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In Luce Tua

Comment on the Significant News by the Editors

A Personal Note — I

Clarence Strietelmeier, father of John Strietelmeier (managing editor of The Cresset on leave at Cambridge, England), died suddenly, but not unexpectedly, early in the month of February. The editors of The Cresset are saddened by this event and we extend our sympathies to the members of the Strietelmeier family in the knowledge that they are moving ahead with the Christian understandings of life and death. In these understandings, as always, the strengths and the joys of the Strietelmeiers will overcome their sorrows and predicaments. No family we know of has their house so much in order for whatever life and death might bring.

Notes From John Strietelmeier

Our managing editor on leave is a faithful correspondent. He writes every week from dear old England. He writes things like this:

If you have your Cambridge calendar open at January and February, I can tell you a little about the picture. Christ's College is downtown on one of the main shopping streets. The foreground is a churchyard — St. Andrew's, I believe — and the stone pillar in the lower left hand corner is a memorial to the church's war dead. Between the churchyard and the college is St. Andrew's Street, along which the Number 106 bus (Girton to Red Cross) runs every 8-12 minutes. Almost every member of our family walks past this scene at least once a week... It is worth the year in Cambridge just to hear Moule lecture on the New Testament. He is a post-Bultmannian who finds both the Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Bultmannian emphasis on the Lord of Faith insufficient. He is interested, as he puts it, in testing the accuracy of the apostolic kerygma. His question is: "Was there a sitter behind the portrait that the New Testament gives us?" He has already indicated that he believes it is possible to reconstruct the corpus of Jesus' actual teaching although he doubts the possibilities of getting at the facts of Jesus' life. His favorite German theologian is Oscar Cullmann. In addition to being quite an original thinker, Moule is an excellent lecturer with a flashing wit and he is a canon of the cathedral of Ely, our diocesan cathedral... You may dismiss as fiction the alleged coldness and stand-offishness of the English. There is — praise God! — an enormous respect for privacy, but we have encountered nothing but friendliness and a very delightful naturalness. The Englishman reserves his sophistication for public conduct, where it serves to keep social relations smooth without threatening any unwanted entanglements. Once he invites you into his home, though, you are one of the family. All is relaxed and old-shoe. The only real difficulty we have found is that he always assumes that you haven't eaten all day and therefore proceeds to stuff you with all sorts of sweet and fattening things... We hope to see more of London and to get to Rochester, Canterbury, Stratford, and Coventry in April... According to this morning's Guardian, Chicago has had temperatures down to seventeen below this week. You will, therefore, not take it as smugness on my part if I merely mention in passing that our temperatures during that same time have been running around fifty in the daytime with dips to around forty at night. But things even out in this world of compensatory law. The warm weather is believed by some to be responsible for an outbreak of Influenza (Virus B) which has been sweeping the country and which we expect to hit us any day now. In fact, David is home from school today with a raw throat... This has been a very pleasant week. Monday we watched David and his Cambridgeshire all-stars take an 11-5 drubbing from Norfolk's all-stars in a rugger match at the Perse School playing grounds. Wednesday night we had an evening with our next-door neighbors, the Cubitts... who showed us slides of their various trips to the continent and then laid on snacks, which amounted to a small supper. Thursday night was the Nagel's annual Epiphany tree-burning party with supper, records, singing, and quantities of mulled wine. And at various times during the week each of us had an appointment with Mr. Jones, our dentist, whom we would all like greatly to take back to
the States with us. In between I have been working at
my research and getting a few last Christmas licks at the
piano . . . Today Rick and David are in London with
Mark Bringewatt. Rick and Mark plan to do a couple of
museums and then take in a play. David is on the search
of some model railway equipment. At the moment, even
Charles is out — down in the Market Square trying to
find a turtle. He has already arranged with Richard
Nagel for a transfer of ownership of the turtle when we
leave for the States.

The Value Of A College Course

During the beginning weeks of the current college
semester, a professor on the Valparaiso University cam­
pus asked students in two courses to write on the theme,
“What A College Course Ought To Do For Me.” These
are some of the ideas that were written back to the pro­

essor:

I expect a college course to motivate me. Perhaps,
this is the most important aspect of the course: Stimu­
lating enough that one will pursue the subject in depth...
One of the most basic tasks of a teacher, a professor,
as I see it, then, is to inspire the student to do research
on his own . . . I hope to learn something new in every
course and to be stimulated by the study. This
stimulus is a joint relationship between the student’s
interest and the professor’s interest. I hope to be able
to exchange ideas and at the conclusion of the semester
to evaluate the course in a positive manner. There is
much to challenge the student in his independent think­
ing. Every course should present a challenge. This chal­
lenge is especially vital today as the Western Way of Life,
characterized by the dignity of man, freedom, and poli­
tical democracy, is threatened by modern totalitarian
Communism . . . Generally speaking, college students
should realize that their formal higher education is the
key not just to occupation and climbing the status ladder,
but also to vocation in the sense of the personal calling
to lead a meaningful life in whatever capacity is desired.
It would seem that college activism is expressing this
very recognition in rejecting the material basis of society
for the more meaningful existentialist search. The fact
that students on this campus find a conflict between
“issues of concern,” the referents of which are well­
known, and hard-nosed study is exempliative of this drive
to understand man and his relations to his environment . . .
A course should lead the student to explore the ma­
trix of life which surrounds him, help him to develop new
insights into what he is studying and to evaluate his find­
ings, and finally to give him a broad perspective and
appreciation of the world which surrounds him . . . The
first ought for a college course is a very practical one.
Quite simply, the college course ought to offer me the
means to earn a living. It should allow a person to step
into the vast and complex modern society and fill a niche
that will benefit both the individual and society. Even
the seemingly simple process of making a living is re­
quiring a higher level of education. Not intending to
shock the purist, the college course and the college cur­
riculum ought to offer the student a chance for a secure
place in a materialistic society . . . As a specific form of
education, the college course must also provide for the
development and use of scholarly tools . . . By a sound
presentation of the material and by an increased use of
the library facilities, one would hope to develop other
mental skills including reading, writing, and reasoning
or organizing . . . In effecting a meaningful analysis of
certain problems, one would hope for absolute honesty.
Human relations in the midst of various confrontations
require this honorable understanding if mutual goals are
to exist . . . It seems to me that the most enjoyable, as
well as the most profitable, college courses are not neces­
sarily the easiest, but quite the contrary are many times
the hardest. The student, I believe, enjoys the challenge
of unknown matters, he enjoys the deep stimulation that
the better college instructors offer. Whereas the mental
faculties should not be exhausted, they should be taxed
. . . To discuss political science or the objectives of a par­
ticular course in the field one has to ask: “What does it
mean to be human?” This is clearly the case . . . Simply
put, something is happening in the classroom, and I ex­
pect the college course to provide an atmosphere which
takes the fact seriously. If the question of relevancy is
critical, i.e., if the intellectual enterprise is divorced from
experience (I maintain it is impossible in actuality) the
guts of the learning process is undermined . . . Estimation
of a student’s personal resources demands of the course
pains-taking criticism as to his expression, grasp of the
intellectual enterprise, and prowess in handling material
in group dynamics. The relationship between the stu­
dent, material, and others whether professor or “man on
the street” calls for a close personal scrutiny of what it
means to be human . . . The student is ultimately respon­
sible for maintaining an interest in the course and for
making the course meaningful to himself. The experi­
ences shared with classmates aid him in this effort . . .
In order to be valuable, one’s mental capacity must be
developed and directed into effective channels. I’ve been
presented with material through courses, books, and
people. That the content is important is not denied, but
that the content needs to be ordered and orientated in a
meaningful way is equally important. Herein emerges
the two-fold task of this course — to present the ideas
and contents . . . in such an atmosphere that the student
is disciplined to read thoroughly and comprehensively
and to do so within a context which clearly recognizes
and deals with the underlying concepts and presuppo­
sitions upon which a thinker’s ideas are built . . . It may
be inferred that I expect a course in the techniques of
study; this is true, in part: the foundations, the scientific
techniques of disciplined study, effective reading habits,
and methods of research, critical analysis, and construc­
tive synthesis are tools needed to handle the material
presented . . . The quest is not in search of absolutes: it
is a false quest which seems to recognize defined state­
ments of truth... validity is recognized in asking right questions that don’t avoid the central issue and in experimenting with first premises, alternate approaches and possible solutions.

A Personal Note — II

Paul T. Heyne, the General Books editor of The Cresset and a competent economist, has decided to leave us, to teach at the University of Illinois.

We thank him very much for the contributions he has made to The Cresset and to our individual and collective lives. We will miss him and we wish him all the best.

The next two editorial comments (“Pious Pronouncements” and “War and Morality”) are from his mind and pen.

Pious Pronouncements

News Item: “A UN committee today approved a declaration opposing direct or indirect intervention by one country into another’s affairs. The declaration was adopted 100 to 0, with 5 abstentions, by the General Assembly’s Main Political Committee.”

What heartening unanimity! Except for five abstainers, everyone has apparently agreed to condemn the following bits of intervention: Russia in Hungary, the United States in the Dominican Republic, Indonesia in Malaya, Tanzania in Rhodesia, the United Arab Republic in Yemen, and everyone except Portugal in South Africa.

Or isn’t that what the declaration means?

Obviously it doesn’t mean that at all. Only unwarranted intervention is to be condemned. But when is intervention warranted?

The trouble with such meaningless declarations is that they divert attention from the important and difficult tasks of international diplomacy. By holding up an empty promise of peace through manifestoes, they subtly condemn the techniques of compromise and pressure by means of which a tolerable amount of peace, justice, and order can actually be achieved.

Nations intervene in the affairs of other nations because they believe their interests require it. This brings nations into conflict. These conflicts will not be removed or resolved by pious proclamations, whether they emanate from the East River, Washington, the Vatican, the Kremlin, or the National Council of Churches. Reconciling the interests of nations is an exercise in diplomacy, requiring attention to details, to subtle differences, to power constellations, to the always shifting line between the negotiable and the non-negotiable.

War and Morality

War is certainly a moral problem. But it is too important a problem to be left to the moralists.

A large number of thoughtful Americans have examined current American policy in Viet Nam and have pronounced it morally indefensible. Perhaps it is. But the case can never be made in the way most of them are attempting to make it. An international policy just cannot be deduced from sweeping ethical generalizations. The most universal principle in Christian ethics is love. But subscription to that principle says almost nothing about what ought to be done in Viet Nam.

If an ethical man is also a responsible man (and how could he not be?), he will consider the consequences of the actions he recommends. It may well be that that American government has not adequately or accurately assessed the probable consequences of its present course in Viet Nam. But if that course is to be corrected, an alternative is required. And the probable consequences of any such alternative must be weighed just as carefully as the critics are now weighing the consequences of our present policy. And realistically weighed!

Anyone who assumes that the Viet Cong, Hanoi, and Peking are eager to negotiate, or that American withdrawal would automatically bring about peace with justice, is engaged in wishful thinking. Wishful thinking, moral manifestoes, and sterile declarations are too often found together.

A Personal Note — III

The May and June issues of The Cresset will probably be combined into one issue. Whatever irritation and surprise readers may feel about this combination will be compensated for, the editors do indeed hope, by its contents.

In this May-June issue we are incorporating a series of lectures, presented on the Valparaiso University campus under the general theme “Toward the Year 2000.” To whet your reading appetites and, no doubt, your inclinations to think and reflect we simply mention that the speakers included such people as theologian Jaroslav Pelikan, political scientist George Catlin, and college administrator George Shuster.

We hope that, in the main, this strategy meets with the approval of our readers.
To the Churches . . .

By ANNE SPRINGSTEEN
Acting University Editor
Valparaiso University

"With deep roots and firm foundations, may you be strong to grasp, with all God's people, what is the breadth and length and height and depth of the love of Christ, and to know it, though it is beyond knowledge. So may you attain to fullness of being, the fullness which God requires."

Ephesians 3:18,19

We are grateful, Lord
For all Your goodness toward us.
For preserving Your Word
Of pardon and comfort;
For preserving Your people
In this place;
For moving us forward
To build and grow;
For keeping us faithful
To do Your will.
We are grateful, Lord,
For these blessings.

Blessings?
Children, listen to Me:

Have you been with Me so long
And still do not know Me?
My patience and mercy are everlasting
But now my judgment comes
In the whirlwind!

Do you think yourselves to be
In the eye of the storm,
Secure and at peace?
Turn around, children —
You are still standing at the edge
With your backs to My mighty winds.

My Word
Is in the wind,
In the dark and angry places.
And you must go in now
To the height of the storm
And hear My command
Roar in your ears!

My people — My remnant
Is in the wind,
In the cold and dirty streets
Warming strangers
With the arms of My mercy.
And you must be torn
From this place and go in
To the depth of the storm
To become a remnant —
To become My people.

Your buildings will not stand
Against My whirlwind.
They are rubble and ash-heaps.
My Cross is built on a hill
In the wildest wind.
And you must gather the wood
For your cross
In the breadth of the storm
To give shelter
To others.

My Will and My Spirit
Are in the wind.
Do not think to capture them.
They have no measure or count.
And you must look now
At the length of the storm
And know My will is not contrived
To fit a pretty pattern.

Do not be grateful
While your backs are turned
And you stand at the
Safe and quiet edges.

In the eye of the storm
Is tranquillity.
In the center
Is pardon.

Come away from the edges.
Dare
To feel the fury of the wind,
To be sucked into its blackness.

Dare
To enter the peace-full eye.
Litany

Lord, we pray:
For our students:
  Grant our students the insight to know that they will learn at Thy pleasure and the wisdom to recognize that education must be a cooperative venture between student and teacher.
  Help them to recognize all those barriers which make it possible for the faculty to help them, and to accept those barriers without a murmur.
  Give them the maturity to conform to Thy set of standards.

For us as faculty:
  Lord, do not protect us from students with a thirst for knowledge and from students who ask questions.
  Lord, do not protect us from students who think differently, but rather give us wisdom to direct and help them.
  Lord, do not protect us from change, but grant us the maturity to change our minds when the situation warrants it.

For our administration:
  Illumine the minds of our administrators so they may have more insight into the problems of the college than the faculty does.
  May they recognize that any trouble we may cause is for the good of the college, because we are striving to do what is best for the student.
  May our administration recognize the sterling qualities of our institution, but let them not be content to leave things as they are. Rather let them, with us, strive toward greater Christian education.

  May they be ever aware of their tremendous responsibilities knowing we are cognizant that no one rules guiltlessly. Do not let them regard us as a necessary evil, but rather their truest friends, one and all united in a great cause.

For these and all other things we know are right in Thy sight, we ask in Thy name.

Warren Schmidt, Ph.D.
Wartburg College
A Guest From England

By ALFRED R. LOOMAN

(This month’s Ad Lib is written by the Cresset managing editor-on-leave, John H. Strietelmeier, who is spending the year at Cambridge University.)

When my editor first suggested that what I needed was a year in the quiet environment of Cambridge (England) I thought “How nice! Perhaps a good whiff of the Middle Ages would be just the thing to restore my normally placid disposition.” And when I learned that we would be living, not in Cambridge itself but in the village of Girton, I thought, “How even nicer! Afternoons I shall stroll from our thatch-roofed cottage to the village pub and raise a friendly tankard with the villagers,” whom I pictured as yeoman types puffing at their pipes and exchanging laconic opinions on the prospects for the beet-root crop. The last detail of this idyllic picture was filled in when a colleague of mine gave me a copy of the Cambridge-Ely sheet of the Ordnance Survey which showed Girton connected with Cambridge by — a Roman road!

This whole romantic picture fell apart, piece by crashing piece, on the cab ride from Cambridge station to 74 Thornton Road, Girton. Even at first glance, it was obvious that Cambridge is about as medieval as Evanston, Illinois, and even more beautiful. There are, it is true, three or four narrow streets in the city center, but the greater part of the city is only about seventy-five years old and as “modern” as anyone could wish who is not addicted to masses of plate glass and concrete. If I could make only one suggestion to President Johnson for his “Beautiful America” program, it would be that all students majoring in city planning be given grants to spend one year in Cambridge.

Now about that Roman road. It is there, all right, only today its name is Huntingdon Road and it is four lanes wide and it is bordered all the way out to Girton by big, substantial homes. Two new colleges of the University are a-building near its townward end and a luxury apartment house is scheduled for construction next year. All day and most of the night, where once the measured tread of Roman legionnaires presumably was heard, there is the buzz of automobiles, the rumble of lorries, and the grating of the Number 106 Bus. At the moment, we Girtonians are fighting an attempt to convert the last small patch of open land along the road into a gigantic shopping center cum bowling alley.

About two blocks beyond the Cambridge city boundary one turns off Huntingdon Road into Thornton Road. This, remember, is in the village of Girton where I had expected to find thatch-roofed cottages with roses climbing up the ancient walls. What I found was a subdivision of almost identical two-story brick houses, mid-1930s vintage, built close together along a road that seemed to extend endlessly toward the sunset. Each house fronted on a meticulously manicured front yard and behind each was a narrow but very long, back yard. The local yeomanry, I learned later, consisted of such rustic types as a lecturer in Roman law, a pharmacist, any number of businessmen, a considerable number of commuters to London, and some of the higher officials of the East Anglican Constabulary.

As for pubs, the nearest one was more than half a mile away, on Huntingdon Road, and it looked about as Olde English as one of the older Greyhound rest stops. I would suppose that its clientele — I have never actually been in it — consists mostly of lorry drivers and motorists who want a quick snack before they get into the main part of the city. A mile and a half in the opposite direction there are a couple of pubs, but the simple yeomen out that way are almost all commuters to Cambridge, whose conversation tends to get stuck on the unconscionable traffic jams in Castle Street during the morning rush hour.

Where, then, does the weary scholar slake his thirst and engage the natives in their quaint amusements? It is my impression that there must be one pub for approximately every hundred inhabitants of Cambridge. With one exception — “The Pickeler,” across the road from Magdalen College — these pubs all seem to have been built by the same solid, honest, but unimaginative contractor who contributed Thornton Road to the landscape of this green and pleasant land. They are owned by great brewery companies whose managing directors dream of the day when they will have acquired the last pub in the land and will thus have achieved a monopoly in the beer industry. And so what your present correspondent does is stop by the John Kelsey, Ltd., branch on his way home of an evening, bring his bottle of Guinness home with him, and drink it in the company of his wife and children, four quaint Americans who have really astonishing views on such things as the inconsequentiality of the Latin ablative absolute and the virtues of central heating.
The New Look In Church-State Relations

A. G. HUEGLI
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Valparaiso University

For many years some of us have felt that one helpful way to understand the American pattern of church-state relations is to see it as an equilibrium achieved in tension. Church and state are separated. Each carries out its own tasks with the good will of the other. But each carefully guards its interests against invasion by the other.

From a practical point of view, it does not quite turn out that way. Prayers in legislative chambers and salaried chaplains in the armed forces are examples of the inter-weaving of the two kinds of activities. From the theological aspect, there has always been a broad spectrum of attitudes toward the relations of church and state. Some denominations never could see a problem in working closely with government, especially if they enjoyed a favored status. Others determinedly have resisted any kind of association which might be considered an intermingling of the realms of Caesar and God. But in general most people have felt the maintenance of an effective tension between church and state assures religious liberty and is the best guarantee of an atmosphere conducive to church work.

I believe that the New Testament insights on this whole relationship are probably best understood in terms of tension. The early Christians unquestionably saw the state in their time as a continuing threat of potentially demonic proportions. Subsequent periods of church history produced quite different attitudes. The church in medieval times became not only the partner of the state, but the dominant partner at that. Our constitutional framework provided for a balanced system, with tension between the two institutions expected to maintain the equilibrium.

That was the arrangement, at least, until a relatively short time ago. What I now want to emphasize is the “new look” which has developed in the American pattern. Essentially it involves a decline in the American system of tension between church and state, and an assertion of cooperative activity quite unlike anything that has preceded it.

In the concluding chapter to the book, Church and State Under God (1964), I reported that “We are now beginning to discern some new dimensions in church-state relations.” Those new dimensions arrived much sooner than any of us had anticipated. They were brought about in the fast-changing environment where church and state meet in our day. And they represent significantly altered attitudes toward the relations of church and state as expressed by representatives of the government and spokesmen for the churches.

I. The Environment Has Changed

The changes in the climate of church-state relations have been highlighted by the revolutionary legislation pushed through Congress by the Johnson Administration during the past two years. Despite its involvement of sensitive church-state issues, this legislation has encountered relatively little opposition. We are beginning to see government agencies and church organizations making adjustments to each other which only a few years ago would have been unthinkable. I need call your attention only to the quiet but extensive participation of church groups in Project Head Start in the summer of 1965 to illustrate the point.

Signs of change, like clouds no bigger than a man’s hand, were visible on the horizon as much as a decade ago. The use of government funds for church welfare agencies became well established in the 1950’s. In fact the Hill-Burton Act, which provides government grants for hospital construction, including hospitals run by religious organizations, dates back to 1945. Such cooperative relationships of church and state were always under suspicion, however, particularly because the Roman Catholic Church so often seemed to be the chief beneficiary.

Church-state relations turned a sharp corner and headed in a new direction with the election of President Kennedy in 1960. As a result of the hard-fought campaign for the Presidency, and the wide-spread discussion of church-state issues, the air was cleared in one respect at least. It was evident that a Roman Catholic could be elected to the Presidency without the Pope taking over the White House. As a Roman Catholic, President Kennedy so skillfully steered a neutral course in church-state matters that much of the suspicion which Protestants had harbored about Catholic subscription to American principles was eliminated.

Amicable Relations
Among the Churches

The shifting of political winds in the last few years has been occurring simultaneously with a growing friendliness among the churches. For many years, of course, organizations like the National Conference of Christians and Jews have been working hard to get widely separated religious groups to know one another better. But in the late 1950’s and early 1960’s the movement toward merger among Protestants and ecumenical talks between Roman Catholics and Protestants got under way in earnest.
It gathered speed under a two-fold impetus. First, there was a growing recognition that in the midst of a world population explosion, Christians were becoming a progressively smaller minority. They need to overcome their differences in order to make any substantial impact on the swelling numbers of the heathen. Second, the summoning of the Vatican Council by Pope John XXIII signaled a readiness to break down barriers separating Catholics and Protestants in the staggering tasks confronting Christ's Church.

Cynics are prone to say that the developing cordiality among the churches is due to a reluctance of American Christians to rock the boat of shared prosperity by engaging in religious disputations. A benignant mood is more fitting when people sense that much of heaven can be brought to earth if we all work together for it. Still, the erasing of ancient religious prejudices and fears among the churches seems to have a substantial element of conviction in it. In any case, one feeling of mistrust that characterized the American church-state pattern in the past has been relieved. That is the lingering suspicion that one or another of the denominations might have a special advantage over the rest in the halls of government.

Helping the cause of denominational good will along were some interesting decisions of the United States Supreme Court. In 1962, and especially in 1963, the Court ruled out prayer and Bible reading in public schools. Protestants had generally favored these traditional rites for school children. They found, however, that the change in atmosphere indicated by the election of a Catholic President had fully come upon them in the Court opinions. If government was to be really neutral, then Protestantism could no longer enjoy its accustomed preference in American society. The service of government would be available to all alike, whatever the denominational membership. Neutrality of government could thus be benevolent to religion without playing favorites. And thus amicable relations among the churches were reinforced by political events.

**New Accent on the Public Welfare**

Immensely significant for the change in environment of our church-state practices is the new emphasis on the public welfare. This is “new” only in an extended sense, of course, because it actually follows the outline sketched by the New Freedom of Wilson, the New Deal of F.D. Roosevelt, and the New Frontier of Kennedy. All of them busied themselves with the employment of government as a mechanism for improving the social well-being of Americans. No administration in our history, however, enacted into law such far-reaching social reforms as has been sponsored by President Johnson.

The so-called Great Society is bent upon the fulfillment of the American dream for all categories and classes of people. With the aid of the vast resources available in the taxing power of the federal government, every man, woman, and child is to share in the good things of life. Artificial barriers placed in the way of minority groups are to be removed. Inadequate incomes are to be supplemented, education supplied, housing improved, and medical care provided. Those who lag in the procession headed for the promised land of the Great Society are to receive a lift and a new opportunity. These objectives are commendable in themselves, as humanitarians and churchmen alike would agree. Through legislation, however, the power of the state has moved into a vast uncharted domain of care for the individual citizen. The church, which long regarded welfare as a major avenue of expression for its love of Christ, now finds the government very busy at Good Samaritan tasks. And the government has virtually unlimited resources to do the job more completely. The Lord's Church must, of course, continue its welfare services. It would not be true to its mission if it omitted its concern for the orphaned, the aged, the ill, and the needy. But competition in good works is unseemly. The practical interests of the Church and the state in this instance have converged. The receptivity of church members to the idea that religious organizations and government agencies work cooperatively at social ills has been considerably enhanced.

As government moves further into every aspect of social life, it cannot help but become the dominating institution in contemporary life. In medieval times the church was the all-encompassing organization, which left nothing in life outside its purview. Today the state has taken its place. The complexities of our existence have probably made the expanding role of government inevitable. From national Capitol to local city hall, each governmental level has broadened its function by law, by executive order, and by judicial decision. The federal activity has expanded the most. But all of government has had to increase taxes, drying up sources of support upon which private undertakings once depended. Enlarged government programs have sharply reduced areas of individual option and action by non-government groups.

These political developments have had their effect. Former champions of rugged individualism and freedom of enterprise are now resigned to sharing their lives with the omniscient state. Even as many Americans have made this accommodation in business, professional, and social life, — note how the American Medical Association has reluctantly but surely gone along with medicare for the aged — so they are about ready to adjust their thinking with regard to church partnership in state projects.

**Social Involvement of the Church**

One of the most interesting evidences that the environment of church-state relations has changed is the increasing involvement of the Church in the issues of the day. We must not, of course, overlook the past activity of the several churches in their social setting. Who could forget, for example, the large part played by the churches...
in the Abolition movement of the middle 19th century, or the Prohibition movement of more recent memory? The "Social Gospel" of the early 20th century did bring the social activity of Protestantism into disrepute, however. Much of Protestantism and virtually all of Lutheranism therefore assumed an attitude of social quietism until the last few years.

The struggle for civil rights of Negroes during the 1960's plunged the churches once more into the major issues of the day. Having shared in demonstrations and freedom marches for their colored brethren, large numbers of Protestant clergy engaged discovered their responsibility for helping society arrive at solutions to its other problems. Even the more conservative denominations, like the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, have issued pronouncements on current views and set up commissions for social action. Pastors of virtually every denomination participate in new kinds of ministries adapted to the cities. Congregations sign petitions for urban renewal. Clergyman and laymen alike work for disarmament and fair housing, or serve on school boards and run for office in local politics. The war on poverty has enlisted church groups as it has also involved other private organizations.

This sort of involvement has required some redefinition of the role to be played in society by churches and churchmen. It is not yet clear what the nature and extent of that role is to be. Not every member of a congregation is happy to see his pastor carrying a sign in a demonstration. Among clerical leaders there are also misgivings about the confusion of identity which can easily take place when the church becomes socially active.

Nevertheless there is a fresh look at the prophetic function of the churches and the clergy. There is an awareness that unless the spokesmen for Christ are willing to roll up their sleeves and get at the dirty practical aspects of living, their preaching will become irrelevant to the people of their times. The application of the Christian ethic has taken on a wholly new dimension in our day. Bishop James Pike of the Episcopal Church has much support for his contention that the church should be "a launching pad" rather than a comfortable place of rest.

As long as the churches isolated themselves from their social setting, the lines of demarcation between church and state could be drawn with reasonable approximation. But ecclesiastical involvement has blurred the boundaries, especially in areas of social concern, where church and state seek to bring about improvement in the human lot. The environment for church-state relations has been altered. Separation is thus becoming less of a problem than it once was. Instead, the establishment of workable and acceptable methods of cooperation appears to be the principal concern on all sides.

II. The Attitudes of Church and State Are Different

Changes in atmosphere would not be enough, of course, to produce changes in church-state relations. The pattern of these relations has been given us in American constitutions and laws, in the interpretations of courts, and even in the statements of church bodies. Without attempting to make an exhaustive survey of these sources, one can nevertheless already discern that adjustments in the pattern are going on.

The American Pattern Updated

We have not abandoned the ideas which underlie our system of church-state relations. The essentials are still there. Those essentials include, first of all, religious liberty. From the Virginia Bill of Religious Freedom in 1786 and the Bill of Rights of the Constitution down to our day, the course of American history has been one of extending and expanding freedom of religion. We progressed from disestablishment to toleration, to the idea that we are a Protestant people, and then to court declarations that this is a Christian nation. Recent judicial decisions have carried us even further toward complete religious liberty for all creeds.

Ours is a system of voluntarism. That is, any group can get together and worship God as it pleases, supporting itself without government subsidy. The result has been a diversified pluralism consisting of more than 250 religious bodies. In pluralism, the churches expect that all denominations will be treated alike by government, and that government will interfere with none of them.

To support these essentials, we have long practiced the separation of church and state. It should be noted that the First Amendment does not use the "separation" expression. That became current as a statement of the intention of the First Amendment. "Separation of church and state" is one means by which religious liberty is assured.

The interpretation of "separation" has caused no end of discussion. Some have thought it set up an airtight barrier between church and state in this country. Jefferson referred to separation as a "wall", and the Supreme Court in the 1947 case of Everson v. Board of Education said, "That wall must be kept high and impregnable," adding, "we could not approve the slightest breach." It could, of course, and did in that very case, by authorizing public bus transportation for parochial school pupils. In the 1947 case of McCollum v. Board of Education, the Court rethought the matter, this time holding released time arrangements for religious instruction on public school grounds unconstitutional, a decision partially reversed in the 1952 case of Zorach v. Clauson, which allowed released time religious programs not held on school property.

In the Zorach case the Court stated the First Amendment "does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of church and state." It then added some sentences which have a bearing on our present situation:

We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being . . . . When the state encour-
ages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions . . . To hold that it may not be would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe.

The clearest contemporary interpretation by the Court of the controversial separation doctrine is to be found in the School District of Abington Township v. Schempp and Murray v. Curlett cases decided together in 1963. Here the Court once again asserted: “In the relationship between man and religion, the State is firmly committed to a position of neutrality.” It went to great lengths, however, to recognize the values of religion and religious teachings, and the importance of providing instruction in public schools about religion. In Justice Goldberg’s words, “both the required and the permissible accommodations between state and church frame the relation as one free of hostility or favor and productive of religious and political harmony, but without undue involvement of one in the concerns or practices of the other.” As if to show its newly defined “benevolent neutrality,” the Court has struck down legislation requiring public office holders to take a religious oath, and upheld a state law closing business on Sunday.

Governmental Good Will

While the judicial branch of our federal government has been interpreting church-state relations in a new and more flexible manner, the legislative branch has proceeded to provide numerous opportunities for churches to accommodate themselves to government benevolence. In President Johnson’s program, the intent is clear that something must be done for those people who suffer many kinds of disadvantages.

Much but not all of the Johnson legislation bringing about a “new look” in church-state relations has to do with education. There was a precedent already established. In 1944 the “G.I. Bill of Rights” provided funds with which veterans could pay their bills at college, whether the college was public or private. In 1958 the National Defense Education Act included private elementary and secondary schools in eligibility for loans to acquire laboratory and other special equipment for the improvement of teaching in science, mathematics, and modern languages. It also authorized loans and scholarships in certain fields for students attending non-public colleges. Through the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, non-public colleges along with other colleges became eligible for grants and loans to construct educational buildings — a program extensively broadened in the Higher Education Act of 1965, which made federal scholarships available as well.

When President Johnson took over the direction of the administration in late 1963, the long-debated issue of federal aid to elementary and secondary education took on new life. What finally emerged was legislation skillfully drawn to satisfy objections raised on constitutional grounds and yet to provide substantial federal funds for state and local educational systems. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in essence gives financial aid through public channels on an individual pupil basis. This aid is available to all pupils — those in church-related schools as well as those in public schools — provided the policy is observed that federal assistance must be for public programs, flow through public media, and be administered by public agencies. The grants are available for the development of dual enrollment (shared time) projects, for the purchase of textbooks and school library books, for the establishment of educational centers and services, for the development of regional educational laboratories, and for the general improvement of the quality of elementary and secondary teaching. It should be repeated that these measures of aid are open to private school pupils, including those in church-related schools, as they are open to public school pupils. Some are for educationally deprived children. Others are for all children.

To avoid charges that violations of church-state principles might be involved in these measures, the act was thus tailored to the “child benefit” theory. Aid is not given to religious agencies or schools. Like school lunches and public bus transportation, the services supported by the federal government in this act are of aid to the child. For this reason, perhaps, in contrast to the previous heated debates on proposed federal aid bills, the act found favor on all sides, from the Attorney General’s office, from Roman Catholic and Protestant leaders, and even from members of both political parties in Congress.

The full implications of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will take a long time to evaluate. It is still too soon to determine the nature and extent of participation of church schools in the various aspects of the program open to their pupils. Meanwhile another Johnson project, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, has already had a year of practical application. Basically it provides for a Job Corps and work-study programs, for community action programs against poverty, and for remedial programs of various kinds. Church agencies, including parochial schools, have been eligible to participate in many of these programs, and indeed have widely shared in them. The experience has thus far apparently been satisfactory. The lessons learned in the Economic Opportunity Act will be available for the application of church-state cooperation in the new Education Act.

Rethinking By the Churches

The government has demonstrated its willingness to become a partner of the churches in good works. What of the churches? Have they taken appropriate stands of their own?
We cannot speak for all the churches, of course. The Roman Catholic Church has already shown its customary readiness to adapt itself to the use of whatever government resources are made available. Some Protestant groups, on the other hand, have persisted in an adamant position of resisting every kind of cooperative activity with the state. In between these extremes, however, there have been some profound adjustments. Baptist church groups, long champions of absolute separation of church and state, seem to find few complaints about their relations is one of friendliness in working toward the welfare of men.

Our branch of Lutheranism went through a long period of withdrawal from public affairs. It has begun to recover only in the past several decades. Nevertheless its attitude in the area of the chaplaincy, social welfare, and especially education has long remained true to its heritage. The Board of Parish Education developed a position on church-state relations in education which was adopted by the Synod in 1944 and proved to be remarkably forward-looking for its day. In that position the Synod indicated its readiness to accept government aid for the social services available, such as school health programs, hot lunches, and bus transportation. It opposed government aid for the teaching programs of its parish schools. The “child benefit” principle was thus stated by the church body as a viable pattern for church schools and for government, to advance the welfare of the individual pupil. This policy was to be reaffirmed by the Synod in subsequent conventions from 1947 through 1962.

As the direction of the Johnson educational legislation toward a broadened child-benefit program became evident, the Board of Parish Education again reviewed its stand. It then recommended a revision of policy to the Synodical convention meeting in Detroit last June. At first the convention was uncertain and tabled the resolution by a vote of 411 to 200. Then two days later it adopted the resolution by 291 to 252. Incidentally, a proposal by the floor committee on higher education that in certain circumstances Synodical colleges might be authorized to accept federal funds for buildings was tabled indefinitely by a vote of 200 to 183. Apparently it was felt that there was a substantive difference between aid to parish schools for supplementary services and aid to colleges engaged in the training of church workers.

The new Synodical policy with regard to elementary and secondary schools of the church cautiously provides that “federal aid for children attending nonpublic schools, as authorized by Congress and defined by the courts, be deemed acceptable so long as it does not interfere with the distinctive purposes for which such schools are maintained.” This revision goes beyond the old policy. It faces realistically the problems of financing church-related schools in a period when there is a gigantic nation-wide effort to upgrade public schools with federal funds to achieve a quality education for all. In a sense it also reflects a fresh insight into the relations of the churches with a state which is highly sensitive to social welfare needs.

While our revised policy is headed in the same general direction, it charts a more difficult course than the one which had guided us before. The lines of demarcation between the two Kingdoms are bound to be more difficult to maintain. Nevertheless our Synod does not feel that its members ought to unnecessarily cut themselves off from those governmental programs which are available for church school pupils and public school pupils alike.

Probably the most significant part of the new policy is the encouragement of Synodical and district officials in the exploration with government officials of “the availability, utilization, and administration of federal funds on an equitable basis for children attending nonpublic schools.” The implication here is an attitude of readiness for cooperative interaction with the government in the pursuit of common goals. This is where we see most clearly the “new look” in church-state relations. We would very likely find that it is typical of the attitude of other church bodies in the setting of our times. Since government has moved into fields formerly reserved to private agencies, such as education and social welfare, the churches are beginning to feel that a kind of working partnership can be effected with the state in seeking worthy goals.

**Conclusion: Problems and Prospects**

The history of the American experiment in church-state relations for more than a century and a half moved steadily away from official acknowledgement of joint ventures of religious bodies and the government. There always were, of course, unofficial cooperative relationships. As court case succeeded court case in an attempt to define more clearly the nature of the American pattern and the actual meaning of the separation of church and state, the swift-changing tempo of the times overtook...
both church and state. Neutrality of government in religious matters was most eloquently stated in 1963, about the time when a new understanding was being reached that church and state could be partners in common tasks. Perhaps these clear pronouncements on neutrality have enabled partnership to take place. Church groups are engaged as agents of government programs under specific conditions. We do not have establishment in this new arrangement, but neither do we have separation in the absolute sense. The flexibility of our pattern has enabled us to enjoy religious liberty and church opportunity in the past. We require that kind of flexibility for the problems of our troubled age.

The state has much to gain and little to lose in this "new look" for church-state relations. For the state the church agencies are just so many more means to achieve the state's objectives. But citizens who hold the state responsible — even if they find it increasingly difficult to control it — might well be concerned that the political Leviathan does not reach too far over into areas of the spirit that do not concern it. And above all churchmen need to be on the alert in this era of new attitudes. State direction can very easily follow state subsidy. Church dependence on the state can quickly minimize or muffle the prophetic function of the churches. To be an "agency" of the state is far different for the Church of Christ than to be God's Right Hand at work with the state as God's Left Hand for the good of man. It would not do for the church, which has principles to guide it, to adopt the view of the Chicago minister as reported in Time magazine. When he announced a neighborhood welfare program to be operated by his congregation with government money, he thought he should speak to those who might wonder how this project would square with the theory of the separation of church and state. "Well," he said, "We're simply going to have to find a way to square it — or change the theory."

There are good constitutional reasons to keep the church and the state separated from each other. There are even better theological reasons to avoid the domination of the church by the state. The state long ago learned that an independent church is of immeasurable value to it. The lesson may need to be driven home frequently. The church long ago learned to carry on its mission in strange and diverse ways without losing its identity or its vision. For such understanding its leaders and spokesmen will have to evaluate every step that they take, lest the primary purpose of the church be lost in the murkiness of compromise with an ever-expanding state.

We have an opportunity for exercising both creativity and concern in the new look in church-state relations. I think we have the wisdom and the humility necessary to take advantage of it.

**On Second Thought**

"Now if I do what I do not want," Paul wrote, "it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells in me." He seems to be saying that he is not really to blame, he did not intend the evil which he has done. There is something else responsible — a force called sin inside.

How much nobler is the confession of the church, saying "mea culpa." Through mine own fault, through mine own most grievous fault. I acknowledge the blame. I should have done better. I should have tried harder. I should have foreseen the outcome, I should have willed the good more strongly and resisted the evil more sternly. I and I alone am to blame. And I purpose, by the assistance of God the Holy Ghost, henceforth to amend my sinful life.

No. Across the heated pride of this our confession there falls the icy word of Paul's judgment. If you had tried harder, if you had foreseen the outcome, if you had done better, you would have failed as miserably. There is no strength or hope in your purpose to amend your sinful life. Paul's confession is exactly the consciousness that when you purpose to amend — even "assisted" by God — there is a force in you which will make it evil. "It is no longer I that do it" means: "It is no longer up to me. I can't count on anything in my effort. Not by trying harder, not by willing the good and resisting the evil, but only by the grace of God I stand."

The man who says "mea culpa" concerning his sins may well be denying all repentance. He is confessing a failing but not the nature of failure. In seeking the whole responsibility for his sin he is limiting the grace of God to his failings — and reserving to himself the responsibility of success. By the assistance of God, of course.

There is a force within me that makes failure out of everything I do. The good that I plan so carefully turns to evil in my hands — and will do so when I am doubly careful. The noblest purpose of my heart turns to dross — and will do so when I am trebly noble. I have to count it all as garbage, as filthy rags. And it is not through mine own fault as though I should have succeeded. It is the common lot of man, it is the total helplessness of us all, it is the shared and inescapable burden of sin.

Then the grace of God is pure. He loves us failures. Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord. It is not because of our sincere and earnest purpose, nor in spite of our occasional failings, but only because God is what he is that he loves us. The prayer of the justified man is not: "God, it was all my fault. I should have known better and I will try harder." It is quite simply: "God be merciful to me a failure."
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From Transgression To Transformation

"The chief question... by which... I have been tormented all my life," the great Russian novelist Dostoevski wrote in 1870, "is that of the existence of God." And whether one reads his letters, his notebooks, or his fiction, that same issue is always present: sinners in search of a God.

Among the best known expressions of this quest is that portrayed in Crime and Punishment where the self-willed Raskolnikov moves slowly and fitfully from the stance of the rationalizing murderer toward that of the penitent believer.

Available in the novel to the student of homiletics are all the points needed for a well-made sermon. Beginning with the act of a proud and sinful nature, the outline follows with recognition, remorse, repentance, redemption, and regeneration. But it takes more than seven hundred pages of writhing trial to reach the final goal, and even then there is some uncertainty. For Crime and Punishment is more than a moral — or even a Christian — treatise. Rather, in existential terms, it portrays the search of an outsider for meaning.

If one were to reduce Dostoevski's familiar story to its barest outline it would be very simple indeed. A young student, searching after the ultimate issues of will and God, murders to test his superman theory.

But if the case of the man-on-the-street, the common man who knows nothing of all this procedure, is posed, what is to be said in the light of Ignatian philosophy or ascetical theology? Rahner maintains the difference between Ignatius' logic of concrete particulars and that of daily life lies not in the formal structure of each, "but in their application to a particular range of objects" (p. 166). Ignatius worked out an elaborate technique of what the faithful do, by and large, every day but with a greater risk of gross failures.

On this note, Father Rahner explains that his intention in this essay has been to permit the Exercises to put questions to theology. He would have many of its pages transformed into the necessary pages in treatises of moral theology. This is a needed practical ascetical theology that will assimilate and reflect upon:

...a logic of concrete individual knowledge which can only be attained in the actual accomplishment of concrete cognition itself, in this instance knowledge of the particular will of God addressed to the individual as such (p. 169).

Father Rahner has made a significant attempt furthering the formulation of a formal existential ethics with emphasis on the uniqueness of the individual. I would not agree with his critics who claim that he is perverting true Thomistic theology and philosophy. I think Father Rahner is too well aware of what Thomas Aquinas thought and perhaps would think were he alive today. The exploratory and suggestive nature of Father Rahner's writing is not very apparent in this study of his three essays. The essays themselves clearly reveal this in his technique of continuous questions that are partially answered and then concluded by a statement to the effect that time and space do not permit further analysis.

Father Rahner gives no definitive and exhaustive answers in these essays but seems to consider it his task as a theologian to ask the right questions rather than to propose definitive answers. He can hardly be accused of not dealing with matters relevant to our age. For this alone any one who takes theological matters seriously should be more than familiar with Father Rahner and indebted to him. Further clarifications are needed and awaited and, one may hope, from him who has made such a cogent plea: "The only defense of the inheritance of the past is the conquest of the future. But for that we need, as well as much else that is far more important, practical prescriptions, not only abstract principles" (DEC, p. 41).

The well-planned crime leaves his identity undetected, and he has only to wait out his own conscience to see if his ideas were right. But compassion wells up strongly in his spirit and he becomes uneasy and uncertain. Only through the intervention of a prostitute's almost saintly love does he learn to yield to something beyond himself. Ultimately his life undergoes a spiritual change and, as the book concludes, the reader is led to expect that a formerly atheistic pride is about to be replaced by a sincere and pious humility.

But let us go back to Raskolnikov's initial dilemma. Disillusioned by the chaos of the world around him, he had found himself casting aside as unsatisfactory any belief in God. For how, he deliberated, could a loving God allow such suffering as he saw all around him. He posed the age-old problem.

Raskolnikov's Dilemma

Yet if there is no God, man himself must then be his own deity, responsible only to his own will and understanding. "If there is no God then I myself am God." How, though, can he know whether he is such a "strong" personality unless he tests himself? This was the dilemma that faced young Raskolnikov and which led him ultimately to the hatchet slaying of a usurious old money-
lender. He provided himself with other reasons for his act — that he needed the money for his family, that society would be better off without such a woman — but these were only disguises for the true motive which underlay what he did.

"I committed murder for myself," he confessed proudly later on, "for myself alone." He had to know if he was a Napoleonic figure or "merely a louse just like everybody else." If he was, and if he felt no guilt for what was clearly a crime by any conventional standard, then he would also have been able to dismiss forever the idea of a God. For he would have proved to himself that there was none.

Readers of Dostoevski know, however, that Raskolnikov's demonic way failed him. His gesture of defiance in the face of the world solved no problems, for within himself he found that he could not thwart a higher moral law. He had killed, but in doing so he had neither made the world any better nor himself any better able to face its cruelties. To borrow a phrase from T.S. Eliot, he was still one of "the hollow men."

Path Toward Recovery

Raskolnikov's path toward recovery was to be a fitful one. For at first he was not sorry at all that he had murdered. Instead he was despairing because murder had brought him no release. But gradually the sufferings of Sonia began to lead him toward the One who said, "I am the way... Come unto me." With her spiritual and physical anguish came the important theme of salvation through atonement. As the agent of reformation she showed how love and suffering can lead to understanding and to the expiation of sin's guilt. In fact, Dostoevski is using her to show how God can visibly become Love.

As Raskolnikov's torment reached a point where he could tolerate it no longer, he came — admittedly more in defiance than in humility — to ask Sonia to read to him from the New Testament. He chose the Lazarus story for it provided the best exemplum for his own problem: he was dead and needed to be resurrected. And, importantly, he knew by then that he could not save himself. He had tried before to achieve the "salvation" of being a superman, but in that quest he had clearly failed. Yet even hearing the story from the lips of Sonia herself, he was still dissatisfied. For though he recognized Christianity as a possible way out, it would have meant admitting failure as an outsider. This he was not quite ready to do.

Only months later, after he had confessed and been sentenced to prison, did Christian salvation begin to appear possible for Raskolnikov. Symbolically, it was after Easter then and the great sacrifice of Love had been made. At the very end of the book one reads how he went to bed with the New Testament under his pillow and, one is led to believe, its message in his heart. Humility, finally, has proven to be greater than pride.

Dostoevski has sometimes been accused of making such abysmal sin a prerequisite to salvation. And nearly all readers will agree that hopelessness is one of his central themes, citing in support Raskolnikov's own declaration, "I have nowhere to turn." But the charge loses much of its force when one remembers that Crime and Punishment is not life; it is life made dramatic for the demands of fiction. Deep sin does breed deep remorse which, in turn, leads the way to notable regeneration. And when one is reduced to the position where he has been abandoned by all other assistance, he has nothing else to rely on but divine aid. As one observer explained it, real order must be preceded by a descent into chaos.

Other critics have charged further that Raskolnikov's salvation as portrayed in the epilogue is psychologically unsound, that a man so full of doubts would not have found through the suffering of imprisonment and the mutual love with a woman the guidelines toward salvation in Christ. And one must confess that it seems somewhat contrived and, at any rate, too abrupt. Moreover, recognizing that the literary traditions of the day demanded such a happy ending, one cannot help but wonder how greatly Dostoevski bowed to convention.

But what does such an uncertainty do to the Christian meaning of the story? Has it been destroyed in contrivance? Is there no force to the experience to make it credible? Is the New Jerusalem to be merely a false hope?

One must answer with an example drawn from the pages of Dostoevski's personal letters. "If anyone could prove to me that Christ is outside the truth," the novelist wrote, "and if the truth really did exclude Christ, I should prefer to stay with Christ and not with truth." Many critics have questioned whether the author has this time stayed with truth; clearly he has stayed with Christ. Perhaps only personal experience will prove whether the two can be compatible.

Ministers and Ministering

He was a sincere young man, a high school graduate and a successful insurance agent making a good living. But, after much agonizing thought, he resigned from the insurance company to become the associate minister in a congregationally governed church.

A professor who had two degrees and had stood as teacher in college classrooms for more than 20 years, resigned to enter the ministry. At 55 when many see visions of retirement and the easy life, he returned to school for preparation to become a minister.
Now after 17 years of ministering and studying, he is no more than a pedant, imparting wisdom arrogated from books filled with the pain and experiences of others. With all of his knowledge he learned little of man’s dilemma.

Now we meet our philanderer who woke up one rainy day with his face bashed in, his pockets emptied and his pride shattered. His new life led him to the seminary and an addition to his college degree. Not only did he have erudite knowledge, but his own experiences had taught him about the frailties of his fellowmen.

Soon his dreams turned to dust, for in his fervor to reach out to everyone, he soon collapsed from physical and mental exhaustion. Though on the way to recovery, he has a long way to go before being able to return to the full-time ministry.

These three men turned, at their own magic moment, from the shadow of the corporate monster to the full-time service of God. Two of them missed their cues. One isolated himself in theory, the other nurtured every sorrow as his own.

What of our former insurance salesman? He learns as he works. He began where the problem lie: with the people to whom he ministers. But, these honest, overt actions cannot unlock every door. Formal training also is a niche in the key, and this young man will rage from his ineptness to reach out and grasp a proven fact, one that might answer an expeditious question.

If this young minister had the education of the elderly one, to mix with the devotion of the over-zealous one, he would have been on the way to a true ministry.

There is a fourth man. Different from the others. He entered college intending to exit a minister. By age 15 his ambition had manifested itself and therein he began preparing himself. Ten years later, he stood before his own congregation, supported by seven years of college learning.

At the close of his 12th year, fruitful primarily because he excelled in administration and public relations, he was called to accept the charge of a small congregation with growing pains.

But, before looking into the particular needs of the people, he set his masterplan into motion. Church membership increased, the red in the ledger evolved to black and the pistons of progress pounded. But, along the track, patches of misunderstanding grew and the minister was accused of imposing a dictatorship. His plan was challenged, not on its merits, but on his methods. He could not understand why he was being put down at every turn.

When the climax came, those with exposed feelings ceased cooperating. The abashed minister would not overlook what was being said about him, nor would he compromise. He did not realize that he had taken the pat results of his college training and fitted them into place like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. In his fervor, he forgot the individuals he needed to know, that they were the torchbearers of his leadership.

He departed the melee when negotiations reached an impasse, and became assistant in ministering to a large congregation. Soon he became impatient to have his own congregation. He decided that men with less experience and education made twice his salary. True. But, because he had never been there, he knew not of the sharp teeth of the corporate tiger.

A minister works as many hours a week as any executive, plus being bound by a centuries-old stigma of “the pious fellow who makes his living saving our souls.” At one challenging moment in his life, he felt the overpowering need to become Promptor on God’s vast stage. How can he measure his monetary worth? If he indulges himself for more than a split second, his purpose loses merit.

Men who choose the ministry make a unique selection. If they are prone to corporate progress and if they seek to establish the proper image, they compromise themselves and have chosen wrongly.

What of the congregations in the so-called “jerk water towns?” Seminarians ready to try their wings are not flocking to them. Their consensus: “With my education, I cannot afford to bury myself and my family in a small, insignificant town. I was called to lead people, ones who know what I’m talking about.”

A particular minister, perhaps one among many, has given himself to a poverty-stricken area of Chicago. He did not go there to find a shining structure and cater to an affluent congregation, but to establish a place for God’s work. He is the Reverend Donald L. Benedict, 47, who saw where he was needed and responded. He helps with an overflowing heart, as well as with knowledge and experience.

He expressed his views: “God operates in the events and movements of men, and the task of Christianity is to get where the action is, to get where the decisions are being made.”

Reverend Benedict imparts his selflessness and projects his education as a tool. showing others where to seek God. He has not joined a group, he has formed one to aid in making a place so hope can grow where poverty and fear and defeat dwell.

Only those who truly choose to minister know what it means to be a minister in the real and true sense of the word.
"I considered all art useless unless it could be employed as a political instrument in the battle for freedom. My art was to be my arm, my sword."
George Grosz

"The highest art will be that which in its conscious content presents the thousandfold problems of the day, the art which has been visibly shattered by the explosions of the last week, which is forever trying to collect its limbs after yesterday's crash." First German Dadaist Manifesto. 1920

"We live in a world in which a million different realities collide."
William Seitz

It is important to realize that there is not, nor should there be, just one kind of modern art; just one kind of contemporary Christian art. As the saying goes, life is bigger than any expression of it. New and varied artistic expressions are to be expected and are needed, especially as in aiding in gaining insight into our quickly changing, highly complex modern world. Someone has said that if you don't know the arts of your time you aren't living in your time.

A minor, but growing approach in modern art expression is that of direct commentary on the issues and events of the day. Perhaps the classic example is GUERNICA the large mural by Picasso based on the German bombing of a Spanish town in 1937. The event is forgotten, but the painting lives on as an enduring protest against war. However, most art expression based on a passing event is so tied to that event's particularities that the art work holds little meaning after the event is over. To most artists this is a distinct disadvantage and they search for expressions of more lasting effectiveness. On the other hand, this impermanence attracts other artists today because for them the more truthful experience of life lies with the qualities of immediacy and transiency.

Such qualities can often be seen in the socially critical drawings of the Prussian, George Grosz, (1892-1958). In the years 1917-1920, Grosz lived in Berlin where he made bitter drawings of life in defeated Germany; in a Germany where government agencies failed, hunger and misery were common.

The drawing here reproduced, THE GUILTY ONE REMAINS UNKNOWN, was originally intended for an anthology of Dada writings and art in 1920. The main figure, and apparently the "Guilty One" is the dryly brushed figure of the overfed but pinched and determined man wearing a coat with a military looking front buttoning arrangement and sleeve cuff. On the "desk" rests his grasping hands with pictures of coins, keys, and bullets for which he seemingly obtains "Muerte", a symbol for purity. "Muerte" is probably a plant out of which is made a bride's crown. This idea of purity is contradicted by the prominent drawing of the naked and coldly obscene woman in the upper center of the picture, implying that the "marriage" of this man to the world with which he deals is perhaps better symbolized by that of the relationship of a man to a prostitute — an unfeeling, unfruitful using and manipulating for selfish gain only.

Looking closely at the upper left side of the drawing one sees layer upon transparent layer of fragments of office buildings, telegraph poles, ships, flags of different countries, palm trees, mountains, and the names of the highly industrial harbor cities of northern Europe. On the right side are photographic fragments of the more residential, historical, "tourist" aspects of cities; drawings of a liquor bottle, shot glass, dope hyperdermic needle, a bound-up stork symbolizing prostitution; and a newspaper clipping of the words "Missionshotel" suggesting a very cheap hotel often found in vice districts. Then at the lower left is a fragment of what looks to be a traditional, realistic Renaissance painting of the Nativity apparently also being used by and supporting this man's world. Grosz seems to be saying that the way of life in Germany in 1920 was unnatural and evil like that of the prostitute, and that the blame for this was the militaristic, capitalistic, upper-middle class mentality. The title suggests, however, that most people did not realize that this mentality was to blame.

As one can see, to get his effects Grosz combined parts of drawings of widely different objects of widely different sizes as though they were clippings from a newspaper, giving the drawing a kaleidoscopic, city-like vitality. The clutter of incomplete lines, fragmented shapes, type, and photographs borders on chaos and is barely held together by the dominance of the somewhat larger, relatively uncluttered drawing of the man. Much of the subject matter is so topical that its meaning is already unclear and makes the drawing so much a part of 1920 that it is hard to identify 1966 with it.

The technique of collage has become very important currently. Artists use it as a way of bringing some of the immediacy of contemporary everyday life into art. Some present day Christian artists have also turned to this technique in an effort to relate the Christian message to the events of our day.

Perhaps one way to have relevant images of the Christian faith is to look on them as being of necessity provisional; useful for a short time, something like the art on church bulletin covers, but not necessarily meaningful for the ages. At least such characteristics can be true for one of the many kinds of Christian imagery possible and needed in our day.
The Secular City


In this provocative and well-written little book Mr. Cox celebrates the emergence of the secular city, describes its "shape," "style" and "culture," and invites "the Church" to submit to its discipline and to appreciate its liberties in order to participate creatively in its life. Mr. Cox challenges the Church to evolve a "theology of social change" according to which the Church as "God's avant-garde" performs the "kerygmatic function" of "broadcasting the seizure of power," the "diakonic function" of "healing the urban fractures," the "koinoniac function" of "making visible the city of man," and the function of acting as a "cultural agent." With regard to the latter function Cox devotes several chapters to an analysis of patterns of change in work, play and sexual behavior in the secular city and adds a short chapter on the Church's relation to the secular university. In describing what the Church can do in performing these four functions Mr. Cox assures us that the Church would be doing what Jesus did, responding to and participating in the coming of the Kingdom of God. Because he knows that his program sounds very much like the General Assembly of 1964, World Council Studies No. 3, a list of events which he might characterize as a cultic center. Nor does he speak of expecting the "heavenly city" of the Apocalypse (which one might also characterize as a cultic center). Neither does he take notice that Israel's historical memory of the Exodus was maintained by the cultic observance of the Passover and not just by reading the Old Testament narrative. Similarly Harvey Cox does not notice that the coming of the Kingdom enacted in the person of Jesus has always been remembered by the Christian community in the cultic act of the Eucharist in which men are led to repentance, liberated from sin and guilt, encouraged in eschatological hope, and which issues in works of mercy toward all men. Does Mr. Cox assume that the common act of eating and drinking together (at a family supper table, if need be) has become nonviable as a depth-symbol for urban man, the vehicle for an eschatologist act of which God comes to restore and heal His people? Religion and cult have been declared outdated at many turning points in history. One suspects, however, that such perennially human matrices of remembering and hoping will find a place in the secular city too, and that catholic substance will persist in the remembering and hoping of the Christian community.

RICHARD SCHEIMANN

Health and Religion


A considerable amount of attention has been devoted in recent years to the relation between health and salvation. The impetus for such studies has emerged from several different quarters. Biblical studies have shown that the term "salvation" is closely associated with the phenomenon of healing, and secular studies on the meaning of health have indicated the need for a much broader base in understanding this concept. However, it is in the field of medical missions that the issue
is most sharply focused, for it is here that a rationale for the relation between religion and healing is absolutely imperative.

At its meeting in 1962 the Commission on World Mission of the Lutheran World Federation decided to invite the Division of World Mission and Evangelism of the World Council of Churches to join with it in a study of medical missionary questions. A group of selected men undertook this study, meeting at Tuebingen in 1964. A small pamphlet on *The Healing Church* contains the report of this consultation. It consists of a number of interesting essays by Leslie Newbigin, Erling Kullberg, and Max Nelms, and John Wilkins, as well as the findings of the Consultation.

The findings of the consultation represent the most significant part of the pamphlet. The statement covers a broad area of concern, including "The Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry," "The Role of the Congregation in the Ministry of Healing," "The Healing Ministry in Theological Training," "The Training of Medical Workers as a Task of the Church," and "A Continuing Program of Study and Work." It is already evident that this consultation laid the groundwork for much more intensive study by the World Council and individual denominations on this important area of concern.

The United Presbyterian Church has taken the lead among denominations in this country by adopting a statement on *The Relation of Christian Faith to Health* in 1960. This is an excellent statement on the relation of faith to health, its particular value being that its point of departure and continual focus of concern is the Christian congregation. The statement includes a good section on the biblical and historical perspectives on this issue. Perhaps the most valuable part of the pamphlet is an excellent bibliography on Christian faith and health compiled by Dr. Seward Garlick, entitled *Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry.*

She states in the concluding chapter: "It is an idea which is emerging from theological studies as well as from the side of the healing professions. The hope that is increasingly held by both sides is that there is a single wholeness towards which the healing in religion and the healing in medicine both contribute. If Miss Garlick is correct, then continued conflict or indifference between these healing professions must eventually contribute to their mutual downfall in that a house divided against itself must fall. Yet it is precisely at this point that the ambiguities begin to make themselves felt. What precisely does "wholeness" mean in concrete terms? Does it mean absence of symptoms, integration of the personhood, integration of the person within the community?""A new synthesis between religion and medicine by Phyllis Garlick, entitled *Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry in Theological Training,* The findings of the consultation represent the most significant part of the pamphlet. The statement covers a broad area of concern, including "The Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry," "The Role of the Congregation in the Ministry of Healing," "The Healing Ministry in Theological Training," "The Training of Medical Workers as a Task of the Church," and "A Continuing Program of Study and Work." It is already evident that this consultation laid the groundwork for much more intensive study by the World Council and individual denominations on this important area of concern.

The United Presbyterian Church has taken the lead among denominations in this country by adopting a statement on *The Relation of Christian Faith to Health* in 1960. This is an excellent statement on the relation of faith to health, its particular value being that its point of departure and continual focus of concern is the Christian congregation. The statement includes a good section on the biblical and historical perspectives on this issue. Perhaps the most valuable part of the pamphlet is an excellent bibliography on Christian faith and health compiled by Dr. Seward Garlick, entitled *Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry.*

She states in the concluding chapter: "It is an idea which is emerging from theological studies as well as from the side of the healing professions. The hope that is increasingly held by both sides is that there is a single wholeness towards which the healing in religion and the healing in medicine both contribute. If Miss Garlick is correct, then continued conflict or indifference between these healing professions must eventually contribute to their mutual downfall in that a house divided against itself must fall. Yet it is precisely at this point that the ambiguities begin to make themselves felt. What precisely does "wholeness" mean in concrete terms? Does it mean absence of symptoms, integration of the personhood, integration of the person within the community?"

"A new synthesis between religion and medicine by Phyllis Garlick, entitled *Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry in Theological Training,* The findings of the consultation represent the most significant part of the pamphlet. The statement covers a broad area of concern, including "The Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry," "The Role of the Congregation in the Ministry of Healing," "The Healing Ministry in Theological Training," "The Training of Medical Workers as a Task of the Church," and "A Continuing Program of Study and Work." It is already evident that this consultation laid the groundwork for much more intensive study by the World Council and individual denominations on this important area of concern.

The United Presbyterian Church has taken the lead among denominations in this country by adopting a statement on *The Relation of Christian Faith to Health* in 1960. This is an excellent statement on the relation of faith to health, its particular value being that its point of departure and continual focus of concern is the Christian congregation. The statement includes a good section on the biblical and historical perspectives on this issue. Perhaps the most valuable part of the pamphlet is an excellent bibliography on Christian faith and health compiled by Dr. Seward Garlick, entitled *Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry.*

She states in the concluding chapter: "It is an idea which is emerging from theological studies as well as from the side of the healing professions. The hope that is increasingly held by both sides is that there is a single wholeness towards which the healing in religion and the healing in medicine both contribute. If Miss Garlick is correct, then continued conflict or indifference between these healing professions must eventually contribute to their mutual downfall in that a house divided against itself must fall. Yet it is precisely at this point that the ambiguities begin to make themselves felt. What precisely does "wholeness" mean in concrete terms? Does it mean absence of symptoms, integration of the personhood, integration of the person within the community?"

"A new synthesis between religion and medicine by Phyllis Garlick, entitled *Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry in Theological Training,* The findings of the consultation represent the most significant part of the pamphlet. The statement covers a broad area of concern, including "The Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry," "The Role of the Congregation in the Ministry of Healing," "The Healing Ministry in Theological Training," "The Training of Medical Workers as a Task of the Church," and "A Continuing Program of Study and Work." It is already evident that this consultation laid the groundwork for much more intensive study by the World Council and individual denominations on this important area of concern.

The United Presbyterian Church has taken the lead among denominations in this country by adopting a statement on *The Relation of Christian Faith to Health* in 1960. This is an excellent statement on the relation of faith to health, its particular value being that its point of departure and continual focus of concern is the Christian congregation. The statement includes a good section on the biblical and historical perspectives on this issue. Perhaps the most valuable part of the pamphlet is an excellent bibliography on Christian faith and health compiled by Dr. Seward Garlick, entitled *Christian Concept of the Healing Ministry.*

She states in the concluding chapter: "It is an idea which is emerging from theological studies as well as from the side of the healing professions. The hope that is increasingly held by both sides is that there is a single wholeness towards which the healing in religion and the healing in medicine both contribute. If Miss Garlick is correct, then continued conflict or indifference between these healing professions must eventually contribute to their mutual downfall in that a house divided against itself must fall. Yet it is precisely at this point that the ambiguities begin to make themselves felt. What precisely does "wholeness" mean in concrete terms? Does it mean absence of symptoms, integration of the personhood, integration of the person within the community?"
In *Women and Religion*, Miss Crook contends that "women have a heritage in religion to regain, develop, and carry forward." She uses the Biblical record as evidence that women were religious leaders in their own right in both the early Jewish and the early Christian communities. Thus, Miriam, for example, was a prophetess who — like Moses and Aaron — could receive the word of God in the "tent of meeting" and present it to her people. More surprising, perhaps, St. Paul is presented as a "champion of preaching women."

Needless to say, the subsequent history of both communities is viewed as a history of loss so far as women were concerned. Unfortunately, Miss Crook elects to trace the history of this loss rather than to argue the resulting masculinization of the central theological concepts of the Judaic-Christian tradition. As a result, the historical account, which is at best sketchy and inadequate, blurs the structure of her argument and undermines not only its focus but its strength.

The point at issue, it seems to me, is not simply the domination of men and its effect upon the history of Christian thought nor even the subjugation of women in matters of religion. Important as it may be, the loss that was suffered by women is not as significant as the loss sustained by the communities that deprived themselves of these talents, concerns, and energies. In addition, no community can secure the dominance of some members at the expense of others and do so with impunity. In such a situation, all are diminished in stature, and the community as a whole is altered.

Whatever its faults, Miss Crook's book has raised important issues and presented a rather novel approach. Her position is not the negative one of the militant feminist. Instead, she is convinced that women have something distinctive to offer to their churches. Many of Miss Crook's readers will, no doubt, find reason to take issue with her conception of what the heritage of women has been. None can deny the importance of the notion that such a heritage exists or the necessity of considering this fact and its implications more responsibly than we have done in the past.

SUE WIENHORST

**Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background**


Shallow Country

I

I have walked among the trees
In the shallow country of the park,
And turned to see strange, aged men,
With knowing smiles within their eyes,
And sinking smirks upon their lips,
Singing a song dead twenty years,
Whose discordant notes mold a melody
Whose leering shape I do not know.
Glancing back, to where I stood before,
I have seen these relics, smiling men
Who turn to me with looks to say,
I know, you cannot think it new,
You even blush when lovers pass.
Protest is the lime key of your past.

Usually the phrase "and his background" (why not include "foreground"?) leaves me dubious; it can be evasively general. This book disproves such a fallacy: here is thorough analysis in depth, a patient critique of Wyatt's initiatory influence upon English Renaissance literature, a presentation of textual evidence from the Primary Sources in several languages — wisely checked against the Secondary Materials in recent biographical studies, etc. Patricia Thomson, a graduate of Oxford, is Lecturer in English at Queen Mary College, University of London.

The courtier and diplomat Wyatt found or took time for poetry and translation. Among innovative Tudor men of letters, he has been assailed for uninspired conventionality of his Italianate lyrics; more recently, even for his English traditional ones. This work re-establishes his literary reputation in the two worlds of Courtly Love and Courtly Wisdom. I recommend especially the chapters on Classical Philosophy and English Humanism as they influenced style, satire, and Petrarchan imagery. Worth careful attention in any sincere study of English language (manner) and literature (matter).

HERBERT H. UMBACH
II
The empty fields, the grasslands in the park
Contain familiar weeds.
Dead dandelions, feathercrystals,
Silken spheres of hollow wind.
Children, boys and girls, run
Into silk-filled fields to find
The featherballs: the wishcrystals;
To wish for a ring, and then a cloud!
Within the field, within the remains
Of children, the relics, I have walked
Within the clouds of wishes.
Someplace, I have found one featherwish.
Burning like a moment gone,
Dead by fire is my airborne wish.

III
Holding the dulled end of my wish,
The stagnant fragment of life
Dead and singed by fire,
Even the stem begins to wilt.
Past the fields, the asphalt walks
Are my tired adventures. The aged men
Now point and mutter incantations.
You see, we knew. We have always known.
Your dead weed has melted in the flame.
But who, I wonder, set the one last wish
To fire; who changed this hollow sphere
To but one wilted stem, one tired leaf,
And I must turn from their suggestive melody
To wonder why they make me turn away.

IV
I have walked the shallow country
Of the aged men and trees within the park,
And I noticed how their melody
Has changed so I begin to stand and hear,
Their ancient smiles and smirks, already,
I begin to know, for I have walked
This empty country for a while,
And I begin to see that I am mocked
As much as any, and I must also laugh.
The fields where children play
Contain no riches — none — even
When there is no smoke, or dead man’s song,
For it is pain to think of such a melody.
But it is death to hear the silence underneath.

PETER KASSAN
The last two decades Broadway has developed an inimitable routine in creating musicals which may not always be as world-shaking as “Oklahoma!” or “My Fair Lady,” but which have enough ingratiating substance to make it somewhat memorable. Jerome Robbins’ “Fiddler on the Roof” belongs with it as much as the “Man of La Mancha,” the Dale Wasserman version of Cervantes and his Don — which, by the way, I remember having seen on television as a straight play years ago. It left me unimpressed then. Now, in the staging of Albert Marre and with composer Mitch Leigh’s tuneful help, it gained a bigger dimension.

It probably is the issue in John Whiting’s “The Devils” — whether the vicar of St. Peter’s Church has or has not played a guilty part in the demonic possession of a nun — which defeats the play. Although people of flesh and blood once felt passionately about this question, as Aldous Huxley made us realize in his book on which the play is based, the characters on stage are flesh — and bloodless. Director Michael Cacoyannis skillfully overproduced the play, but one could hear the echo of emptiness through all the noise.

Only to prove that it would have been the right choice for the Lincoln Repertory Theatre, the APA (Association of Producing Artists) came up with a brilliant performance of the Moss Hart-George Kaufmann comedy, “You Can’t Take It With You,” which is a period play by now, though it is only about three decades old. But its zany characters and its conventional romance seemed very much alive on stage, as Ellis Rabb gave it a straight reading with tongue-in-cheek. This production is the best argument in his favor that he and his group should have been put at the helm of the Lincoln Center Repertory Theatre which, at the same time, proved its basic weaknesses in Wicherley’s “Country Wife.” Robert Symonds’ staging did not recover the wit and lustre of this bawdy Restoration comedy. Essentially, it was the lack of style and of a unified point of view which reduced the fun and laughter to a minimum.

Herbert Blau, one of the directors of the Repertory Theatre at Lincoln Center, staged Jean-Paul Sartre’s “Les Sequestrés d’Altona” which was given the title of “The Condemned of Altona.” Mr. Blau has not yet overcome flaws that troubled his company and productions. They mainly lie in the uneven acting and in creating a precise line of development. The latter is particularly important when it comes to a play as complex and full of ideas as Sartre’s play is. “The Prisoners of Altona” was once used as a title and, though not quite correct, seems to be closer to the play’s meaning. Sartre does not think so much in terms of these people being condemned.

The heart of the matter is the door — as in his “No Exit” — , the escape, behind a bolted door, of a man whose guilt feelings drive him to pretend madness. He locks himself up and uses his room as a self-chosen prison and insane asylum, as a tribunal in which he is the accused as well as his own prosecutor and defender rolled in one person. Franz is the hero and heir to a rich ship-building owner who profited under the Nazis and did so when the Allied occupiers of Germany began to build the country up as a bulwark against Communism. The father’s efficiency and German pride turn into the twin-brothers of doom and destruction.

The boy saved the life of a Polish rabbi and hid him in his room. The father, in turn, saved his son from being punished by the Nazis for this crime. After witnessing the brutal murder of the rabbi, Franz volunteers and, being sent to the Russian front, becomes the butcher of Smolensk.

Sartre shows us how the human mechanism works when emotional extremes get caught and twisted in their own intricacies, how quickly we learn hatred and cruelty when the power is ours. Franz, returning from the front, delights in seeing Germany in ruins. He cries out for self-punishment. Hiding in his room, he only has one contact with the outside world: his sister Leni, who has an incestuous love for him. He is her life, and she not only feeds him with food, but also with the daily lies of a bankrupt, miserable, suffering Germany while outside the Wirtschaftswunder rages. Johanna, his sister-in-law, finally succeeds in breaking through the door, in bringing him to the realization of his pretenses and the recognition of reality.

When Franz opens the door of his “sequestered” existence, he can only visualize one way left to him: self-destruction. And he takes his father, a fatally sick man, with him. It is the Day of Judgment for two lost generations, for man threatened by the “cruel enemy who had sworn to destroy him, that hairless, evil, flesh-eating beast — man himself!”

In this play the puritanic conscience is pitted against the murderous instinct in us. Sartre wrote a negative play. He saw no exit for man. But it is not a play that deals with any specific country. Germany is not the issue, it is a convenient example. Sartre said he wanted to speak to the French, he was angered about the brutalities during the struggle for Algerian independence. He said he only writes plays when angry. Unfortunately for the world, fortunately for the theatre — there is plenty of reason to get angry.
Great music, like great poetry and great prose, moves me to the quick. At the moment I am thinking primarily of the melody and the text of Martin Luther’s magnificent battle hymn titled Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott (A Mighty Fortress Is Our God).

Did Luther himself compose this melody? I do not know. Nor, I make bold to think, does anyone else. I suspect, however, that the tune did not originate in Luther’s brain. Yet it is not my present purpose to examine or discuss what scholars and pseudo scholars have thought and concluded with regard to this question. I know that the stirring melody has given rise to some fanciful theories. But I do not propose to tread on treacherous and dangerous ground.

Luther’s text is strikingly musical. It is vigorous, sturdy, bold, and defiant. To me it represents the Reformer as he lived, moved, and had his being. But please bear in mind that I am speaking about the German words. No English version I have ever seen or heard has succeeded in capturing all the elemental power contained in the original. In fact, some translations of this hymn have caused me and many others excruciating pain.

Before I single out one particular line for special comment, I shall digress for a moment or two and say a few words about the exceedingly difficult art of translating some of Luther’s German into English.

A few weeks ago I was struggling in the sweat of my face with a work which the Reformer wrote in 1523. One day a German theologian happened into my office when the problems with which I was wrestling were especially difficult and exasperating. I was moving along at a snail’s pace, and my dissatisfaction with what I was accomplishing knew no bounds. I was trying to say in idiomatic English what Luther had said in wonderfully forceful and indisputably idiomatic German. But bear in mind that this was the German which the mighty Reformer wrote and spoke in 1523.

“What are you working at?” my friend from Germany asked. I told him. Then he said something which gave me much comfort. “Don’t fret or worry,” he told me. “We Germans have just as much trouble with some of Luther’s German.” This made me feel better. It buoyed me up and gave me new courage. I continued to struggle, and I still do so, although it is a thousand times easier for me to work with Luther’s Latin than it is to cast some of his idiomatic and obsolete German into the English of our time.

One day it became necessary for me to investigate the word Dank as it is sometimes used by Luther. Thank fortune, I soon found the answer. Then something which I consider exceedingly important hit me between the eyes.

Do you remember the fourth stanza of Luther’s battle hymn? In one translation it begins as follows: “The Word they still shall let remain / Nor any thanks have for it.”

I have sung these two lines many times. But was I always thinking when I did so? Sometimes I was merely parroting what a translator had concocted. More than once, however, I wondered about the meaning of “Nor any thanks have for it.” Have you had the same experience? Many of my friends have answered yes when I put this question to them. Why, I often wondered, shall God’s foes have no thanks for letting His Word remain?

The German text reads as follows:

Das Wort sie sollen lassen stan
Und kein Dank dazu haben.

What does kein Dank dazu haben mean? Does it really mean “Nor any thanks have for it”? It does not.

I did not know the meaning of these words until the “something” I mentioned a few moments ago hit me squarely between the eyes. One of the dictionaries I consulted when I was investigating the word Dank gave me the answer all of a sudden. There I read that soll keinen Dank dazu haben means ob er will oder nicht (“whether he wants to or not”). Now I knew the meaning of the words Luther used in his battle hymn, and now someone with far more skill than I have must devise a metrically satisfactory translation. Besides, he will have to pay careful attention to the rhyme.

Do you want to know where I found the meaning of soll keinen Dank dazu haben? Well, I discovered it in Alfred Goetze’s Fruenuehochdeutsches Glossar (Verlag Walter de Gruyter and Co. Berlin. 1956).

Although I am neither a hymnologist nor the son of a hymnologist, I do believe with all my heart that the proper study of hymnology requires much more knowledge than some of those who are called hymnologists have at their disposal. Among other things, it demands a wide-reaching acquaintance with music, both sacred and profane. One of these days a completely competent scholar in the field of hymnology may be able to discover the real origin of the melody to which we sing Luther’s wonderful battle hymn. But I am by no means confident that this will ever come to pass.

Meanwhile I wonder why so many translators have failed to find the true meaning of the second line of the fourth stanza of Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott. My own discovery was wholly accidental. Nevertheless, it was a revelation. Or will someone come forward to say that Alfred Goetze is mistaken? I do not have the courage or the effrontery to do so.
Early this year the people who run the Youth Leadership Training Program on our Valparaiso University campus invited me to spend a retreat weekend with them at Winona Lake, Indiana. I came away from that retreat full of confidence and hope—with the realization that our young people, in spite of all the irritations, are a pretty good bunch. On Sunday morning a student, Mike Ruhnow, delivered the sermonette at worship service. This sermon follows.

Text: “God said to Moses, I am who I am... And I will take you for my people and I will be your God.” (Exodus 3:14; 6:7)

The question raised at this retreat weekend is an ethical question inasmuch as it asks about our reaction to our neighbor and our relation to God.

The temptation is to turn to the Word and look for an answer to the tension between being for ourselves and being for others.

Yet when we listen to the Word all we hear is our text repeated in one form or another: “I will cause to happen what I will cause to happen... And I will take you for my people and I will be your God.”

We seek a simple Biblical solution to our dilemma... We want direction, answers, goals, principles... We seek to know the will of God.

God keeps us in this tension by insisting that He is our God and that we are His people.

What does it mean that God is our God... It means that He is faithful to us... that He will keep His promise of Grace to us no matter how unfaithful we are to Him.

He judges us by His standard—Jesus Christ—and not by our acts or motivations.

He works His will or redemption from guilt, sin, and death in us.

He frees us, not from the Law which always accuses us to be sinners and always demands that we live our lives within the orders of creation of family, university, community, classes, roommates, friends. Instead He frees us from the curse of the Law. He frees us from His execution of His pronounced judgment of sinner on us. He frees us to live with the tension in our lives.

II.

It means that we trust His Word of promise no matter what we do or how we feel. It means that we can carry out our tasks as noted in the O.T. lesson for today, knowing that all our works are His works and the qualitative judgment of God on our lives is through Jesus Christ. Our good works are good because God pronounces us good in His redeeming activity in His Son. We can rejoice in God’s creation and use it to serve our neighbors. Theologically speaking, God creates, preserves, sanctifies. Sociologically speaking, God creates, preserves, sanctifies in, with, and through us, for God does not work apart from His creation.

Part of God’s good creation is our minds, emotions, talents. We use these to carry out His work in the world. We use — in the fullest sense of the Word — His gifts of professors, pastors, roommates, friends to make the decisions necessary but fully realizing that our actions in themselves do not make us good. Instead, God’s pronounced judgment of Jesus Christ on us makes our works good.

Just as God deals with us in, with, and through His creation of people, He also deals with us in, with, and through the rest of His creation such as bread and wine. The name “I am who I am” does not indicate God’s eternal being but His action and presence in historical affairs. Since God is our God and we are His people, we will meet him in His creation of bread and wine.
Sights and Sounds

The Loved One and That Darn Cat

Pauline Kael, veteran film critic and author of I Lost It at the Movies, a collection of essays and reviews, has said, “I think a good critic is honestly subjective.” It is not that Miss Kael believes that objectivity is not necessary or desirable in the appraisal of any art form. She does, but she is convinced that objectivity cannot be completely divorced from subjectivity. These are words of comfort to me at the moment, since I realize that my review of The Loved One (M-G-M & Filmways, Tony Richardson) is both honest and subjective. And I hope that it is not entirely without objectivity.

The Loved One is based on a searing satire written by Evelyn Waugh in 1948. Mr. Waugh had been shocked by the crass commercialism and the pretentious practices that characterized the management of a famous cemetery in Los Angeles. Unfortunately, in the film Mr. Waugh’s disciplined satire has been debased to grotesque travesty. Although the opening sequences may be in questionable taste, they are clever and amusing. But soon the entire dreary business deteriorates into sick gags and morbid humor. I know that there were moments when I regretted having had dinner before I exposed myself to this nauseating and revolting spectacle.

The Loved One has been bluntly advertised as “the motion picture with something to offend everyone.” This is one of the rare times when a film lives up to advance publicity blurs.

Apparently movie-goers are eager to be offended, for The Loved One is big box office. At any rate, long lines waited in near-zero temperatures to get into the theater. By contrast, when I went to see The Agony and the Ecstasy (20th Century-Fox, Carol Reed), the theater was less — far less — than half-filled.

I realize that the film version of Irving Stone’s bestselling novel is disappointing for many reasons. At best, this is a shallow, one-dimensional portrait of one of the towering figures of the Renaissance. But this is also true of Mr. Stone’s book. It, too, fails to present an accurate, searching study of Michelangelo Buonaroti, the famous Florentine whose many-sided genius found expression in sculpture, painting, architecture, and poetry.

In spite of many shortcomings I did not find the picture to be wholly unrewarding. The prologue alone, with its wide-ranging examination of Michelangelo’s magnificent sculptures, was worth the price of admission. The photography is superb; the sequences, filmed in Florence, Rome, and the Italian countryside, are fascinating; and the decor and costuming are stunning. It is the script that is dull, and here history is often distorted or bypassed entirely.

Charlton Heston is hampered by inane dialog and a crippling script. Rex Harrison fares better in the role of Julius II, the warrior pope who is regarded as one of the great popes of the Roman Catholic Church. History tells us that Julius II was shrewd, witty, dynamic, and ambitious for temporal power. He was also not only a patron of the arts and of artists but a connoisseur as well. Since Julius II was the first bearded pope, I wonder why Mr. Harrison, a stickler for detail, chose to show him with a clean-shaven face.

The Christmas holidays would not have been complete without a new film from Walt Disney. Children look forward to these pictures and flock to the theater during the vacation period. I have the scars to prove it. I saw That Darn Cat (Buena Vista, Robert Stevens) in a theater jam-packed with youngsters and the harried parents who accompanied them. One should see a Disney picture in just such an audience. Nothing is quite so much fun or so refreshing as the spontaneous reaction of youngsters to the action on the screen. For the moment everyone is touched by the magic of youth.

A mere adult might say that That Darn Cat is not the best of the Disney films. He might even say that it is a bit farfetched and contrived. But who would be so mean? Every citizen of our nation owes Bob Hope a personal debt of gratitude. For 14 years this man has taken his special Christmas show to American troops stationed in faraway places. In 1964 and again during the past Christmas season he has taken his troupe to the front lines in Vietnam. Even during the years when the world was at peace these annual tours were hard and tiring. Now they are also dangerous — a fact which has deterred neither the players nor Mr. Hope. I found this year’s program almost unbearable to watch because it was so poignant. Not the show itself, of course, but the men and women who are involved in grim and frustrating guerrilla warfare. A salute to Mr. Hope, to his troupe, and to our armed services!

Other fine programs on TV were The National Health Test and The Search for Ulysses (CBS). The program titled Testing: Is Anybody Honest? (NBC) was disturbing. To be honest, as a nation we seem to have sacrificed sharply delineated moral values on the altar of conformity and expediency. Black and white have been replaced by shades of gray.

March 1966
Farewell To Hallelujah

Shrove Tuesday . . . At Vespers today — or at the services last Sunday — the church sang the last Hallelujah, and Lent began . . . From time immemorial the Hallelujah has been omitted from the services of the Church during the season dedicated to the remembrance of the Passion of our Lord . . . The last Hallelujah dies away in chapel and cathedral, and while the echo still lingers among the rafters, the violet paraments of sorrow are placed upon the altar . . . It will be Easter morning before the Hallelujah is heard again . . .

There is wisdom in this . . . It is another and profound difference between the Church and the world . . . The world never willingly abandons joy . . . Her votaries hang on to happiness with all the strength they have — until, inevitably, it is taken away from them . . . They have forgotten that the line of life must sometimes go down into the darkness of sorrow . . . It is never easy, but it is a great deal better to go down willingly than to be driven down like a slave . . . To give up joy by the strength of Him who gave up heaven is a part of the way by which joy and heaven will return . . .

The shadow which clings to all earthly good when it is seen in the light of faith is inevitable . . . Because of this the Christian view of life appears so much darker than the pagan — checkered with a darkness the more intense the brighter the light of faith shines upon it . . . But the farewell to Hallelujah, though necessary, is only temporary . . . It springs from the strong compulsion of the dust from which we came and the stronger compulsions of the everlasting mercy which lifted us from that dust . . .

So it is good that our Hallelujahs are silent for a little time . . . In their stead appear the crown of thorns, the drops of blood, the way of mourning, the five wounds, and the sound of our hands driving nails . . . And on Easter Morn our returning Hallelujahs will say that our Lord arose and ascended into heaven, that He is now the King of Glory, who has given us a share in both His suffering and His victory, in His passion and His power, in His former pain and His present peace . . .