter days, each afternoon would find him making his sick calls. He usually walked because Hans, the parish horse, was a contemporary of Ulysses S. Grant and got the chills on cold days. This was therefore the logical time—during his absence—for some of the elders to deliver their share of the wood. They could drop it and run. Grandfather Hueschen would come home as dusk came down over the Friedhof (cemetery) on the hill, take one good look at the new pile of wood in the barnyard, and say: “Das hat nun wieder der elende Schmidt gebracht. Der liebe Gott hat ihm gesagt er soll teilen was er hat; er teilt aber was er uebrig hat.” Translation for the monolingual reader: “This wood comes from Schmidt. God told him to share what he has; but he shares only what he has left over.” Footnote: it is a curious linguistic, cultural, and nationalistic fact that English has no exact equivalent for “der elende Schmidt” or even for “der liebe Gott;” neither “the noble Schmidt” nor “the dear God” captures anything like the precise meaning of the German.

These reminiscences were brought on by a report in the New York Times that a young Anglican vicar’s wife had published an article in which she advised “Never Marry a Cleric.” In that article she observed that she “had high-minded visions of entering with my husband to the great work of converting the world (who doesn’t at 21), but here I am surrounded by four children, tied to the house, expected to turn up at every cat-hanging and feeling like a widow as my husband is always on duty.

She continues: “I also resent the fact standard. A clergy wife is expected to run the conventional things, turn up at church and every other connected social affair whatever her domestic circumstances may be. It is often extremely difficult with a young family. One receives no encouragement from managing it with plenty of blame when one does not. Ordinarily a woman has a right to share her husband’s life but for the clergy wife this has been reduced to an occasional privilege.”

I really wonder if she is right. I know that occasionally I get a letter from a pastor’s wife in which she writes: “My husband is too busy. He told me to write.” I always read the next few paragraphs hurriedly because I know the good part is coming. It always begins: “As far as I am concerned—.” At this point my attention quotient goes up and I read with a great deal of interest and no little approval. Perhaps I should say that too often she refers to some hidden grief which has touched her family. I become aware of the fact that she does not like to trouble her husband with some of these problems and that she has very few people in whom she can confide. So she writes to a dim, dumb, and distant figure. Perhaps there should be a separate set of counselors for pastors’ wives.