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DR. ELIZABETH KÜBLER-ROSS, if she has not been the cause, certainly has been a significant shaper of the revolution in thinking about death. Perhaps the popularity of the subject of death, and the accompanying death and dying business, might have grown without her researches or the publication of her findings. However, the popularity of the subject of dying and her work have so grown together that the present state of the art of caring for the dying would be significantly different without the impact of her work.

Americans have been more afraid of dying than of death. We had developed a culture built to forget death. Dying, however, is not so easy to forget. Fostered by the cultural mode of forgetting death, the dying patient faced this lonely end to his life in even more lonely isolation.

The clear perception of this situation by Dr. Kübler-Ross in the initial stages of her researches is to be admired. She (accurately) detected and described the general conspiracy of silence among professionals who care for the sick and dying. Many pastors have experienced the weight and dread of this conspiracy. Members of the family, sometimes on the advice of professional medical people, would often urge in hushed tones and with over-the-shoulder glances that so and so was not to be told he is dying. Many pastors, nurses, and doctors did not follow such advice. They worked with the families as well as the dying patient. But it was Dr. Kübler-Ross’s great contribution to bring careful research into the facts of the responses of the dying patients. And she crowned that research with relentless insistence that professional people who care for the dying are to face the fact of dying. Her research with dying patients and her seminars for workers to deal with the fact of their own mortality, as well as the patient’s, have put innumerable patients and professionals in her debt.

The documentation for her work and the insights derived from her observations, while more akin religiously and philosophically to something like ancient Stoicism than the Christian faith, also have revised
much of the Christian ministerial thinking about death and the care of dying people. Despite the fact that Christians have held central to their preaching the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ for us, too many Christians had joined in trying to ignore death. Despite the fact that Jesus is known and preached as the "Man of Sorrows," many Christians, including pastors, had failed to care for the sorrow of the dying and the bereaved. Despite the fact that such ancient and exquisitely clear texts as Psalm 90 have taught both Christians and Jews about the shame of our mortality, many Christians, including pastors, were silent about the divine judgment that manifests itself in human death.

IT WAS AN EMBARRASSMENT to the church to have forgotten so much about death and dying and the human response to it. The embarrassment was increased when it was revealed how much the churches had joined so easily in the cultural habit of ignoring death. But it would be a haughty mind that did not use the embarrassment as an engine for grateful learning and judicious use of those things that are good for training the sensitivities about the dying.

Amazement has now overcome the embarrassment. Dr. Kübler-Ross's continuing researches have led her to come to believe in life after death. Death has now become a stage in life. The soul's shedding of mortality is like the butterfly shedding the cocoon and flying off into beautiful, bright freedom. In fact, it would seem that the advancement in the art of dying is now to the point where dying with dignity has taken the sting out of death. Butressed with meticulous and wide-ranging research, this new position stands in the long tradition of Socrates, Epictetus, and the noble Romans, all of whom were taught to die with dignity, serenity, indeed, a disciplined apatheia.

However, even more amazing than this development in the thinking of Dr. Kübler-Ross, who has not studied dying from the top-side of religion, heaven, and the transcendent God, but from the under-side of earthly, human observations, is the wholesale adoption of this point of view by Christian ministerial people. The stages of death and dying can be recited with catechetical precision, but the catechetical treatment of baptismal union with the crucified and risen Christ and the hope of the resurrection of the body has been left in the hallway. While Christian ministerial workers hold to what is good and true in the investigations about death and dying, they ought to know that the ultimate delusion is to take the wrong stinger out of death, or so to massage the psyche of the dying person that he imagines the stinger is out when it is not. The conspiracy of silence can indeed be overcome by informed talk, but death cannot.

By reading carefully the experiences of man and his responses to dying, it is possible to learn something of the sting of death. But it is a counterfeit life that proposes death as one of its stages. Death is an execution, not a natural development. Death is the divine judgment that brings to an end the attempt to live a counterfeit life.

We humans are the victims in death. The sting of death is sin; the strength of that sting is the law of God. And the law's execution is not merely the inexorable working out of arbitrary legislation in the cosmos. It is, rather, the fearful will of the Creator, operating as freely to end that life as he did to bring it into existence in the first place.

Our gratitude for and judicious use of the insights of Kübler-Ross and her associates, together with the studies that have flowed from her work, ought not lead us to use these very insights to deepen and confirm the delusion about death. Christians are to be taught to die as victors: death, the last enemy, gets its comeuppance. The church that sings "Dignus est Agnus" ("Worthy is the Lamb") should keep her dignities straight when she talks about death and when she teaches her children to die well. The sting of death, extracted by the Lamb who was the Victim, is not itself removed merely by some religious or philosophical anesthetic daubed around its edges.

BE MY VALENTINE?

IT HAS BEEN ROUGHLY A decade since I began reading Ann Landers' column, with less rather than more regularity. It started at the same time I began teaching a course on the Theology of Sexuality, Marriage, and Family Life. Reading the column was a self-imposed duty, something I thought I ought to do in order to learn what kinds of problems non-academic people were interested in. Like Ezekiel of old who went down and sat among the people seven days, and was astonished, I experienced some amazement.

My amazement was limited when Ann Landers reported that seventy percent of the people who responded to her first survey ("If you had it to do over again, would you have had children?") said, "NO!" The saying is true: one's children can furnish the quickest way to go to hell. And it is not only when one is old and the children full grown that one has regrets. There are difficult times also as the family life is underway. Ages ago Ovid said, "Raraque in hoc aevo quae velit esse parens."

Children, especially sons, do not know how they can injure their
parents, especially their fathers. And if we have had romantic and excessive pictures of what motherhood is about, we have absolutely wallowed in our misunderstandings of fatherhood. The sense that being a man (as husband and father) is to ask for a crown of thorns and to bear suffering is surely not part of the mental equipment of the "playboy" or the "jock" or the successful professional man. And the passion to fashion fatherhood to reflect the Fatherhood of God, as this is revealed both in the history of Israel and in the work of our Lord Jesus Christ, too rarely crosses the mind of even Christian fathers.

Such sturdy instruction in "fatherhood" hardly escapes the mouth of the preachers and teachers in the church. And the moralists so frequently work with a pain/pleasure principle that they cannot help instruct the boys or the men. Hence, almost all become victims of regret, a regret that seldom leads to salutary repentance and a new mind about one's life or work. Such regret becomes the self-indulgent way to deny one's decisions without living out the consequences of the alternate (make-believe) choices. Our excessive enthusiasms about motherhood, combined with our stony silence about fatherhood, may have set us up for the cruelest punishment of all: the incapacity to bear the burden of taking our place in the human race.

BUT ANN LANDERS HAD ANOTHER survey—released significantly enough on Valentine's Day. This time the question was, "If you had it to do over again would you marry the person to whom you are now married?" Landers reports that there were two sets of responses: one group signed their cards and letters; the other group did not. From the signed mail, seventy percent answered the question, "YES"; from the unsigned mail, thirty percent said, "NO." Forty-eight percent of the unsigned mail said, "YES"; fifty-two percent said, "NO." The forty-two homosexuals who replied all answered the question with a "YES."

The therapeutic value of saying, "I regret the choice I made" may be argued. It is a strange and noteworthy commentary that a newspaper columnist must become the therapist, the father confessor, the moralist, as it were.

And yet, regret does not go away by scolding; neither does ignoring it deal with its dynamics. Regret continues to function for fallen man as a way to escape repentance, for to repent is to die, just as to love is to give one's life away. Where the norm and arbiter of the life that is desired is the indulgence of the self, regret furnishes a wonderful illusion. Regret over decisions once made leaves the person in the present make-believe situation that consequences of choices can be divorced from the choices, as if one can live a life of choices while at the same time living apart from those choices. The illusion is that one can rectify his life without losing it, without having the wrong stripped from him; that one can find a life of love and goodness without practicing the burden of faithfulness to promises made.

Regret is the world's way to testify to the valid necessity of repentance—without repenting. Regret is the proclamation that God has misjudged in leading lives to their present point; it is a way of wishing that God had been neither so good or so gracious. Regret is the way of living in a world of wishing.

CORRECTION

Wilmar F. Bernthal, author of "Searching for an Ethical Business System," The Cresset, April, 1977, pp. 3-9, was not writing under a pseudonym; neither was he trying to evade responsibility. He was rather the victim of an editorial slip. His name is Wilmar, not William as printed. The editor apologizes to Dr. Bernthal and to The Cresset readers for this slip.

Have you seen quite recently our master plan for Jessie?
The gerrymandered neverland where sage-sad sometime children stand discarded on the street 'neath neon-lighted concrete walls and all the brutal nevermores our either-ors have built for other mothers' almost men—whose pent-up anguish has been stilled by skillful drawers of the diagram?

Sweet Ashland child what has our wild and pious stand against your dreams of manhood done? What victory has our expert hordes won for humanity by boarding up your rainbow schemes with data-proven disenfranchisement? Forgive us this and every vile insanity our wisest men deliver to your cell. We never meant a one-way street to hell for you.

LOIS REINER
THE MUSICIANS

"And here," droned the chief builder in monotone, "let us put five letters, M-U-S-I-C, so that all who pass will know the purpose of this place . . .

To perfect piano and overcome organ
To modulate the voice,
To teach trombone and trumpet and tuba,
To blend choral breath and instrumental air,
To climb the highest scales,
To name the masters and master the names of the masterpieces,
To practice teaching others to practice, and
To create—in strict time—Musicians!"

"And here," sang the chief sparrow in perfect tune, "in these five letters, M-U-S-I-C, let us build our homes and share our songs of love with all who pass this place."

ROBERT BADEN
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Luther: We know, however, that it is the Lord's Supper, in name and in reality, not the supper of the Christians. For the Lord not only instituted it, but also prepares and gives it himself, and is himself, cook, butler, food, and drink.

Zwingli: The Eucharist is never bread or the body of Christ but the action of giving thanks.
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CROSSING THE NORTH ATLANTIC in the spring of 1942 was extremely dangerous. German U-boats were everywhere, or seemed to be. Nearly every day reports came in of one or two ships being sunk. On March 6 the M. S. Axel Johnson, a small Swedish freighter, left New York as part of a convoy bound for Europe. In addition to its cargo the freighter carried a few passengers, among them the English composer Benjamin Britten and his countryman and friend, tenor Peter Pears. After three years in America, they were returning to Britain.

With the maneuvering necessary to avoid enemy air craft and submarines, the crossing took four weeks. One would suppose that the normal anxiety accompanying such danger would inhibit the creative process, even in a composer of Britten's gifts. Such, however, was not the case. During the month at sea, in cramped quarters down near the ship's refrigeration unit, he put to paper the Hymn to St. Cecilia for unaccompanied chorus and soloists and A Ceremony of Carols for treble voices and harp. There were also some settings of Beddoes which have never been published.

Later, Britten recalled that Atlantic crossing as one of the most enjoyable months of his life, in spite of the danger. The threat from enemy vessels, though very real, was external, and external circumstances had less effect on his ability to compose than those psychological. A far more serious threat to his creativity had been the anxiety of the last three years, trying to decide where he would live and work. That anxiety had made composing very difficult during much of his stay in America, and, for Britten, not being able to work was "the greatest tragedy of all." Should he become an American citizen or return to England? Once the decision had been made and he was aboard ship, the creative flow resumed, German U-boats notwithstanding. He was returning to his roots.

W. H. Auden had proposed in the late '30s that artists should either live in a land where they had live roots or where they had no roots at all. Feeling "twisted in dying roots," Auden left England for America early in 1939.2 Auden's example had considerable influence on Britten. They had worked together frequently. Auden had written scripts for several documentary films for which Britten composed the music. In addition, Britten supplied incidental music for two of Auden's verse plays and Auden provided lyrics for a number of Britten's early vocal works. Like Auden, Britten was at that time feeling dissatisfied with his environment. He was frustrated by what seemed to him a general indifference in England to anything new. Prospects for a young composer appeared brighter on the other side of the Atlantic. So he and Pears followed Auden in the fall of 1939, going first to Canada and then to New York. For the greater part of his time here, Britten made his home at Amityville on Long Island.

Twenty-five years later, on winning the Aspen Award for Services to the Humanities, Britten expressed his gratitude for the impact the American experience had on his career. It was here that he came to realize that, unlike Auden, his English roots were alive and, more to the point, vital to his development as a composer. The option of working in a country where he had no roots, however viable for Auden, was not possible for him.

THE "MOMENT OF TRUTH" occurred in the summer of 1941 in California where he had gone to visit Ethel and Rae Robertson, the du­o­p­i­a­n­ists. He was working at that time on a series of two-piano compositions: the Introduction and Rondo alla Burlesca, the Mazurka Elegiaca in memory of Paderewski, and the Scottish Ballad for two pianos and orchestra. One day while looking through a copy of The Listener, a weekly magazine published by the B. B. C., he came across an article by E. M. Forster titled "George Crabbe: the Poet and the Man." Crabbe, the late eighteenth-

---


early nineteenth-century English poet, was a native of Aldeburgh, a small fishing village on the North Sea, not far from Lowestoft where Britten was born. Forster began his article, “To talk about Crabbie is to talk about England. He never left our shores and he only once ventured to cross the border into Scotland. He did not even go to London much, but lived in villages and small country towns.” In discussing Crabbe’s poetry, Forster referred to The Borough, a lengthy poem depicting life in Aldeburgh. Among the passages from the poem quoted by Forster were several about the fisherman Peter Grimes. Forster’s comments on the Suffolk countryside where Crabbe had grown up and about which he had written, recalled to Britten memories of his own youth. The need he felt to return to England — more specifically to East Anglia — was confirmed. Return he did, living for a time in a converted windmill at Snape and then, for the last thirty years of his life, at Aldeburgh. It is there, in the Parish churchyard, that he was buried last December.

Britten was not familiar with Crabbe’s poetry when he read Forster’s article, but soon after he found a copy of the poet’s works in a Los Angeles bookstore. Reading The Borough, he was fascinated with the possibilities for an opera based on the character of Peter Grimes. Earlier that year, he and Auden had collaborated on an operetta, Paul Bunyan, which was produced at Columbia University. In spite of the fact that the work was poorly received by the critics, Britten regarded opera as “the most exciting of musical forms” and was eager to write more works for the stage.

Returning to the east coast in the fall of 1941, Britten set out to obtain passage to England. For six months he lived with bags packed, ready to leave on twenty-four hours notice. In the last months of his stay, Britten attended a performance in Boston of his Sinfonia da Requiem under Koussevitzky. In conversation, Koussevitzky asked the composer why he had not written a full-scale opera. Britten responded that the amount of work required including the preparation of nearly a thousand pages of orchestral score, “demanded a freedom from other work which was an economic impossibility for most young composers.” A short time later the conductor informed Britten that the Koussevitzky Foundation was awarding him a commission of $1,000 for an opera to be dedicated to the memory of Natalie Koussevitzky, the conductor’s wife, who had recently died.

Soon after his return to England, Britten asked Montagu Slater to supply him with a libretto on the Peter Grimes story. Britten, with the assistance of Peter Pears, had already worked out a scenario of the main elements of the action. Preparation of the libretto, including revisions, took about eighteen months. In January of 1944 Britten began work on the music; by February of the following year the score was finished. The first performance took place on June 7, 1945. Its success is a matter of record. Within three years it had been performed in many of the major opera houses of the world and, thirty years later, it remains one of the most frequently performed operas of the twentieth century. Among the scheduled performances for the coming season are those by the Metropolitan in New York and the Lyric Theater of Chicago.

Peter Grimes marked the beginning of Britten’s career as an opera composer. It was a career which produced eleven operas (including his realization of The Beggar’s Opera), three parables for church performance, and a musical setting of The Chester Miracle Play, Noye’s Fludde. It would be wrong to think of Britten solely in terms of his stage works (or even of his vocal works for that matter); too many compositions of great beauty would have to be overlooked. It is right, however, to think of him as one of the most, if not the most, important opera composers of the last fifty years. And it is pleasant to observe that it was while he was in this country that he first turned to the operatic form.

If the years in America were not particularly happy ones for Benjamin Britten, they were important ones. It was here that he came to a fuller understanding of who he was, where he belonged and what he wanted to become. It was the creative fire kindled by that understanding that brightened the darkness of that dangerous Atlantic crossing thirty-five years ago. Appropriately, he celebrated the event by composing a work in honor of St. Cecilia—his patron saint, both by birth (he was born on her feast day, November 22) and profession.

THE ENGLISH WRITER AND caricaturist, Max Beerbohm, admitted to being shy of works labelled as masterpieces. In Beerbohm’s view such works had a “mustiness” about them which implanted distaste. People were always insisting he must know them. With “masterpieces” the danger always exists of finding too much pleasure in the label and too little in the work. In his speech at Aspen Britten warned against those who try to label and pigeonhole a composer’s works for posterity. Britten was a “now” composer. His concern was always to write the best music for the present moment. “I want my music to be of use to people, to please them, to ‘enhance their lives’ in Berenson’s phrase. I do not write about music now in Aldeburgh for people living there and further afield, indeed for anyone who cares to play it or listen to it.” It seems without doubt that for a long time to come there will be a large number of people who find pleasure in Britten’s music. 

5 Ibid., p. 7.
NEIL ARMSTRONG, THE FIRST MAN TO WALK on the moon, is a shy man. He now prefers a quiet life as an engineering professor at the University of Cincinnati. But in 1969, when space travel was still new and scintillating, Armstrong gave a Wittenberg audience a brilliant insight into what much of life and learning are all about. “Curious men around the world are trying to unlock the doors to the universe in which our planet forever swims,” he said. “It is, however, one thing to search for knowledge, and another to find it. “But knowledge is not wisdom. To find wisdom requires knowledge, understanding, experience and participation.”

Now in its 132nd academic year, Wittenberg aspires to find the wisdom necessary to accomplish its stated goal of “educating the creative minority of a civilization to assume not an elitist’s role, but a servant’s role while being conscious of the responsibility to lead and to seek self-discipline.”

Wittenberg, with 2,300 students, is not a large school, nor a small one. It is a place of quality alive to its surroundings in its own locale and in the world at large. But above all Wittenberg has always placed primary emphasis on the student as an individual.

The University has produced such famous persons as Lloyd C. Douglas, author of the novel The Robe, and Sherwood Anderson, creator of Winesburg, Ohio and Adam Funk and Isaac Wagnalls who compiled the Funk and Wagnalls Dictionary.

Wittenberg’s greatest assets have always been a dedicated faculty, a concerned administration, and enlightened students eager to learn. But Wittenberg is first a church-related school, one of the first originally devoted to both science and religion.

The University’s history is long and often dramatic, and much of it is depicted in twenty-four stained glass panels found in Weaver Chapel on campus. One of the panels shows Ezra Keller, Wittenberg’s founder, riding horseback over the western frontier of Pennsylvania and Ohio on his way to accept the position of professor at a non-existent Lutheran college. The decision to come west was not an easy one for Pastor Keller to make. He was enjoying a comfortable post in the east and Springfield, Ohio was merely a small outpost in a rugged wilderness. And even when Pastor Keller accepted the position, he did not travel to Springfield, but to Wooster, Ohio, where the board of directors had voted to begin the college.

In 1844, with four students, Wittenberg College first held classes at Wooster. The Wooster location did not satisfy Pastor Keller, however, and with the board’s permission, he set out to look for a site in the Miami
Valley. His goal was to establish a college capable of educating an English-speaking clergy. Such a ministry, he believed, could then spiritualize the thousands of German immigrants who had settled in the western Ohio area.

Just at this time, Charles Anthony, a prominent Springfield attorney, encouraged his fellow townspeople to compete for the college’s location. An institution like Wittenberg, Anthony surmised, would bring together the divergent populations migrating to the Ohio country and alleviate growing tensions. He was aware of growing nativist sentiments and had read accounts of riots in the east between native white Americans and recently arrived European immigrants. Anthony hoped that out of this contact would grow mutual appreciation for the culture and heritage of both the English and the Germans.

As a location for the new college, Keller desired a site on the major arteries over which the German immigrants moved westward. Springfield was twenty-two miles northeast of Dayton on the National Road, and was on the route of the Sandusky-Cincinnati Railroad. The city was also a hub for stagecoach lines.

On Feb. 16, 1845, Pastor Keller announced that the board of directors had approved Springfield as the location for the new Lutheran college. Desperately needed funds were found when Alexander Gebhart planned the first Wittenberg endowment campaign that eventually raised $100,000. Although not eager to assume the position, Pastor Keller accepted the presidency of the college. After part of the 18-acre tract was cleared, Pastor Keller staked out the land for the first building. The first classes were held in the First Lutheran Church in Springfield. One year later in 1846, Myers Hall opened its doors for classes and dormitory living.

Keller lived only three more years. He died at age thirty-six. Pastor Samuel Sprecher was then appointed Wittenberg’s second president on January 17, 1849. In only a few short years, the college had become well known throughout Ohio, and students had adopted the time-honored rite to complain against such things as the tuition fee of twenty dollars a term, the monthly room fee of fifteen dollars, and $1.50 it took to do a month’s laundry.

WHEN THE CIVIL WAR BEGAN, STUDENTS placed the flag of the Union on the cupola of Myers Hall and vowed that it would not be lowered until the war’s end. Many Wittenberg students joined the ranks of the Union Army.

In 1874, Pastor John B. Helwig, who had worked as a blacksmith, became the college’s third president. His mighty physique reportedly stood him in good stead when he was called upon to deal with an obstreperous student. During President Helwig’s initial year the first woman was admitted to Wittenberg and in 1879 Miss Alice Geiger became the first woman graduate.

The spirit of Wittenberg changed during the 1880s under Pastor Samuel Alfre Ort, the University’s fourth President. Wittenberg grew from a small classical school to a modern vigorous college. The generosity of Springfield citizens in contributing to Wittenberg enabled construction of Recitation Hall to get underway in 1883. This prevented the movement of the college to Mansfield, Ohio.

President Ort understood Wittenberg’s young people because he had been one of them. He was the first student to kick a football over Myers Hall, and he was one of the students responsible for putting a horse in the cupola high atop the building.

The ultimate size and destiny of Wittenberg became a paramount problem at this time. Some thought it should be the Harvard for American Lutherans and should add schools of law and medicine and graduate and professional schools. Others staunchly believed that Wittenberg should be the exclusive liberal arts institution of the great midwest. The trends of the times and deliberate decision pointed Wittenberg in the direction of the liberal arts. The view of President Charles G. Heckert, who had succeeded President Ort in 1903, was that Wittenberg should embrace a world view. This concept, coupled with modern standards of quality, moved Wittenberg into the mainstream of a new era in higher education.

The prejudices against Wittenberg’s German heritage took its toll during World War I, but the institution was strongly patriotic. The University was selected in 1918 as the ideal site for a speech by former U. S. President Theodore Roosevelt to German Americans. “I decline to recognize any discrimination because of the creed a man professes, or because of diverse nationalities. Judgement should be based upon a man’s service, his sympathies, and his actions,” Roosevelt told the Wittenberg students.

In 1920, Pastor Rees Edgar Tulloss, an aggressive man, became Wittenberg’s seventh president. He presided over a post-World War I boom in education and enrollment expanded to match the exuberance of the “Roaring Twenties.” Pastor Tulloss led Wittenberg through the “Great Depression.” Assistant professors took three cuts on an already below scale salary of $3,000 a year and waited for better times on an annual income of $1,800. The inflation and diminishing enrollment caused by World War II were eased when an Army Training School was established on campus and kept the school alive. In
1949, Pastor Tulloss retired and was succeeded by President Clarence C. Stoughton.

**PRESIDENT STOUGHTON WAS A DRIVING force behind Wittenberg's emergence as a leading liberal arts college.** The University's assets grew to twenty-three million dollars, enrollment increased to 1,850, and the number of buildings totaled twenty-nine. Stoughton is credited also with deepening and broadening Wittenberg's liberal arts concepts, improving the quality of the faculty, sharpening the Christian purpose of the University, building a sense of university community and improving "town-gown" relations.

During Stoughton's tenure, Wittenberg developed its unique Management Development Program for foremen, supervisors, and middle-management personnel from business and industry across the nation. This program has become a national model in the growing field of what is called adult education or "life-long learning." Stoughton vowed that no matter how big Wittenberg became "it must continue to be what it has always been—a place of great teaching and great teachers."

Soon after Dr. John N. Stauffer was named president in 1963, the University opened a new science building, and constructed a hall for music and a high rise residence hall. Six years later, Pastor G. Kenneth Andeen was elected the school's chief officer and Wittenberg was swarming with over 5,000 students who were attending classes either full or part-time.

President Andeen resigned in 1974 and was succeeded by Dr. William A. Kinnison, a native of Springfield and a 1954 graduate of the University. Kinnison served one year as acting president before being named permanently to the post in April of 1975.

In his acceptance speech, Kinnison declared that "Wittenberg has the will and the strength to maintain and increase its effectiveness as a quality, church-related academic institution emphasizing the liberal arts." Then the energetic 44-year old leader began heading a series of constituency-supported efforts to equip Wittenberg to face a future in which an average of one private college will close its doors each month.

Under Kinnison's guidance, a new admissions plan was created which involved the whole campus and which reversed a previous sharp and unexpected drop in freshman enrollment. The first year's efforts showed a ten percent upswing in new students, a trend that has continued into the 1976-77 academic year. A human resources concept, funded by grants from the Lilly and Surdna Foundations which exceeded $150,000, was established to help staff and faculty meet their personal and professional goals. A Faculty Development Organization was initiated to help faculty members redirect their professional careers, and to improve their teaching. An Educational Support Staff Development program was undertaken to sharpen the skills and aspirations of non-academic employees.

**UPON ASSUMING THE PRESIDENCY, KINNISON declared that perhaps the major problem facing the University was that a number of separate groups with legitimate interests were planning incompatible futures for the school.** He appointed a 14-member Commission on Mission and Priorities (CMP) and charged it with creating a statement on institutional mission and a consensus on institutional priorities which would chart the future course of the University. This effort, to be completed in 1977, is being funded by grants from the Lutheran Church in America's Department for Higher Education of the Division for Mission in North America and from the Aid Association for Lutherans.

The CMP's tentative statement of mission holds that the primary concern of Wittenberg University is, and ought to be, to provide a learning environment and a teaching facility of superior quality which is committed to a liberal arts education and is designed to impart knowledge, inspire inquiry, and encourage independent thought.

It is expected that Wittenberg men and women will live responsibly, think critically, judge rationally, communicate effectively, appreciate the aesthetic, and exhibit creativity.

The CMP, which includes representations of all Wittenberg's constituencies (Board of Directors, Faculty, Students, Alumni) also concluded that as a University related to the Lutheran Church in America, Wittenberg seeks to manifest its Christian commitment and Lutheran heritage. For its academic and social integrity, it provides an environment in which all people and diverse beliefs are respected. As a result of its religious heritage, it encourages growth in faith, critical assessment of beliefs, and ethical integrity.

In a move to further define and assess all areas of the University, Kinnison appointed a Task Force on Church Relations to re-examine all issues involving Wittenberg and the supporting Ohio and Indiana-Kentucky Synods and the Lutheran Church in America. Areas to be
examined include continuing education for pastors and lay, use of University facilities and resources, and cooperative programs with other church institutions, agencies, and committees. The examiners include representatives from the University's administration and faculty as well as from both Synods and the Hamma School of Theology.

WITTENBERG'S NEARLY FIFTY YEARS OF COMMITMENT to adult education took a giant stride forward last spring when ground was broken for the Joseph C. Shouvlins Center for Lifelong Learning. Named for a Springfield industrialist who helped Wittenberg get started on its now highly-successful Management Development Program, the one and one-half million dollar building will be the focal point for classes for the non-traditional student outside the 18-22 age range.

In a further move to provide learning for all ages, Wittenberg this fall initiated a program which permits students twenty-six years of age or older to enroll for the first course of undergraduate college work in the day session of Wittenberg College or the School of Music at a fee of fifty dollars on either a credit or an audit basis. Normal admission procedures will be waived. In addition, retired persons sixty years of age or over will be permitted to enroll without charge in University credit or non-credit courses on a "space available" basis. Wittenberg has also adopted the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) which permits college credit to be earned by examination.

Mindful of the criticism arising in some quarters that liberal arts graduates are not educated to do any special job, Kinnison early in his administration supported career counseling efforts. As a result, Wittenberg students now may begin to learn as early as their freshman year what job possibilities lie ahead for graduates with different majors or areas of concentration within the liberal arts context.

More than forty upperclass men and women now occupy a Life and Career Planning Residence Hall headed by a professional director of career planning where many varied programs to acquaint them with career options are being carried out.

Kinnison also restructured Wittenberg's development and public relations departments to take closer aim at funding from alumni, parents of students, friends of the University, foundations, corporations and various governmental agencies. The two departments were incorporated into an Office for University Advancement, and C. David Cornell, who has had many years of successful experience in higher education and in business has been employed to spearhead the new thrust as Vice President for University Advancement.

As a first step toward better orientation and continued effectiveness of the members of the Wittenberg Board of Directors, the University has joined the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). The AGB aids members of boards of non-profit institutions of higher learning to keep abreast of current problems and possible solutions in higher education.

The University, with the help of a firm which specializes in planning learning environments, has embarked on a physical facilities upgrading program to make maximum use of campus buildings through the 1980s. The guidelines call for older buildings to be recycled whenever possible to avoid costlier new construction.

A former chemistry building is about to be renovated into a center for the art department and a theater workshop. This effort is being aided by a Kresge Foundation $100,000 challenge grant. A new library to be built at an estimated cost of at least six million dollars will contain the most modern learning equipment. Health and physical education facilities will be renovated with the physical education building slated for refurbishing along with the addition of an indoor playing area and an Olympic-sized swimming pool. The tennis courts, football stadium, playing fields and running track will be improved. Wittenberg recently acquired 11 acres of land near the campus which is expected to fill student needs for intramural and intercollegiate practice and play space for the next eight to ten years. To secure funds for renovation and construction projects, as well as for endowment for faculty chairs and scholarships, Wittenberg expects to begin a major campaign within the next fifteen to eighteen months to raise at least fifteen million dollars.

It is Wittenberg's aim to provide the best environment in which students can gain the "knowledge, understanding, experience, and participation" which Neil Armstrong held so dear after his walk on the moon. The touchstones of this quest for wisdom at Wittenberg are its great teachers, who display contagious enthusiasm, devotion to the arts, love of students, and an abiding sense of vocation. Apparently, Wittenberg achieves a measure of success in its quest. One of the nation's leading authorities on learning environments said after spending many weeks on the Wittenberg campus, "You do here what many other schools only say they do, which is to really care for students and to give them individual attention."
THE NOVEL IS LOST. Sometimes it looks as if it were lost in a swamp, sometimes in a desert, but it is lost anyway.

The traditional novel is based on a belief in realism, and realism is suffering from paralysis. No one has the courage to tackle contemporary society head-on. That's not surprising. When the novel was in its heyday people still thought they could cope with life, understand reality, re-order human existence, explain human behavior, and control politics. Now there is a breakdown of confidence in the solidity of this world, and increasing doubt as to whether science will ever adequately explain it.

The universe has always been a confusing place. But today there is more than confusion, there is a kind of terror caused by the physical assault upon the psyche of ordinary people which makes patience and concentration difficult. It is partly due to a kind of plastic expression of the most degrading thoughts and feelings in television, newspapers, hoardings, films, forms, and buildings. Naked power is everywhere, and disguised power skulks behind it dominating, deceiving, and pursuing people.

It seems impossible to assimilate and digest events, to gain time and clarity to order and purify experience to the point at which it can be understood. The continual flood of low impressions saps energy and makes people depressed and irritable.

In self-defense the novel retreats into triviality, dealing with such questions as whether the professor's wife will or will not get into bed with the young drug-addict; or into violence, tarting everything up with sex and sadism. People retreat into magic, seeking in it not the traditional truth from which it grew but the sensationalism of its crudest manifestations. Or they read biography instead of realistic fiction as if to anchor themselves in plain fact.

Science Fiction and fantasy are an escape from this situation and have their own dangers. But Science Fiction is certainly not an escape from the problems themselves. It is possibly the only genre which tries seriously to grapple with root problems, the only form in which writers deal with ideas. Science Fiction fizzes and buzzes with ideas, and some of the suggestions it makes are of urgent importance.

But in general it lacks body, and so it lacks warmth and authenticity. It lacks these things because it retreats from the reality of human beings into the realm of ideas. It is difficult to be at home enough in a future world to relax among human beings. In bad Science Fiction the author is always trying to convince himself that we are finding whatever he has imagined both real and surprising, while he himself knows that it is not real and not surprising, because he has just invented it. You know the kind of thing: "Dak Grodek raised the beaker of golden liquid to his lips and smiled. The frandog
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shimmered in its translucent envelope. ‘Take it easy, thought-baby,’ Groddek said.”

No, we just will not believe, deep down, that Elsewhere is like Here in just that particular way and not in another way which the writer hasn’t thought of. Because of course nothing real is imaginable at all. It simply is.

In the best Science Fiction, the best fantasy, there is nothing worked out or arduously invented, it is all seen. A vision is embodied, and moves. It both moves in itself, and it moves us. For this to be possible, something real has to be there, and has to be felt now, just as it is, and so comes as an entire surprise to reader and writer alike. And because it is so surprising, it is inevitable. Books which achieve this are rare, in the same way that miracles are rare.

The limitations of Science Fiction lie then in the fact that its worlds lack real inhabitants and the writing tends to be inadequate to cope with the fund of ideas and the complexity of the material it has to deal with. Too often the plots are those of a tearaway thriller. A good rule of thumb is: the more complicated the plot, the less confidence the writer has in it.

DISTINCT FROM SCIENCE FICTION, BUT CONFUSED WITH IT, are a variety of forms of fantasy and a type of historical novel pitched somewhere between history and fantasy. All answer to the urgent need which people feel for another dimension of reality—for otherwhere wherewith all here is salted. And all are in danger of falling into self-indulgence and so losing connection with life as it is.

We can go into history or fantasy wearing a mask and answering to blind psychological need or we can go in seeking truth and using as a touchstone authentic perception of how things are in a real world. If we do the first we wander into a swamp. If the second, there is a chance of finding treasure.

The type of historical novel I mentioned has produced books of permanent value—John Cowper Powy’s *Porius* and Owen Glendower, for example, and L. H. Myers’ *The Near and the Far*. Profound contemplation and wild vision combined to produce David Lindsay’s masterpiece, *A Voyage to Arcturus*, published in 1920, a metaphysical outburst of extraordinary power, which is now classed as Science Fiction although Lindsay had never heard of that category. There are Neil M. Gunn’s wise and limpid *Green Isle of the Great Deep* and Robert Graves’ characteristically sharp and quirky *Seven Days in New Crete*.

Science Fiction has produced James Blish’s *A Case of Conscience*, Ray Bradbury’s *The Silver Locusts*, Kurt Vonnegut’s *Player Piano* and *Sirens of Titan*, and one or two other things with the power to affect the imagination at a depth, like Nigel Kneale’s television plays *Quatermass and the Pit* and *The Stone Tapes*.

The fact is that all the restless changing of form and method in literature is simply the twisting and turning of writers trying to overcome the difficulties peculiar to themselves, common to them all and common to us all.
THE MORE YOU LEARN ABOUT WRITING, THE more difficult it becomes. Eventually it’s impossible, and that is the beginning of wisdom. In order to write better a man has to see more ruthlessly and more clearly. The more clearly he sees, the more plainly his own errors and confusions stare him in the face. He knows that nothing he has written is entirely true, and that the flaws in his work are flaws in the writer. He will not admit it, but he knows it.

Many a writer goes through life searching vainly for a form and method that will break the psychological unease which spoils his work, and will free him to express satisfactorily what he has in it to say. Because of failure to find the right theme or method a man may grow dumb, incoherent, extravagant, or discouraged. Some quirk, obstinacy, impatience, confusion, fear, unhappiness prevents him from hooking the fish he is after, however many casts he makes.

Not only has every writer got weaknesses, and so therefore have his books, he has a particular weakness, a major fault, a chief feature. The reader must not dwell on this fault if he is to enjoy the writer, nor must the writer dwell on it if he is to create literature. Normally he is not conscious of it at all, and if you pointed it out to him he would not believe you. His books surround this weakness, trying to hide it. Sometimes they are written simply to assault it. No writer succeeds finally in overcoming the weakness: the struggle makes the work.

To take an instance, Kurt Vonnegut’s fierce and ironic detachment may well express a fascinated loathing for life itself and an effort to at once confront and evade his sense of horror. When the tension falls, the quality evaporates. What is valuable in Vonnegut or anyone else is true perceptions vividly embodied; success has not helped him in this. By lowering the tension it has confused his vision and made self-indulgence inevitable. The result is an emphasis on cleverness of presentation rather than insight, demonstrated in Breakfast of Champions.

The weaknesses which a writer is trying to conceal may in fact prove to be the very qualities which make a particular book popular, for it is at the point of weakness that a writer strikes a pose which he prefers to acceptance of things as they really are, and the acceptance of himself as he really is.

If the attitude struck by the author is one that appeals to critics and public because it gives them a sense of release from their own conflicts and frustrations, it will catch on, and the writer may get rich and find himself like someone in a rage, shaking his fist in the air, who is turned suddenly into stone.

J. R. R. TOLKIEN WAS PROBABLY AMAZED BY his cult following. He was for many years a man playing with his world like a child with toy soldiers, and he was also a scholar fascinated by language and Norse mythology. But the world he built up has nothing of the stark matter-of-fact realism of the Sagas. It is softer, mistier, and less pure. I am not suggesting that his success was due to his weaknesses. It was also due to his strength, which is a wonderful instinct for story-line and suspense. His weakness—haloes, heroes, and rigging the result. Unfortunately the cult follows the weaknesses.

Temptations lurk everywhere in writing and no one resists all of them. In choosing one word rather than another, one event rather than another, a writer tests each for truth, like biting a coin to find out if it’s counterfeit. And if he tests one scene and finds that it won’t ring true and he cannot think of another, then he is paralyzed, perhaps for years, until something new stirs in him if he only tests for effect—will it make people cry—the final result will be false. And if he only tests for its making him feel how clever he is, that is disaster. What makes him feel clever when he has just written it will make him feel terrible a year later.

If he is facing a problem in a story which he cannot cope with in life, he may force the solution in writing. That means he strikes a pose. The situation is one which a man as the writer knows him to be would find it difficult to cope with. But a brilliant tactician or a tough egg or a sage or a hero or a wizard or a simple ordinary fellow who isn’t a simple ordinary fellow at all would deal with it. So his character deviates from being a man as his author knows him to be and becomes something else.

Frodo in The Lord of the Rings is intended to be real in the sense that he is human or hobbitish—less than a king, less than an elf, less than a hero. He has frailties; therefore, we can identify with him. But, it’s worth asking, why is Bilbo a more convincing character than Frodo? Because Bilbo’s weaknesses are natural and spontaneous, whereas Frodo’s are willed by the author. Tolkien did not invest in Bilbo, he was simply amused by him and felt affectionate towards him. But he invested heavily in Frodo, and Frodo suffers from it.

On the whole the fault of most fantasy is to divorce the sublime from the common, and by doing that to falsify reality. The ultimate and only human solution is to at once “attain to the sublime and perform the common task.” “I draw water, I chop wood—miraculous deeds and acts of wonder.” It is the formula of the Tao Te Ching: “Man follows Earth, Earth follows Heaven, Heaven follows the Way, the Way is what it is.”

THE MAN WHO IS SLY ENOUGH TO EVADE A blockage while keeping his eye on the road ahead will get through, and when he gets through will be able to deal with contemporary reality, whether he writes fantasy, Science Fiction, or anything else. It is contemporary reality in some form that he has to deal with if he is to solve his problem. The problem lies in the here and now; it won’t go away, whether he likes it or not. But of course it is not the contemporaneousness that matters, but the permanent underlying truth about the nature of human life.

To me no novel—fun and games apart—is worth reading unless the author has seen something and found it necessary
to communicate something of fundamental and permanent importance about the nature of reality. If a novel is about something fundamental, the date or place in which it is set is merely a matter of convention or artistic intuition.

The most interesting feature of the historical novel or the Science Fiction novel—that its action seems to take place in the past and the present, or the future and the present, at the same time—gives them an ambiguity, an ambience, a resonance of a peculiar and intriguing kind. The double dimension must remain ambiguous and concealed. A too obvious and pressed parallelism between past and present or future and present is fatal to a work of art.

L. H. Myers wrote in the foreword to his great novel *The Near and the Far*

This is not a historical novel, although the action is placed in the time of Akbar the Great Mogul (who was a contemporary of Queen Elizabeth's), nor is it an attempt to portray oriental modes of living and thinking. I have done what I liked with history and geography as well as with manners and customs. Facts have been used when they were useful, or ignored and distorted when they were inconvenient. . . . In choosing 16th Century India as a setting, my object was to carry the reader out of our familiar world into one where I could — without doing violence to his sense of reality — give prominence to certain chosen aspects of human life and illustrate their significance. It has certainly not been my intention to set aside the social and ethical problems that force themselves upon us at the present time. On the contrary, my hope has been that we might view them better from the distant vantage ground of an imaginary world.

But, of course, if that was all he did he would have failed in warmth—just as that foreword itself fails in warmth. And this is the only book of Myers' in which the warmth is real and the richness tangible. His novels of contemporary life tend to be cold and thin.

Thornton Wilder said in an interview

I think you would find that in my work there is a gradual drawing near to the America I know. I began with the purely fantastic 20th Century Rome; then Peru; then Hellenistic Greece. I began, first with *Heaven's My Destination*, to approach the American scene. Already, in the one-act plays, I had become aware of how difficult it is to invest one's contemporary world with the same kind of imaginative life one has extended to those removed in time and place. But I always feel that the progression is there and visible; I can be seen collecting the practice, the experience and courage to present my own time.

One more case. David Lindsay's *A Voyage to Arcturus* begins in a drawing room. I believe he may have meant it to continue there. But at a certain point vision takes over and explodes into light, shooting him off to a planet of the star Arcturus. What do I mean by vision? Something seen vividly and explicitly and related with perfect clarity to the touchstone of truth in experience. In other words, it does not matter whether we are talking about realism, fantasy, Science Fiction, historical fiction, or what, we are talking about truth.

What a writer discovers about recording an event, he discovers about the event itself, and the result of this discovery is a method of observation as it were through the eyes of a witness within him which is always objective, rather than through the eyes of the everyday self, which is *never* objective. But that of course is the end of the quest, and most of us never get within miles of it.

In any case, you may say, why should a writer concern himself with truth? Why should he not simply set out to entertain his reader, have fun, show off, make money? A reader may feel "I would prefer the writer to strike an impressive attitude, to enliven events by stylish exaggeration, romantic falsification, brutal over-emphasis, or evasive literary grace. It's more entertaining that way."

Yes. But the impressive attitude, stylishness, and so on are all ways of lying. Many people—most people, perhaps—prefer falsehood to truth, but this doesn't make truth any the less true or falsehood any the less false.

It is in fact the nature of the writer's discipline to concern himself with truth. He cannot do otherwise and retain any sense of vocational integrity. Even though the imaginary scene a writer is trying to describe may be false to his experience—for example, one man being besieged by two impossibly lovely women—in his effort to describe the scene he must choose one word rather than another, one phrase rather than another. Each such choice is a moral choice in the sense that the more exactly he visualizes it the more real the scene will become for the reader; and the more exactly the words he chooses express what he sees, the closer he gets to the truth of his imaginary world. This and no other is his immediate aim. So that even though the scene is false, the writer cannot avoid the attempt to be truthful to it, and he is committed to the necessity for some form of the truth despite himself.

A writer's deliberate choice of imaginative falsehood to imaginative truth finally destroys not only the ability to express anything solid and significant at all but the actual ability to describe vividly and accurately the false vision he aims to display.

A writer has a job to do. He is driven by necessity to write. Exploration of the nature of his job involves a rigorous concentration upon the effort to speak the truth. Acceptance of the vocation of writing increases pride, self-consciousness, vanity, detachment, honesty, and subtlety, and brings a man to the point where he topples on the edge of a hole through into another world. And that is the point which matters. Because unless this world is shot through with light from another it is not real.
Writing about my work leaves me feeling like the elephant being described by blind men. It can hold a memory, build a wall, make me some space, or simply be a sort of driven fun. Making a painting or print is like a juggling act. It isn't mysterious, it just gets complicated. Perhaps it is best explained in other terms—like writing a story in which plot, subplots, pacing, character development, must all be dealt with and hammered into a unified whole. In painting one deals with colors, their cultural associations, rhythms, texture, scale, etc. It is a tradition and a vocabulary. In representational work, the object dictates or at least suggests many of the choices. In work which isn't representational, everything is up for grabs, and the criteria is no longer how much something looks like something else, but on how all of the elements fit together and on how many levels they fit together. That is what interests me most—the orchestration. The starting point for much of my work is the attempt to reconcile opposing elements so that each can maintain its own identity and yet seem inconceivable without the other—like making Chicago's monstrous black Clyfoord still give off the seductive disorienting glow of some of Dan Flavin's work.

I think that for now, the paintings are closer to my intentions than the prints. It's unfortunate that they're generally fairly close in value so that they don't photograph well in black and white.

William DeHoff, "TRACE," Intaglio print, 1976, 18 x 24

William DeHoff, "RELICS," Lithograph, 1975, 17 x 15.
KENNETH REXROTH

FIVE TRANSLATIONS

My heart emptied,
All pity quiet,
Still I am moved, as
A snipe rises and flies away
In the autumn dusk.

Kokoro-naki
Mi nimo aware wa
Shirare keri
Shigi tatsu sawano
Ake no yagure

SAIGYO (SATO NORIKYO)

I sleep alone,
On my tearstained pillow,
Like an abandoned boat,
Adrift on the sea.

Hitori neru yo wa
Namida no tokono
Fukaki umibe no
Sute obune

ANONYMOUS

SAIGYO (1118-1190) was descended from the Fujiwara. His secular name was Sato Norikyo. He was a favorite of the ex-Emperor Toba and a famous archer. At 23 he left his wife and children and became a monk and travelled throughout Japan reciting poetry and preaching. He inaugurates with Shunzei and Teika a new phase of the Japanese poetic sensibility.
In the open sea
With the thousand birds
Crying around me,
How can I ever give up
The life of a sailor?

Oki chidori no
Naku koe kikeba
Funa mori kagyō ga
Yameraryo ka

ANONYMOUS

The moon is full
The night is very still
My heart beats
Like a bell.

Tsuki wa saerushi
Yo wa shin shin to
Kokoro bososa yo
Kane no koe

ANONYMOUS

It is the time of rain and snow
I spend sleepless nights
And watch the frost
Frail as your love
Gather in the dawn.

Ame mofuri
Yuki mofurumeru
Kono koro o
Asashimo to nomi
Okiite wa miru

IZUMI SHIKIBU

IZUMI SHIKIBU (Shikibu is a title) was born in the last quarter of the tenth century and was a contemporary of Murasaki Shikibu, Sei Shōnagon, Ise Tayu, a group of great women writers unsurpassed in the history of any literature. Her story of one of her many love affairs, the Izumi Shikibu Nikki, is a masterpiece of Japanese prose.
TO CRITICIZE THE CRITIC: ARNOLD ON RELIGION

IN HIS INTRODUCTION to Matthew Arnold: Selected Essays, Noel Annan remarks: "The great critics are those who provoke our intense disagreement and in so doing disturb us. Arnold nearly always succeeds in getting under our skin."

Those words aptly describe my reaction to Arnold’s writings on religion and the Bible. Arnold succeeds in disturbing me, in getting under my skin because of his peculiar blend of insight and opacity, sensitivity and insensitivity. He is certainly right in admonishing theologians who argue over petty differences, who try to prove miracles and infallibility where there can be no such certitude, for he sees that their effect is more destructive than instructive. He is certainly right in trying to restore religion to the common man by teaching him to read the Bible sensibly and imaginatively, and he is sensible in noting that the Bible is an expression of conduct, a great inward movement. But Arnold is wrong in demanding a basis for belief in verification by human experience and psychological insight, especially when both turn out to be his. And he is wrong in dismissing, almost nonchalantly, the metaphysical dimension in religious writings.

With somewhat of a utilitarian air, Arnold chooses Literature and Dogma for a popular, inexpensive edition in 1883. He tells us in his preface:

I do not, however, choose for the experiment of a popular edition this book, merely because it admits of being shortened, or because it has been much in demand. I choose it far more for the reason that I think it of all my books in prose, the one most important (if I may say so) and most capable of being useful.

And useful it is, too, for in it Arnold sensibly and clearly teaches the layman (if not the divine) how to read the Bible. The first thing we must understand, he points out, is that the language in the Bible is not scientific language, as many theologians would have us believe, but rather literary language. We must not fix definite and rigid meanings to words, such as "grace," "new birth," and "justification," as found in St. Paul. Even the word "God" is used poetically:

But, in truth, the word "God" is used in most cases as by no means a term of science or exact knowledge, but a term of poetry and eloquence, a term thrown out, so to speak, at a not fully grasped object of the speaker’s consciousness, a literary term, in short . . .

(LD 171)

One must not base his belief in Christianity and the Bible on miracles and prophecies, Arnold feels, especially in an age such as his when great strides were being made in science. Science may easily disprove such a belief, just as, for instance, Darwin’s theory of evolution undermined the creation account in Genesis, and one may be in jeopardy of losing his faith. Such a literal, factual basis for belief, Arnold notes, is even admonished by Christ himself: “Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe!” This is “as much as to say,” comments Arnold, “Believe on right grounds you cannot, and you must needs believe on wrong!” (LD 261) In short, Arnold is right when he tells us the language of the Bible is not scientific language but rather literary language and that it must be read accordingly.

THE OBJECT OF RELIGION, says Arnold, is conduct, and conduct constitutes, “at the very lowest computation” (LD 173), three-fourths of human life. Arnold says that “conduct is really, however men may overlay it with philosophical disquisitions, the simplest thing in the world. That is to say, it is the simplest thing in the world as far as understanding is concerned; as regards doing, it is the hardest thing in the world” (LD 173–173). The great lesson of the Old Testament is “righteousness,” a word Arnold equates with conduct. Likewise, the great concern of the New Testament is righteousness, only righteousness reached through a particular means, Jesus Christ. He sums up the Old Testament in one sentence: “O ye that love the Eternal, see that ye hate the thing which is evil! to him that ordereth his conversation right shall be shown the salvation of God” (LD 175–176). He sums up the New Testament in this sentence: “Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity!” (LD 175)

Arnold says that for Israel (the writer of the Old Testament) God was “the power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness” (LD 368). The great value of the Bible is that the Power is expressed in the Old Testament itself. This is Arnold’s answer to those who ask, since there is an enduring power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness, why we may not learn it from other teachers or from other books?
“Why?” answers Arnold, “‘why, because this Power is revealed in Israel and the Bible, and not by other teachers and books! that is, there is infinitely more of him there, he is plainer and easier to come at, and incomparably more impressive’” (LD 370).

Arnold is perceptive in explaining Jesus’ message in the New Testament, too. The great work of Jesus Christ was that he restored the inner vision: “He came, it is true, to save, and to give eternal life; but the way in which he did this was by restoring the intuition” (LD 284-285). In this method, secret, and temper, Jesus restored for us “the power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness” (LD 368). Arnold says that the method (metanoia) of Jesus was the setting up of “an immense new inward movement for obtaining one’s rule of life” (LD 288-289). Metanoia for Arnold is not the commonly translated “repentance,” but rather “A change of the inner man” (LD 289).

Christ says,

The things that come from within a man’s heart, they defile him! cleanse the inside of the cup! beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is insincerity! judge not after the appearance, but judge righteous judgment! (LD 288)

This inward method, which Arnold equates with the Socratic “know thyself,” is the method of Jesus.

What is needed now is a rule of action, and this is provided in Jesus secret (necrosis) or “dying.” Arnold relates Jesus’ secret to the Pauline doctrine of two selves: “St. Paul contrasts them as the inward man, and the man in our members; the mind of the flesh, and the spiritual mind. Jesus contrasts them as life, properly so named, and life in this world” (LD 292). This secret, which St. Paul has discovered, is the dying to the lower self and the world in order to rise to a higher, moral self and experience a spiritual regeneration in this life. If the method finds out what righteousness is and the secret shows how to achieve it, Jesus’ temper (epieikeia) makes for a perfect balance of the two. Arnold calls this Jesus’ “unerring balance, his intuition, his sweet reasonableness” (LD 352). In short, Arnold sees that the great lesson of the New Testament is simply, “Follow Jesus.”

WITH ALL OF THIS I HAVE no quarrel, for it is an intelligent and sensitive reading of the Bible. But Arnold, in remaining completely humanistic in his interpretation, does not go far enough; he presents a closed system. That is, simply because he recognizes that the Bible makes perfectly good sense in human terms, simply because he has found in Christianity “the firm foundation for human life . . . and the true source for us of strength, joy, and peace” (LD 144), it need not make sense for us in divine terms. But religion, which is literature in its highest or anagogic phase, like all literature, works through the particular to the universal, and it is incomplete criticism to curtail its expressiveness. Arnold, having given us a very good definition of metaphor in the Bible—“language thrown out at an object of consciousness not fully grasped” (LD 189)—should have known better.

But even this is not my real argument, for if Arnold were presenting a humanistic, purely literary reading of the Bible as poetry which offers us a model of inward conduct, a morality touched with emotion, indeed, a criticism of life, I could, at least, agree with him. But to maintain that such a reading can still be religion, still be Christianity with a ministering Church, is nonsense. Yet, over and over, Arnold tells us this is his aim:

The object of Literature and Dogma is to re-assure those who feel attachment to Christianity, to the Bible, but who recognize the growing discredit befalling miracles and the supernatural. Such persons are to be re-assured, not by disguising or extenuating the discredit which has befallen miracles and the supernatural, but by insisting on the natural truth of Christianity. (LD 142-143)

For Arnold, the natural truth of Christianity is that which can be verified in human experience. But religion is man’s attempt at formulating intimations of a higher order. Arnold is wrong and somewhat blind in his assertion that the Bible contains no metaphysics:

But surely, if there be anything with which metaphysics have nothing to do, and where a plain man, without skill to walk in the arduous paths of abstruse reasoning, may yet find himself at home, it is religion. (LD 172)

As Noel Annan says,

The metaphysics that Arnold laid so lightly aside are age-long answers to questions that men have put about their predicament in this world and their relation to God and the universe and a world to come.3

THERE ARE SEVERAL REASONS, I believe, which contribute to Arnold’s misjudgments concerning religion. One is that, despite his constant cries that the Bible is literature and not science, he himself demands the scientific method for his investigation: “For whatever is to stand [in the Bible] must rest upon something which is verifiable, not unverifiable” (LD 149). Or again, he says,

Here, then, is the problem: to find, for the Bible, for Christianity, for our religion, a basis in something which can be verified, instead of in something which has to be assumed. (LD 150)

But religion is not science, and the intimations of a spiritual order that man has gleaned cannot be verified through the scientific method. At best, as T. S. Eliot says in The Four Quartets, there

3Annan, p. xiii.
... are only hints and guesses, 
Hints followed by guesses; and 
the rest 
Is prayer, observance, discipline, 
thought and action.4

This is why Arnold is wrong when he claims that “faith, instead of being a submission of the reason to what puzzles it, is rather a recognition of what is perfectly clear . . .” (LD 313). And this is why, contrary to Arnold’s opinion, Cardinal Newman is right when he says:

The moral trial involved in faith 
. . . lies in the submission of the 
reason to external realities par­
tially disclosed. . . . Faith is, in its 
very nature, the acceptance of 
what our reason cannot reach, 
simply and absolutely upon testi­
mony. (LD 312-313)

One may ask at this point, What is 
Arnold’s “power, not ourselves, that 
makes for righteousness” (LD 368), if it is not an assumption?

Second, Arnold suggests, some­times explicitly, sometimes in his 
tone, that people in his day were simply getting too smart for tradi­tional religion. In God and the Bible, he speaks of “the stage of experience where men are now arrived” (GB 389):

It is the habit of increased intellec­tual seriousness, bred of a wider 
experience and of a larger 
acquaintance with men’s mental 
history, which is now transform­ing 
religion in our country. Intelligent 
people among the educated 
classes grow more and more 
sceptical of the miraculous data 
which supply the basis for our 
received theology. The habit is a 
conquest of the advancing 
human race; it spreads and 
spreads, and will be on the whole 
and in the end a boon to us. (GB 390)

It is beyond me how anyone so 
steeped in literature as Arnold can 
believe in such concepts as “the 
avancing human race,” “a wider 
experience,” and “a larger 
acquaintance with men’s mental 
history.” Arnold seems here to be 
considering wisdom as cumulative, 
as if it were science. This naïveté 
also manifests itself in Arnold’s 
claim that “Israel shows no talent for 
metaphysics” (LD 241), or that we 
must not credit the Hebrew writers 
“with our own dubious science, 
deduced from metaphysical ideas 
which they never had” (LD 200).

Lastly, Arnold’s ethical idealism 
has led him astray. We find it in his 
assumption that there is a “power, 
not ourselves, that makes for 
righteousness” (LD 368). His 
idealism leads him to say in St. Paul 
and Protestantism:

The miserable sense of sin from 
unrighteousness, the joyful win­
ness of a good conscience from 
righteousness, these . . . are facts of 
human nature and can be veri­
ified. (SPP 33)

This is certainly humanism of the 
highest order, but it is the humanism 
of one completely immersed in a 
religious tradition. Even Arnold’s concept of culture—that knowing 
the best that has been said and 
thought in the world can lead to 
moral perfectibility—is not unre­
lated to a religious tradition. T. S. 
Eliot, in “The Humanism of Irving 
Babbitt,” tells us that humanism is 
“auxiliary to and dependent upon 
the religious point of view.”5 True 
humanists, like Arnold, are rare in 
history. Though he denies the super­
natural in the Bible and religion, his 
sense of righteousness, justice, good­ 
ness is thoroughly Christian. But it 
is somewhat ironic, for humanism, 
as Eliot also notes, “will never pro­ 
vide showers of partridges or abun­ 
dance of manna for the chosen 
peoples.”6

---


THEATER — WALTER SORELL

BUT THEY DO MOVE!

ONE OF THE CRITERIA OF 
great art is its lingering effect on our 
thoughts, the provocative message of a play or only a sentence whose 
thought and phrasing may hit home. Sometimes we face a stunningly 
choreographed image of rare beauty 
and meaning in a ballet we cannot 
easily forget. Our memory may also 
play unkind tricks on us and make 
us retain an impression that has 
infuriated us.

Of what I have seen of theatrical 
performances lately, nothing can 
compare with the two revivals of 
Monteverdi operas at the Opernhaus 
in Zurich. It was Claudio Monteverdi 
with whom opera, as we have come 
early to know it, began, even though the 
term for this theatrical art form goes 
back to one of his disciples. Montev­ 
deri wrote a great deal of sacral 
and quite a bit of lighter music, the 
latter having been a skilful imitation 
of the then current fashions. But what 
gives him a superior role in the 
history of the opera is his unique 
ability to translate human emotions 
into sound. He was the first to grasp 
the range of musical expression 
and laid a solid groundwork for other 
giants to follow him: Gluck, Mozart, 
and Wagner.

Very impressive about these 
revivals in Zurich, about Monteverdi’s first 
opus, Orfeo, and his last, L’Incorona­ 
zione di Poppea, were the most metic­
ulous production, recreating the 
visual splendor of early Baroque 
theler with all the modern technical 
means at our disposal, the use of 
contemporary instruments and the 
total integration of the orchestra and 
the singing voices which recaptured 
the very spirit of the early seventeenth 
century, and the staging and the 
visual impact of décors and costumes. 
Many international talents conspired 
to make these two operas unforget­
table experiences, with the conductor 
being Viennese, the stage director
and designer French, and the singers being of diverse nationalities.

The period in which these two operas were composed encompasses thirty-five years of Monteverdi's life, from his youthful beginnings with Orfeo (still based in the world of the sixteenth century Madrigals), to Poppea, a very mature work composed by a man, who eleven years before his death, became a priest without giving up his post as maestro di cappella at St. Mark's in Venice. Poppea, composed a year before his death, is a work that speaks articulately in terms of passion and suffering, of joy and merriment. It is fascinating to hear and see how Monteverdi's own suffering found eloquent expression in his last work.

I was particularly impressed by the staging of these works. For the first time, I saw singers move on an opera stage in a dancing mood becoming an active part in the choreography while singing. This contributed essentially to the feeling of lightness with which these operas unfolded. Movement, of course, has become a central issue on any stage nowadays. I have found an overwhelming number of plays very much aware of and giving meaning to gesture and movement.

If not necessarily the grammar, certainly the syntax of the performing arts has changed a great deal. The stage directors have come to put their personality before the play and have given their motor-mindedness and concepts of stage dynamics first place. A prime example is Peter Brook whose staging of Marat/Sade and A Midsummer Night's Dream has made histrionic history. What we now so often see on stage is choreography which is not necessarily dance.

DURING A SHORT STAY IN New York I have re-seen The Berlin Schiller Theater at the Brooklyn Academy in the production of Samuel Beckett's Waiting for Godot staged by the author. Beckett has been very conscious of the symphonic-choreographic patterns of the dialogue in his play which is, more or less, a sequence of ritualistic routines of a highly communicative significance in a deceptively non-communicative play. More than any other director of his play he tried to evoke the hidden meaning behind the articulations of his downtrodden creatures through gestures, body positions, and facial expression. All this began to strike me as inescapable and significant when I saw this play done in German in an Anglo-Saxon environment.

MAURICE BEJART'S Ballet of the 20th Century, stationed in Brussels, has now been seen on Broadway for the first time. Béjart is less known as a fine stylist of choreographic notions than as a man of the theater who, more often than not, uses movement in an exciting way to capture and stimulate his audiences. Most of his scenic devices are mesmerizing; they are often simple and even simplistic.

I was most interested in his new work, Notre Faust, his free translation of Goethe's Faust into a dance drama. In a most informal way he uses key sentences or, sometimes merely key words, from this poetic play. They were in French and in the German original. To be better understood on Broadway, some of the phrases in French were translated into English. The tri-lingual presentation was, on the one hand, a bit too much Babel (all the more since German and English were spoken with heavy accents), on the other hand, it gave Faust an international touch.

Heinrich Heine had once written a ballet scenario in which Mephistopheles appears in the disguise of a ballerina. Béjart surprised us with a series of metamorphoses which, in a way, seem to be significant, almost in a Kafkaesque manner, and do make sense. At the very outset when Faust voices his doubts about:

Habe nun, ach! Philosophie, Juristerei und Medizin. 
Und leider auch Theologie . . .

the play of metamorphoses begins. But instead of telling my version of it, I let Béjart give his:

To start, everybody is on stage. It is a small cast—twelve boys and myself and eight girls. All soloists . . . they play all the parts. They change costumes, and they come back. We found authentic church clothes in museums and galleries. Every one of them is a museum piece. They are so beautiful . . . two or three hundred years old.

The music is an interesting mixture, the Mass of B Minor of Bach, and all the demonic parts I made on Argentine tangos. We use almost three-quarters of the mass. I dance mostly the tangos. It's half funny, half parodic. I dance tango like Gene Kelly would dance tango.

I found out that Faust was like a religious ceremony for Goethe, so the story happens inside a ceremony, which is like a magic black mass. They put on those enormous church clothes, and when the crosses and chalices—everything is real. So it really looks like a black mass.

I start as old Faust. Then young Mephistopheles arrives. When Faust wants to become young, we change personalities. So he becomes the young Faust, and I become the old Mephistopheles. Every time young Faust wants to meet one of the three women he falls in love with, he never meets the woman, because the woman is dancing abstract. And I myself put on the costume of the woman and act the role for him. I put on a mask like in the Kabuki, and I have huge costumes like in the Noh theatre, and do very little movements—slow movements—at the same time the girl is dancing. It was in my mind to use the old religious theatre ceremonies where the man takes the woman's role. It is something that I have been thinking about for a long time.

Did Béjart succeed? He succeeded brilliantly in the first part. What was happening on stage was electricifying in the finest theatrical tradition. But the second part, with the exception of one or two ideas, was less impressive. Perhaps the surprise had worn off by then, perhaps there were a few empty stretches when my mind had time to wander off and to think of some Goethean lines. It was probably too big and daring an artistic endeavor to swallow both parts of Faust and to hope to get away with it without giving the artistic devil his due.
IN SOME RESPECTS MELANCTHON felt at home. The mass was being conducted in a university center. Some of the celebrants were humanists whom he respected. All the participants affirmed theological allegiance to the Augsburg Confession. He enjoyed being with the communicants of all ages and conditions of men who crossed the river and moved through the streets of the town in a long disorderly procession to the church nave. The nave was crowded so he found a place in the balcony. The church was overheated in competition with the rigors of Wisconsin Pentecost season, but he did not mind. He removed his coat as country people had taught him to do at midsummer services and joined in the singing of the familiar opening hymn. At the close of the hymn of praise he became more and more confused. The liturgy was based on a modified version of Contemporary Liturgy #4, but since he did not have a church bulletin his participation became more and more erratic. At one point he thought he could participate in the affirmation of the Nicene Creed but his Greek was of no avail. The new version had some resemblance to the journaliase of Time Magazine. He never did find out how the filioque clause was handled. From this point on his critical faculties were aroused and he found himself analyzing the good and bad features of the service, emphasizing Luther’s point that one should not judge one’s fellow Christians negatively but “put the most charitable construction on all his actions.”

Certainly the intentions of the clergy who were responsible for this liturgical innovation were laudable. They intended to offer an opportunity for Christian worship to use contemporary language and music. The jazz combo, however, should never have been placed behind the altar and the communion table. The altar and the cross should be the center of attention, and no jazz band no matter how devout its members can appear before an audience without demanding and receiving their full share of attention. They are trained to produce a sufficient volume of sound to compel listeners to attend to the persistent beat. The combo should have been placed in the balcony.

The confession of sins which opens the Lutheran service was in this case dedicated to enumerating the sins of all conditions of men, but somehow did not seem to get around to including perennial difficulties with the basic theological virtues of faith, hope, and love. The confession did seem to include almost everything else. It was a strange combination of frank accusation right out of the Old Testament and the editorializing of the daily press releases. Melanchthon confronted with this massive compilation of sins which he had never even thought of committing and too confused to examine his own sins, gave up and read a penitential psalm.

The kiss of peace, the reconciliation of the brethren, should have been accompanied with an appropriate hymn so that participation could be achieved for all even those who thought of themselves as “pilgrims and strangers.” As it was, the mixed multitude became a jumbled mass of humanity under the stimulation of the clergy who emerged from the sanctuary like a pack of beagles. If only the combo had come on with “Baby I’ll See You Again,” and the clapping of hands a real hootenany might have ensued. No one spoke in tempo, but there was certainly a confusion of noise and bodies in motion reminding one of the rush hour in a city terminal. Melanchthon turned to his hymnal and read “Now Thank We all Our God.” He was sorry only four of the twenty verses had been translated for the hymnal since the commotion continued a long
time and the combo really began "to dig it." It was hard to think peace when there was no peace.

IT IS NOT EASY TO MODERNIZE the Sacrament of the Altar. A sinful, anguished, dying people trying to be the people of God received the gift of God as always and Melanchthon was one of them. But even at this point the voice of the critic could not be stilled. He waited patiently, listened intently throughout the long eucharistic prayer, the source unknown, and no footnotes or textual references provided. He never heard the word of promise, the words of institution. How does one respond in faith to an icon, even to a symbol in absence of the Word? He did not know the answer. No amount of good intentions could excuse this oversight in a celebrant of the evangelical heritage. He had come with his fellow Christians to receive the communion. Should he excommunicate himself from the church? If he communed would he be communing with a church which had overnight become a church of schismatics? Melanchthon sighed and thought of the Zwischen prophet-s at Wittenberg in 1521. Where else could he turn? Where could he go? No misguided, well-intentioned, psychedelic priest could keep him from being a participating communicant with God's holy Christian people. In this manner Melanchthon resisted the temptation of intellectual, critical pride. It wasn't an easy victory. Maybe it was no victory at all. But then Melanchthon always was timid, perhaps even something of a coward. And since he was a layman he never had the responsibility of shepherding the Holy Synod at a communion service for Twentieth Century, mid-American Lutherans.

It took two bird walks and the reading of ten chapters of Romans before Melanchthon finally achieved sufficient theological equilibrium to take his place among the voting delegates of the Holy Synod the morning after.

COMMUNICATION: III
(concluded from page 28)

opportunities to meet basic and widespread human need.

However, a special measure of responsibility rests also on ministers and teachers. As respected practitioners of the communication arts, they serve as models. Whether consciously or unconsciously, many students tend to pattern their speech behavior after the example their teachers set. When pastors and professors demonstrate in their own lecture, conversation, and instruction habits that they have a great concern for verbal precision and factual accuracy, when they avoid glib generalizations, when they carefully qualify broad, cosmic comments, when they circumscribe their evaluations of fellow human beings with cautions against attempting to read hearts, judge motives, or otherwise assume an omniscient stance into areas where human intellect does not have the power to probe, when they indicate their awareness of the subtle differences between subjective, connotative, often biased analyses and objective, denotative, more exact reporting of a situation—such patterns of speech behavior are bound to make an impression. People not only note them but they try to imitate the example of the ministers and teachers whom they respect. Good communication example is clearly one of the most effective ways to get more people to adopt good communication habits.

Example, however, is— I believe— only the first step. It ought to be followed and reinforced and brought to conscious levels of growth efforts by a systematic program of careful communication training. Moral and ethical concerns and objectives are involved. God, in His Word, challenges His children to be careful for accurate teaching, honest and truthful in their conversation about their neighbor, and in general to show that their communication behavior reflects a Spirit-led determination to speak God's truth faithfully and to reflect a disposition of kindness and tenderheartedness toward one's human associates—a combination that is so aptly covered in the Apostle Paul's phrase "speaking the truth in love."

Few people, of course, will argue with this principle. The problem is putting it into practice. What are the techniques, what are the specific speech actions that are involved? How does one avoid watering down truth, how does one avoid diluting the soothing tenderness of considerate kindness and fellow-compassion. Admittedly, there are fine lines here and there are verbal skills. This kind of communication involves an art—a Christian art—that must be learned and practiced. Somehow, it seems to me, training procedures should be incorporated into religion courses where morality and ethics are taught. And the earlier the better. Children's religion courses, including confirmation classes, should include training and exercises in Christian ways of talking, geared to a variety of communication situations. Such practical, speech-habit skills training should be elaborated with attention to principles, philosophy, and morality-ethics at the Christian high school and college level. In addition, adult institutes, seminars, or workshops should round out the effort to bring systematic Christian communication training to all levels.

Finally, public media, because of their patent communication power, also have a heavy responsibility. Hopefully, Christian print and visual media managers would accept the responsibility for participating in a comprehensive skill training, so that each segment of the communication training community can demonstrate its awareness of the importance of this problem and its willingness to aid in a determined program to improve our use of our God-given communication abilities in a way that will reflect Christian principles and practices.
COMMUNICATION: III

WHAT IS THE CHIEF problem with communication? Communication, as I indicated in the two previous issues of this journal, breaks down because the message that is sent and the message that is received is often not the same, even though people assume it is the same.

What contributes to this breakdown? I suggest that a primary cause is that people have erroneous ideas about communication. Let me name a few.

One, people often assume that words have inherent meanings. Two, people assume that what they hear is what people say. Three, people like to believe that their own particular definition of a word is sacrosanct. Four, people often operate on the assumption that the true meanings of words are found only in their cognitive definitions, exclusive of feeling, heart, and spirit. Five, a popular view is that once a word appears in print it takes on a kind of inviolable character, apart from the consensual meanings that human beings agree to attach to them. And this is not an exhaustive list.

The point is that, when accepted without qualification, notions like these are erroneous. Some are never true. Others may be true sometimes but not always. Yet the fact that people think of them as invariably true has enormous consequences for the process of communication.

Intelligent communication, I want to stress, is a great gift of God. It sets mankind apart from the nonrational creation. Certainly, it is one of the factors that moved the Psalmist to extol mankind as "a little lower than the angels." Yet the erroneous ideas about it cause great difficulties.

HOW CAN THE PROBLEMS OF communication be minimized? How can erroneous ideas be corrected? How can we take man's unique communication ability and use it for maximum human benefit? Let me, as a starter, offer two suggestions, realizing that these suggestions only open the door to a more comprehensive program of communication growth.

First, it would help if we all kept in mind that both verbal and nonverbal communication has many ambiguities. The dictionary often lists from two to ten variant definitions for the same word. Add to this the fact that people "color" word meanings by emphasis, inflection, and intonation. Also note that people sometimes use a word in a self-adopted non-dictionary sense. It all adds up to potential communication short-circuiting.

What does this mean in application? It means that we have to develop greater sensitivities to the matter of understanding one another correctly. We have to avoid taking the process for granted. We have to train ourselves to listen as well as talk. We have to increasingly develop skills in the correlation of the sending and receiving aspects of the communication process.

Second, it would also help if we "gave the devil his due" in regard to communication. The devil has found that the gift of communication which can be used for great good, can, when left to the promptings of man's sinful nature, be turned to great harm. There are few sins that have been more prevalent or more destructive in the history of mankind than what the Eighth Commandment calls "false witness," which Luther explains includes lying, betraying, slandering, defaming, as well as the subtle but devastating practice of putting the worst, rather than the best, construction on our neighbor's words and deeds. It must be admitted, however, that humans often fall into these sins unwittingly. And it would help if they knew more about the intricacies of the communication process. For example, to differentiate between true and false witness takes careful evaluation and discrimination. Yet it is an exercise that is essential if we want to begin to break through the barriers that so often block effective and accurate communication.

IN APPLICATION, WHAT this means is that practices must be learned. They don't drop full-blown from heaven into a human being's brain or heart or lips. We ought to do much more than we are accustomed to doing to train people in communication habits that maximize accuracy, factual reporting, avoidance of loaded expressions, differentiating between truth and half-truth, steering clear of speculative innuendo that involves the making of unsubstantiated or unsubstantial judgments, and, in general, using language to maximize truthful and edifying communication rather than exploiting language to win self-serving points or achieve vindictive ends.

Parents bear a heavy burden of responsibility in this process. Children begin acquiring life-long communication habits the minute they speak the first word. This is an area that adult education people have barely touched and, therefore, offers great possibilities for creative and constructive educators who are eager to provide continuing education opportunities.

(continued on page 27)