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A REVIEW OF LITERATURE,
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In the Fall of 1976, the Chair of Business Ethics, endowed by the International Lutheran Laymen's League and supported by an annual endowment from them, was established at Valparaiso University.

Dr. William E. Schlender, one time dean of the College of Business at Cleveland State University, and regular columnist for The Lutheran Laymen, became the occupant of that chair.

We are pleased to bring to the readers of The Cresset the results of an interview with Dr. Schlender, held at the end of the school year. The release was prepared by Norman Temme and Pat Downing of the News Bureau of Valparaiso University. —KFK

Effective business leadership must be ethical leadership,” according to William E. Schlender. In today’s world business leadership must be effective and ethical. “The chief agent for change in our society in the past has been the business sector,” he said. “It is one of the few institutions that has been dynamic over our history. The technological society in which we live, our standard of living—both good and bad aspects—are to a considerable degree the results of business innovation or business’ developing of innovations into economic goods and services.”

“In our consumer oriented and pollution conscious society of today,” he said, “executives have found it extremely necessary to become aware of what the social responsibilities of business and industry are.”

Dr. Schlender does not feel that business is a great deal more unethical today than before. Quite the opposite. “There is no question,” he said, “that we are made much more aware of the lack of ethics in business today. That does not mean business is more unethical. It is true that the impact of an unethical action by a large business firm can be broad, and therefore dramatic. It is also true that there is greater disclosure today, thus the public is more conscious when unethical acts occur. A third reason why business is seen by some as being more unethical is that society’s expectations of business have risen. Our values and standards have changed, often in a more exacting manner.”

He cited as an example the ethics of pollution as being a relatively newly created value. “We used to
accept the effects of pollution as a social cost of doing business which society was willing to bear. Now we expect business to shoulder a much greater share of the cost of pollution.

"This is not to say that there are some areas which may not have worsened. Price fixing, for example, seems to be practiced on an increasing scale, and certainly must be condemned. When such practices are disclosed, they tend to influence our image of business generally," he said.

"Also," he added, "much of the publicity one sees regarding unethical behavior of business men revolves around international business. There is no doubt that pay-offs have taken place to gain preferential treatment in dealing with a foreign government or trading partner. In some cases payment has been plain bribery; in other cases payment has been made in good faith to an agent who acts in a legitimate role in the interest of an American firm. If such an agent later chooses to make a questionable payment to achieve his goal, the principal firm may not be informed. On other occasions American firms have acted in conformance with accepted practices within a foreign country, but what is acceptable in another country may not be acceptable in the U.S., and thus conflicts in value systems arise. While business firms in Europe may engage in such practices to the same extent as do our, they do so more discreetly and with less pressure for disclosure."

That there is a difference in practices in foreign areas, and that the government does not necessarily regard such pay-offs as criminally actionable, he pointed out, is indicated by the requirement that a company report "improper payments" abroad, but the government does not take legal action against it.

Dr. Schlender concludes that publicity of questionable behavior and increased controls over business have been influences toward more ethical behavior. But, he said, business men have not simply been coerced into being more ethical.

He also credits business management with being more socially responsible and more perceptive of the need for and the merit of ethical standards of conduct. "Business people are not more immoral than the rest of the people in our society. To the contrary, by far the great majority of business persons are not only ethical, but they want to be and they make an effort to be ethical in their decision-making."

**ACCORDING TO DR. SCHLENDER**, the establishment of the Chair of Business Ethics by the International Lutheran Laymen's League in 1976 at Valparaiso University places the University at the beginning of what he sees as the start of a growing trend. In the near future, he feels, most business schools will offer a course in business ethics, and may even require it in a student's program.

"Such a course has several objectives," he pointed out, stressing that today's students will be tomorrow's business and industry leaders. "It can aid students in becoming more alert in the discovery of moral issues that will arise in their working lives, it can help them learn to reason more carefully with ethical values, and it can clarify moral aspirations."

"People are rational beings and have the power to make choices," he said. "Sometimes in business decision-making, the right thing to do is not immediately clear. Business has gotten much more complex in recent years and therefore pinpointing problems and assessing guilt is sometimes very difficult to do. A course in business ethics can benefit the student who will be faced with such problems in the future."

"Some people believe a code of ethics is worthless, either just window dressing or an exercise in futility. I don't believe that," he said. "Some are, but they need not be. If codes of ethics are set up substantively and used, the business person remains conscious of guidelines. It helps if, in his academic training, he has had the experience of consciously applying ethical considerations in decision-making."

Dr. Schlender commented that teaching a course in ethics is not without its problems. For example, he said, people may not want to go through the process of questioning their values—values which for the most part have been formulated years earlier. Other students, he added, may feel that a business ethics course doesn't contain specific and concrete knowledge of how to solve a problem or how to learn a functional skill. In fact, he said, some educators probably feel that business ethics cannot be taught. Dr. Schlender does not feel this way.

"Filling Valparaiso University's Lutheran Laymen's League Chair of Business Ethics is an opportunity to develop an awareness by future business managers—today's students—as to the importance of ethics and to develop an approach in the classroom so as to encourage them to include ethics consciously in their future business behavior."

The incorporation of ethics in decision-making is extremely important for the free enterprise system which operates in the United States, he stressed. "In the future the business men who do not behave in the interest of the public and their employees will, sooner or later, have somebody such as the government place additional regulations or controls on business. The more outside control of business, the less room there is to manage one's own business. Take that logic far enough, and it doesn't matter whether we own a business or not if we have no control over it."

"Here at Valparaiso University where there is a commitment to academic excellence, rooted in Christian heritage, the establishment of a Chair of Business Ethics was a logical thing to do. Our educational philosophy is not one that simply equates future success with making a profit. We know that success means more, and we know that our quality of life and even the survival of our economic system may depend, in large part, on the ethical values used in future decision-making."
THE RELOCATION OF LEARNING AND MINISTRY

The Shift from “Campus Ministry” to “Ministry in a Learning Society”

Ministry in a learning society is too important to leave to campus ministers.

THE POINT OF THIS ARTICLE MAY BE STATED simply: ministry in a learning society is too important to leave to campus ministers. Since the author is proud to be a campus minister, however, the reader will do well to be on guard. The aim here is not to put down campus ministry but rather to point to its broadening horizons, it increasing scope and challenge, and the greater claim it is making on today’s church-in-mission, particularly at the point of its regular (not specialized) ministry.

Regular congregations—it is important to say “congregations” and not just “pastors”—have become involved again and in coming years will become more fully involved than ever before in what traditionally has been called “campus ministry.” A recent statement on the mission of the church in higher education concludes:

If by higher education we mean the whole spectrum of post-secondary educational institutions, then it is clear that few local congregations are not in touch with this activity in some way. We believe that it is necessary for all congregations, their pastors and laity, to become aware of the changes in society caused by the explosive development of post-secondary education for all ages. . . .

The proliferation of education institutions, especially noticeable in the community college movement, creates a new need for that type of mission which must be the responsibility of local congregations. They can be encouraged to see such institutions as an area of concern for their ministry even as they are concerned about hospitals, prisons, or military bases. There are many possibilities for creative interaction between the local congregation and the community college.¹

This article aims to sketch important background for this plea by describing two current phenomena and to offer to congregations hearty encouragement in the face of it.

RELOCATION OF LEARNING

THE FIRST PHENOMENON MAY BE CALLED the relocations of learning in our society. This refers to the way learning is bursting the seams of its former structures and pouring out into more of life and society. This is true both of physical-geographical structures and of chronological structures.

Physical-Geographical

Most people are familiar with the kind of institutions that Harvard and Michigan and Ohio State have become, but a review of some history may give a feel for the development of higher education among us. Harvard,

the first institution of higher learning in this country, was founded in 1636. It was followed in the next 134 years by eight additional schools, including William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, and Dartmouth. These were more aristocratic than popular institutions but were very important to the life and future of the colonies. By 1776, it is estimated, 3,000 college graduates were living here.

In the two decades after the Revolution, colleges were established at the rate of almost one per year. Between the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, the number of colleges grew from nine to 250, of which more than 180 still exist. Many more—some 700—tried and failed to get established. Then came the act that did more than anything else to change the outlook of the American people toward college-going, the Morrill Federal Land Grant Act of 1862, which aimed to provide training and preparation for life and work in a changing world; the change was developing from the industrial potential that had come to an agrarian culture. The Morrill Act gave public lands and endowments to support state schools (such as Ohio State, Michigan State, etc.). So began the fantastic growth that by 1900 had enrolled over a quarter-million people in higher education in the United States and by 1950 over two and a half million people.

But even that was only the beginning in the perspective of the last two decades. Consumer demand for learning has been very great, and the learning industry has blossomed; in our own time there has been an unprecedented proliferation of educational institutions. The latest Education Directory (1976-77) lists 3,075 institutions of higher education in the United States; only 48 per cent of them are public, but the public schools have more than three-fourths of the total enrollment. Last fall the total enrollment numbered over eleven million, more than five per cent of the population. The enrollment figures since 1950 suggest a remarkable story: 1950, two and a half million; 1960, nearly three and a quarter million; 1969, over seven million; 1976, over eleven million. To the current eleven million-plus students can be added one million professionals in higher education and another fifty-four million alumni, and the result indicates that over 30 per cent of the people of the United States are or have been involved in higher education (not including drop-outs and stop-outs).

A significant part of this proliferation has been the development of new kinds of institutions, most notably the community college. Not long ago community colleges were opening at the rate of more than one per week. Last year more than 1,300 community colleges served more than four million students, nearly 40 per cent of all post-secondary students. That growth, too, is interesting to note. In 1950, some 300 public junior colleges enrolled 168,000 students. (Community colleges are the predominant factor in the category called junior colleges.) In 1950, over 600 junior colleges were enrolling over one and a half million students. In 1976, more than 1,300 junior colleges enrolled more than four million students.

What we are witnessing here is higher education's move from exclusiveness to inclusiveness, the shift from elitism to open admissions. These new schools, together with large, urban universities and smaller technical schools, are springing up not in rural areas or on the outskirts of our communities, as formerly, but in the middle of them. The aim in many places is to get some such school within thirty or forty miles of every citizen. So the number of commuting students has increased dramatically, and the commuter student radically changes the shape of ministry to students for both traditional campus ministry and local congregations.

The physical-geographical result of all this development is that higher learning is no longer confined to hundreds of clearly-defined and -delimited campuses dotting the map of our country, but it has poured out from those campuses into all of society; it has ceased to be one carefully differentiated activity of the society and become an important and pervasive characteristic of the society. Hence we speak of the shift from "campuses" to the "learning society."

This development in higher education can be recognized as one important aspect of the urbanization that increasingly has been changing the character of the land. In 1790, this country was 5 per cent urban, in 1900, 40 per cent, and in 1970, 73 per cent. And some predict that by 2000, 80 per cent of the world's population will be essentially urban. Urbanization is a massive change in the way people live together. It points to the ever-increasing complexity of life, the increasing development of systems and structures (social, economic, political, etc.), and the increasingly interdependent ways these systems and structures exist together in our cities. Higher education is one of those systems and structures; and its interdependence with other social, economic, and political structures is clear.

Urbanization refers to the increasingly abundant and recurrent choices of things, activities, and life-styles that make many dizzy, wondering whether they have the mind and will to make yet one more choice or decision, and so sometimes lethargic and passive, hoping that someone else will make the necessary decision or that it will go away. This is an important factor in the political life of our time and in the goals and purposes of education. Higher education represents, on the one hand, yet another place where dizzying choices of things, activities, and life-styles need to be made and, on the other hand, a potentially powerful resource helping people to sort out their life and its options, to choose thoughtfully the values and to make intelligently the decisions for which they must be responsible.

This relocation of learning is profoundly significant
and must be understood by the church-in-mission. The old physical-geographical symbol of learning was the campus. The new symbol, less precise, is the learning society, of which the old campus is an important part but only a part—and a part having to adapt itself to a vastly changed learning environment.

**Chronological**

The relocation of learning can be described not only in physical-geographical terms but also in chronological terms. If the average age of the college student was once 20 or 21, today it is not uncommon to find institutions, particularly community colleges, where the average age is 35 or 38. The reason is not that young people have stopped going to college, although they are learning to do new things in physical-geographical terms but also in chronological terms.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has used the designation "stop-out" to refer to those who interrupt their education to attend to matters cerebral or financial, to ask fundamental questions about their life, work, and vocation, or to get some experience of the world, including perhaps the work-world, before resuming their college education.

Not only "stop-outs," however, are changing the average age of the college students today; but also older people from among the poor, the ethnic minorities, and women are going to college to make up what they missed earlier in life. And coupled with this is the increase of what is commonly called "lifelong learning." In its broadest terms, lifelong learning refers to all the continuing education, formal and informal, that goes on for clergy, doctors, lawyers, mechanics, and holders of McDonald's franchises, the evening courses that people take to gain additional credentials or certificates, the programs by which people in mid-career re-train for another life's work and the more leisurely but important pursuit of knowledge and understanding of what is happening and possible in our world. Television and newspapers in recent years have offered courses in the humanities, sometimes even for credit. The churches' efforts to help people through such things as Parent Effectiveness Training, Bethel Bible Study, or the use of Transactional Analysis are part of the development of lifelong learning.

The point is that if learning and formal education were once primarily, almost totally, ways of preparing for life and for one's life-work, something one did between the ages of 18 and 22 (having spent the previous twelve years in elementary and secondary education), something one did and concluded so as to get on with life-work and vocation, it is that no longer; and this will become increasingly true in the future. Instead, learning has become a slice of life itself, not just preparation for life and work but a prime ingredient in them, approximating the importance of sleeping and eating. Learning has become a lifelong activity, in part because what we have to learn is seemingly inexhaustible—new knowledge does not diminish but only increases the unanswered questions and the amount of knowledge still to be sought—and in part because change—in the professions, skills, and society—happens so fast among us now that what once may have been education for a lifetime is now education for only a few years, little more than an introduction to a field for which learning will have to be lifelong. This has exceedingly broad implications, as Margaret Mead, for one, has pointed out. She describes how knowledge about life and the world once was passed down from generation to generation but now young people confront a world and a future their elders cannot teach them much about because it is unexplored territory, a new frontier. So old and young must learn about it together—but not as if the young have only questions and the old all the answers.

Continuing learning has become a new necessity. It is necessary for well-being, perhaps even survival, in today's world. In 1973, the Lutheran Council in the USA published a study by Lutheran campus ministers, "Ministry in a Learning Society," which listed some of the ways learning has become a new or increased necessity. Learning is needed, the study points out:

- + for adaptation to change and orientation to new opportunities;
- + for lifelong vocational development and occupational competence;
- + for human relations and social interaction in a pluralistic culture;
- + for citizenship and churchmanship amid the challenges and complexities of urban life;
- + for leisure and recreation;
- + for discerning the meanings, stewarding the resources, and managing the destinies of human life.3

Continuing learning is needed, in short, for faithfulness and responsibility. Gregory Baum suggests that each of us is called upon constantly to create his/her own future. It is not the whole truth about our life with God moving toward the future; but it is an important part of the truth, especially for people who mistake faith in God for fatalism and passivism.

---


As learning has become a new necessity, so it has become a new possibility by virtue of the vast proliferation of educational institutions referred to earlier. And so we have come around full circle in describing the relocation of learning, both geographical and chronological.

RELOCATION OF MINISTRY

THE SECOND PHENOMENON THAT IS CHANGING THE SHAPE OF THE CHURCH'S MISSION IN HIGHER EDUCATION IS LARGELY A CONSEQUENCE OF AND DEPENDENT UPON THE FIRST. THE RELOCATION OF LEARNING IN OUR SOCIETY IS LEADING TO THE RELOCATION OF MINISTRY, SPECIFICALLY WHAT WE TRADITIONALLY HAVE CALLED "CAMPUS MINISTRY," IN THE CHURCH. IT SOUNDS PECULIAR, ALMOST ANACHRONISTIC, TO GO BACK TO THE BEGINNING IN THE 1920S—TO MEN AND WOMEN WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN CALLED "STUDENT PASTORS" OR "CAMPUS MINISTERS"—BUT MANY HAVE BEGUN TO SUBSTITUTE THE LARGER TERM, MINISTRY IN A LEARNING SOCIETY, WHERE THEY ONCE CALLED "CAMPUS MINISTRY"

The move, the shift from "campus ministry" to "ministry in a learning society" is what this article is about.

Lutheran campus ministry began in and out of parishes—in Iowa City in the 1850s and Ann Arbor in the 1890s. But as land-grant colleges and then other public institutions of higher education burgeoned, the churches came to look increasingly to specialized ministry—beginning in the 1920s—to men and women who would undertake ministry in higher education full-time. So began the development that went from student pastors to campus and university ministers.

Today Lutherans have some 220 full-time campus ministers and another 1,000 part-time, or contact, pastors. These are administered by the National Lutheran Campus Ministry (NLCM) for the Lutheran Church in America, the American Lutheran Church, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches and by the districts of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. The Division of Campus Ministry and Educational Services of the Lutheran Council (LCUSA-dcemes) provides communications and other services for all and convenes an annual four-day conference of the full-time campus ministers. The Lutheran Campus Ministry Association (LCMA) is a voluntary organization of campus ministers that fosters continuing education and professional standards and co-operates in planning a semi-annual ecumenical campus ministers' conference.

The Center for the Study of Campus Ministry (CSCM) is an independent program which Valparaiso University offers as a service to the churches in their provision for campus ministry. In all denominations and including the Jews, some 8,000 campus ministers serve nationwide; and an independent National Institute for Campus Ministries (NICM) aims to assist the ministry of Jews and Christians in higher education.

This vast network of campus ministry usually has been quite independent of the regular parishes, though not of the judicatories, of the church. Or to reverse the perspective, not long ago the average parish pastor looked primarily, sometimes exclusively, to full- and part-time campus ministers to do the church's job of ministry to students at institutions of higher education. But the strong suggestion in this article is that this is changing—and needs to be. The reasons are fairly simple to perceive. First, the higher learning institutions of our society have multiplied far faster than has the staff of full-time campus ministers. Second, many of these newer institutions are built according to a different model; they are not four-year, they are not residential, many are not liberal arts schools (or the liberal arts are having a hard time keeping their place in them—and that is another large concern in the relocation of learning). Third, the churches do not have the resources to assign full-time campus ministers to all these places; in fact, they are struggling to find the resources to maintain the campus ministries they have now. And not only the resources are lacking but also the mind and the will, for that is a model of ministry suitable for the more traditional campus and campus ministry: but the new higher education calls for a reconceiving of ministry and divising new strategies for its work.

And so, fourth, parish congregations are seen as appropriate places to look for help, appropriate because: (a) the institutions of higher education are located with not much difficulty identifiable within the parish boundaries; (b) congregations which search their parish neighborhoods for the needs and opportunities for ministry there will inevitably locate, say, the nearby community college as presenting such needs and opportunities; and (c) the people who are in these institutions of higher education (as students, faculty, administration, and staff) are people from the congregations in approximately the same proportion as the number of people in the country are church-affiliated. With considerable justification and sense, then, we are looking increasingly to parish congregations to get involved in what we traditionally call campus ministry but now more and more are calling ministry in a learning society.

The need for specialized campus ministry will remain; and the statement on the mission of the church in higher education cited at the beginning also expresses
hope that the churches will see the importance and wisdom and virtual necessity of continuing it at many, if not most, places. But we can no longer look only to specialized ministry to do the church’s work in higher education; it is not the model by which the churches will meet the future faithfully. They do not have the money or the personnel; and they do have a very precious resource, the congregation, that can no longer be ignored for this important ministry.

The question is: how do we make the transition, how do we take on this fuller challenge of parish-based campus ministry? Are our congregations ready for it, eager for it? If not, how can anybody help them get ready, get eager? Even deeper, the question is: how does one do ministry in a place like this? How does one do the ministry of Word and Sacrament in a learning society, in a world so different and changing so rapidly? Can we find a way to be both conservative (holding on to the precious resources of our tradition, centered in the Gospel) and liberal (free to respond in new ways to new challenges and opportunities)? How are we the Church of Jesus Christ in this world? How do we generate faith, hope, and love that relate and respond to the urban experience and the learning society?

NOTES FOR THE PARISH

A RENEWED IMPORTANCE IS BEING ASSIGNED to parish ministry today, also by the campus ministry community. It used to be that certain elitist notions attached themselves to campus ministry and that an unhealthy separation, if not enmity, was present between campus and parish ministry. Some of that may have been inevitable and necessary as campus ministry struggled to find its way in the church and in the world. But in many places at least, the trend has reversed itself. Campus ministers, especially Lutheran ones, are finding it increasingly important and mutually helpful to relate closely to parishes; a survey several years ago discovered that in the face of threat and crisis, Lutheran campus ministers would go for support first to pastors of their own denomination in the community.

The parish congregation is the most fundamental, existential, urgent place for the church to be the church; this is where church-in-mission needs to be happening first and foremost. We may need to reconcile and restructure our parish congregations for their mission in today’s world, but it is not likely that we can do without them. The congregation is a whole place. Its actual mission is restricted only by its lack of vision, courage, or faith. With its resources it wants to do as much good as possible and to be as many things as possible to all people in the community. The congregation is a general practitioner, not a specialist. And the points of contact for the ministry urged here are the institutions of higher education in the parish community and the people from congregation and community who are in those educational institutions.

By way of offering hearty encouragement to congregations in this ministry, the remainder of this article aims to raise two fundamental concerns which ought not be taken for granted: the gospel and the church.

The Gospel

How does one speak cogently about something so obvious that its meaning and vitality may be taken for granted, especially by Lutherans who believe that the gospel is assured by their continued lip-service to the doctrine of justification? William Hordern writes that the practice of the Protestant churches has contradicted what they have preached about justification by grace. He points, for example, to the way we condemn public sinners and condone the sins of the respectable, quite in contrast to our Lord. He thinks—and here he gives a parish pastor a thoughtful and challenging checklist—a congregation that believes the doctrine of justification by grace through faith for Christ’s sake should: (a) be a place where people are not afraid to be themselves; (b) be a place where disagreement among members about ethical conduct is tolerated; (c) be free of obsessive fear about survival as an institution; and (d) be free to serve God in the sociopolitical world (for the purpose of this paper, read “the learning society”). Those are valid ways to test the place, use, and effect of the gospel in a congregation.

Certain questions may be posed, hopefully without offense, whose answers simply ought not be presumed.

† QUESTION: Do preachers themselves know and trust the gospel, and do they preach the gospel? Anyone who spends time reading sermons knows the importance of the question. Even many a good sermon is good for reasons other than its preaching of the gospel.

† QUESTION: Do the people in the congregation hear the gospel? Even if by orthodox standards the gospel is being preached, preachers are not always heard to say what they think they say. So it is important to ask and to notice what the people are hearing. The blame may not be all the preacher’s if the people are not hearing it, but


a preacher does want to be heard to preach the gospel.6

†QUESTION: How is the parish life and program different because the preacher preaches and believes and the people hear and believe the gospel? That is, how is the church different as an institution from institutions that live from a different message and have a different mission?

The attempt here is not to give a Bible study or theological discourse on the gospel but rather to describe the importance of and the context for raising the question of the gospel. A fruitful and revealing way to get at this wholistically in the congregational setting is to tell stories, stories of personal and parish life that reveal the effect or the frustration of the gospel—like these:

† a fraudulent business man becomes freed in the gospel-community for repentance and service (Zacchaeus);
† a young woman feels compelled to move outside the congregation with her strong concern for social justice because the congregation seems to have priorities that do not get a matters of social injustice;
† a young couple takes the word and promise of God with drastic seriousness and leaves its home and secure jobs at the university to seek new relationships and a new ministry;
† people in conflict over day-to-day decisions meet and embrace at the Eucharist and find that their unity lies in something other than their consensus or majority vote;
† a layperson takes the minister aside and lets him know that she knows how to minister, too, and that sometimes their usual roles need to be reversed—that is, the minister needs ministry and the layperson can give it;
† Eucharist after outreach to poor and needy people nearby can be the most genuine and exciting of all;
† a teacher apologizes for insensitivity to a hostile class of students, and some genuine community—and learning—commence among them.

In various ways these stories reveal that the gospel is a powerful thing. But it is a strange power, strange to the natural person and to the natural society. And it is easy for the gospel to get lost or to be abandoned, even while the words continue to flow, as the congregation struggles to survive, to get along, to grow, and to find something useful to do. We can go beyond asking whether the gospel is being preached/heard/confessed/spoken to asking whether the gospel is being used and whether it is having free course among us.

None of this should suggest that preaching is not important, only that it is not sufficient, it is not a goal in itself. Preaching is very important particularly for educated people who have to make and listen to much talk about many things. The preacher reveals many things in his preaching, the most important being not how intelligent and clever he is but rather the world he lives in and the way he lives in it. “They come not to hear what you say but to see if you burn,” said one campus minister.

Sermons in the learning society need not be intellectually flamboyant, but it will not hurt if they are intellectually respectable and if they reflect the world of the hearer, which generally is not a theological world but rather a secular, economic, political, social, and psychological world. If in terms of that world the preacher can speak a good word and, even better, the gospel of Jesus Christ, then the power for meaningful ministry may be created and people may be enlisted to burn with the passion of Jesus Christ for the world of the Father. But if the preacher seems to be living in a different world, a world of unasked questions and unintelligible meanings, or has no good word, no gospel to add to the confusion and tragedy of this world but only at best scintillating analysis, then call it what you will—but do not call it gospel and do not call it preaching.

The basis of ministry in the learning society is the gospel, and our own continuous surprise at the gospel has no real substitutes. So this is an attempt to live out the precious jewel of our ministry and not let its concern be taken for granted or crusted over with other concerns. The clarity and vitality of the gospel in the congregation are all-important. The aim of all Christian ministry is that the gospel be heard, felt, experienced, and lived. If we have successful parishes where the gospel is replaced by some other precious jewel—a personality, a psychological method, or a marvelous plan of organization—what is the good of that as far as the mission of the church is concerned? We aim to do ministry in a learning society not to show that we can do a hard thing, that the modern world has not got too complex or difficult for us Christians, not even to be successful, but to be faithful, faithful above all to the gospel and its place in the church.

When the gospel is alive in a community of people, they will have the nerve to ask the questions about this ministry; they will want to look among themselves for the necessary resources and to encourage one another in their successes and failures. They will have courage and hope and imagination not to conquer but to serve the world of higher education, to do what they can do, to be faithful. And that is enough!

The Church

A second fundamental concern that ought not be taken for granted in this discussion is the church. The gospel creates church; and the church is mission and ministry, including ministry in a learning society. A few important elements of this concern must be mentioned, however briefly.

The sense of church as body is important. Church is more than a statistical collection of individuals. It is a community, the body of Christ praying and working to be in the world in ways continuous with our Lord's way of being in the world. A sense of the church's proper unity and proper diversity is important too. Likemindedness about the gospel and its power is one thing; brainwashing and conformity to an ideology, even a theological one, are something else. Ministry in a learning society will put to good use the rich diversity that can be discovered in most parishes.

Above all, the way in which the church is essentially gospel and freedom for people rather than law and bondage is important. The church, like a good parent, seeks for her members' growth, maturity, and free interdependence; and that is the fruit of the gospel among us. And finally, the institutional life of the church must facilitate rather than obstruct the gospel; that is, the design of the church somehow must be not according to the servant character of our Lord, but according to the servant character of our Lord.

The really important issue here, the tiger in the tank, is the ministry of the laity. The ministry of the laity is the church's primary ministry, the one the ordained ministry exists to serve and facilitate. For all their talking about it, Lutherans and most other Christians still do not do a very good job of it. Parishes are usually clergy-dominated. The sense that Our Lutheran Church is all over the community on Monday morning rather than just at 1000 S. Country Club Drive is woefully lacking.

Ministry of the laity does not mean making laity look like clergy, amateur clergy, teaching them how to pray in public, letting them read a lesson in church and preach once a year, getting them to attend church functions—though none of that is a bad idea. But it means teaching and training and encouraging them to be ministers of Christ and priests to one another in the context of their life and work, to work joyfully at being Body of Christ in the family, the neighborhood, the office or factory, the nation, the world, rejoicing at good things and caring for needs, wounds, and injustices because of the gospel, bringing skill and caring together in the life of the laity. The doctrine of the priesthood of all believers that flows from our understanding of baptism has important implications for strategizing the mission of the contemporary church and is a "relocation of ministry" from clergy-domination that is urgently needed.

The good news here is that ministry in a learning society and parish-based campus ministry do not mean more work for the pastor but rather more mission for the parish. Many laypersons will be better suited, equipped, and located for this ministry than the pastor. Students themselves will want to be involved in this ministry so that it is a mutual thing.

But the pastor does have a key role. He is sometimes the most effective leader in the parish. He likely holds the fullest vision of what is going on in the parish and what could be going on. The congregation often will reflect the extent and the quality of his concern. Usually he administers the parish program and co-ordinates resources. And he preaches so as to encourage and enable the parish to see and do new things. He does well, then, to ask how real the ministry of the laity is in the parish and to discover how it is real, who are the people well-suited and well-situated for the demands of ministry in a learning society, how much of his vision of what is possible and faithful he has shared with them and how much he has listened to what their visions and hopes may be.

CONCLUSION

THE QUEST HERE IS FOR CHRISTIAN CONGREGATIONS in ministry to, for, and with the learning society, concerned for people in their needs and relationships, taking the learning dimensions and the educational institutions of our society seriously as great gifts to be used and large opportunities to be seized for mission and ministry. Ministry in a learning society is too important—and too large, too demanding, and too exciting, as well as too central to the mission of the contemporary congregation—to be left to campus ministers.

RESOURCES

Ministry in a Learning Society, 4 booklets available from the Lutheran Council in the USA—Division of Campus Ministray and Educational Services (LCUSA-dcmes), 35 Wacker St., Chicago, 60601, $3.00 for the set.

Notebook for Ministry with Community Colleges, published by the LCUSA-dcmes, 65 pages, $2.50.

holden .. 
The Lake is long and cool . . .
the water spray unfolds behind the boat and shadows from the shore
race the wake to the center and back again to the tree-lined water . . .
the people talk about Minnesota and about California . . .
the apples are good this year in Leavenworth . . .
the first two hours go by and the talk slows . . . the sun warms
your face atop the boat . . . the Captain puffs his pipe and watches
the currents . . .
the mountains move back and the boat drills through hidden
passes and the passengers are quiet . . .
and talk resumes of HOW . . . WHERE . . . WHEN . . . and LOOK AT THAT GLACIER!
and the boat finds the hidden landing . . . the bus takes off to higher
passes . . . ferns part . . . peaks rise in front of you . . . the bus slows . . .
the Village is ahead with people waiting to greet you . . . the chipmunks
scamper . . . each with his own territory . . . children frolic on the lawn
like bigger chipmunks . . . the staff repair a waterline . . . people
wave to the bus . . . and you are here:
HOLDEN VILLAGE . . .
HOLDEN. This special place nestled in a deep valley high in the north Cascades in Washington state is more than a name, more than pictures, more than words: yet it is all of these.

Holden was a copper mine some years back. Through the efforts of Wes Prieb, Holden became a Lutheran Retreat Center. Yet it belongs to no church, no sect, no creed, for Holden Village is just what it is and cannot be owned. (Carroll Hinderlie, former Director of Holden, knew this well.)

Holden is one of those extremely rare places where people can go to be most themselves. There are no demands made on people at Holden—unless being oneself is a demand. Vespers each night bring the community together in something like a miracle because the spirit dwelling in Vespers is like no other, yet again it is most like our spirit when we think it is clean and fresh. The candlelight glinting off the old wood sparks a special glow on faces kneeling to receive the communion and blessing . . . the hymns fairly crackle with joy and hands cannot stay quiet . . . they clap and clap and clap until the rafters ring with holy sounds.

Food! Yes lots of it! The soups are another miracle, The warm dining hall gathers the villagers to it like no other place save the Chapel . . . children sit with other families if they wish . . . talk goes up and down the hall like wholesome air . . . like hands reaching across the table to shake other hands . . . like the scent of good bread . . .

The trails lead to mountain passes which explode in color of wild flowers . . . freshets spring unexpectedly from the sides of mountains and from beneath rocks and you drink the water Eden must have known . . . large-leaved ferns spread the forest with their fragile-tipped wings and filter the warm sun . . . huge pines sough in the breezes and shadows deepen inside the forest and deer follow you along soft paths . . . and deer come at night to lick the salt-lick behind the chalets . . . their long slender legs moving like other shadows beneath the forest cover . . . and evening comes to Holden with night sounds beginning in the forest . . . the Jacuzzi bubbling, throwing steam to the stars which stand out like diamonds above the saddleback . . . the saunas are quiet with a handful of people who talk and sweat and dare the icy waters . . .
And the night folds you in and sleep comes gently to soothe aching muscles from the day’s climb to the old copper mine . . . to Hart Lake or to Holden Lake . . . and dreams slide easily beneath the warm roofs of chalets and dorms . . . the quiet broken only by Railroad Creek as it winds its way down from high glaciers to Lake Chelan . . .

And morning comes with bells floating over the Village calling the villagers to breakfast . . . and prayers and announcements for the day . . . and each day finds people talking . . . visiting . . . hiking with Rudy Edmund . . . watching slides by Rich Caemmerer, Jr . . . joining Herb Brokering in the Hall to do something different and new . . . the people standing beneath the tree talk with Al Pitcher . . . they listen to talks by “Prof.” Caemmerer Sr., and by Walt Bouman, while a Paul Heyne Invitational Volley Ball game begins . . . the dust sprayed with water and talk of economics . . . people watching . . . Sara musing on new films . . . Julie Heyne painting . . . Hans Spalteholz talking about Dostoevsky . . . John Graeber reading poems . . .

. . . and the day wears on with good conversation . . . discussion of Phillippines continues during the week . . . the cooks perspire in the kitchen, dreaming of new soups . . . the bell tolls to lunch and the camp rests . . .

. . . and the late afternoons finds small groups in chalets hearing Carroll Hinderlie or Mary talk about Buber . . . Doris Edmund tells about early childhood development . . . Leo Bustad shows slides of his pigs and tells jokes . . . Ernie gets his slides of wild flowers ready while Karen greets another bus of guests . . . the bus! How new and strange it seems when it arrives . . . how terribly different and sad when it leaves . . . with cameras clicking . . . much hugging and crying . . . singing the Holden song as the bus pulls away . . .

. . . but you know you will be back . . . that God has prepared this special place . . . this Eden . . . this Holden . . .
FACTS, INFORMATION, AND VALUES

THE SCIENCE OF COMMUNICATIONS IS among the most advanced technologies in the world today. The transmission of images and pictures via TV satellite from around the world is taken for granted. A computer translates radio signals from Mars into colored photographs of that planet. Across the nation computers are talking to other computers to give us the information we need. And most recently the telephone company has begun experiments to transmit telephone calls over a laser beam without the use of wires.

This proliferation of information and the ability of people everywhere to have instantaneous access to that information is a phenomenon of the late twentieth century. The individual is literally bombarded with words from morning to night; and sometimes—from his neighbor’s radio or TV set—even at night. A new word—media—has come into currency to describe this supercharged atmosphere of TV, radio, print, and Databanks that surrounds our lives.

This observation leads to the question I would like to raise with you today; namely, are we using this technology wisely in communicating with each other or are we merely being engulfed by a verbal tidal wave in which words have lost their meaning? If so, we may have seriously impaired our ability to communicate and exchange those ideas which historically have been the basis of the value systems by which we live.

Wes Gallagher, former president of the Associated Press, once remarked that “the American citizen is either going to be the best informed in the world or the most confused and disillusioned.” Certainly this has been the dilemma over this past decade as the press has tried to report the truth about Vietnam and Watergate, two of the greatest agenies in our national history.

These contemporary crises have also led to another phenomenon new to our time. You may remember that during the early nineteenth century, Thomas Macaulay referred to the men in the press galleries of Parliament as the “Fourth Estate,” suggesting that the press had as much power as the other three political establishments—the House of Lords, the hierarchy of the clergy, and the House of Commons. But at the time this power was derived from the fact the press was the sole means of communication among people seeking to establish common goals. It was not the personalities of the press who were powerful; it was the ability of the press to give form and shape to the sentiments of the common man.

Today, as a result of Vietnam and Watergate, the press, instead of being only observer and reporter, has become more and more a part of the action. Many Americans judge the reliability of their news, for example, on a judgment about the personality of the individual reading the news and the image he conveys on their TV screen. Marshall McLuhan has said “the medium is the massage,” a philosophical obfuscation as curious as asserting that ends and means are one and the same. But if ends and means differ, it is still important to remember that the ends partake of the means; to that degree McLuhan has obviously called our attention to a phenomenon of importance to our society.

ANOTHER PHENOMENON OF OUR TIME IS the celebrity journalist, in which the messenger becomes more important than the message. Eric Severeid, in commenting on this development, said: “Journalists furiously write about other journalists and an unhealthy self-consciousness is infecting their ranks. We are important, but we are not that important.”

One of the aspects of this personal involvement in the news is the popularization of investigative reporting in which the wrongdoing of public officials, environmental
polluters, and others are brought to public attention so that the processes of government will be forced to correct such wrongs as may be uncovered.

Investigative reporting in itself represents one of the best contributions the press can make to a better society. But carried to extremes, as it often is these days, it can create injustices, distort the truth, and set itself up in a judgmental position for which it has neither authority nor aptitude.

Again, as Wes Gallagher has observed, "One of our problems has been that the revelations about the Vietnam war and Watergate have been so bizarre and illogical that we have come to believe anything is possibly true, no matter how far out."

A British journalist has used the term "predatory journalism" to describe this current tendency to judge every public figure as guilty until proven innocent. "It is journalism that is out of balance," he said. "It is unrealistic in its demands. . . . It is distasteful in its relentlessness."

Certainly many of us have had this same feeling as we have read stories in which accusations were insufficiently documented or carelessly or hastily put into print or on the air. At the same time though, we must recognize that the press is itself part of the social process, and what is wrong with our press may also be part of what is wrong with our society.

Thus, when the press makes mistakes, as it inevitably must, a distrust arises between the press and its public. The press tends to be judged not by its achievements but by its mistakes, which are by their nature public and conspicuous.

But too often antagonism to the press is related to the fact that the turmoil represented in our pages and on the TV screen is a reflection of the disorder in society itself. To quote B. F. Skinner: "A failure is not always a mistake; it may simply be the best one can do under the circumstances."

Certainly in dealing with the excesses that have resulted from our almost unique press freedom in this country, we cannot attempt to correct those excesses by limiting that previous freedom. As Jefferson said, "Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost."

**The Connection Between Freedom of the Press and Freedom in Our Democratic Political System**

The famous philosopher Ortega y Gasset concluded that "liberal democracy is a discipline too difficult and complex to take firm root on earth." B. F. Skinner, in his provocative book, Beyond Freedom and Dignity, asserts that "autonomous man has reached a dead end" and "his abolition has long been overdue."

"Twenty-five hundred years ago," Skinner writes, "it might have been said man understood himself as well as any other part of his world. Today he is the thing he understands least." Skinner's solution is to develop a technology of behavior comparable to the technologies of physics and biology. But if man is to live his life to the fullest, he needs more than technologies; he needs a value system that recognizes his needs as a reasoning individual with the ability to make decisions affecting his relationships to the world and the people around him.

It is precisely this ability to be man—to be a person, to be an identifiable individual in a mass society—that is most threatened by several aspects of our communications revolution and its computer-spawned proliferation of information.

"For at least 100 years," said Joseph Wood Krutch, "we have been prejudiced in every theory of behavior (by ideas that) reduce the stature of man until he ceases to be man at all in any sense that the humanists of an earlier generation would recognize."

Another scholar quoted by Skinner asserts that "What is now under attack is the being of man." C. S. Lewis put it bluntly: "Man is being abolished." Is this "dehumanization" a necessary by-product of our highly technological society? Even B. F. Skinner doesn't think so. "Man is not made into a machine by inducing him to use machines," he writes. "Some machines call for behavior which is repetitious (such as the assembly line), and we escape from them when we can, but others enormously extend our effectiveness in dealings with the world around us."

**This Is One of the Particular Challenges for Your Generation.** You are graduating into a machine society in which the computer will probably be as much a part of your work-day as the automobile and TV set are a part of your leisure-time planning. This leads to a further question: will a generation so dependent on a machine to do its computations and even its predictions, be the master of the machine and use it to extend our horizons or will we merely manage the machine, content to live within the limitations set by its technological boundaries?

It is a fundamental question and one toward which we cannot afford to be passive. One of the problems of ingesting and digesting the information already available is the passivity which television has brought to our system. We can watch the world from our own living room without actually becoming involved in it.

A further problem is the lack of language skills—the ability to read and write—from which many of your contemporaries suffer because their childhood was spent dealing only with visual images and not with words and ideas.

Today it is estimated that ten to fifteen per cent of the adult population are not exposed to a daily newspaper
or news magazine. Their information comes totally from the audio and visual media.

What implications does this have for democracy, when ten to fifteen per cent of potential voters are outside the mainstream in which ideas and issues are discussed? Do we end up with a government run by the elite who write and read the printed word? Or do we see the collapse of public responsibility and accountability because so much of the public is outside the political process.

Our friend Marshall McLuhan has expressed it this way. "Print technology created the public," he writes. "Electronic technology created the mass. The public consists of separate individuals walking around with separate, fixed points of view. The new technology demands that we abandon the luxury of this posture, this fragmentary outlook."

We have already seen this in public life. Presidents are judged on the basis of television skills. President Jimmy Carter, a consummate political leader, has made it abundantly clear that in his view symbolism is the best means to communicate with the American people. A walk down Pennsylvania Avenue, doing away with limousines, avoiding a fancy hotel in London—all these are communication by symbols; but they are all communication which will ultimately fail unless backed by actions based on sound values and valid ideas.

These, then, in summary, are some of the issues around us and to which you as graduates and now full partners in our society will be addressing yourselves in the years ahead. Information will surround you on all sides; some of it of great value, some of it of little value. The means by which you get that information—the media—is itself a part of the problem as well as a part of the answer.

You also are being graduated into a world in which technology threatens to overwhelm the individual—to reduce man to something less than the individual and child of God whom we have traditionally believed ourselves to be. The "identity crisis" is not a fiction; it is very real, not only for a distressing number of young people but for our free and democratic society itself.

In a recent study, Daniel Yankelovich, the noted researcher, reported on the existence of a new Lost Generation. He identified them as the "aimless" and he puts their number at an astonishing thirty million people in the United States. These, he says, are the people who live from day to day. They turned their backs on old values but could not measure up to new values. So they gave up.

The fact you have reached this culminating graduation day shows that you are not among these "aimless." But they represent one in seven Americans in the social system around you and if you are not to be one of the "aimless" you will need, above all, a clear sense of the validity of your own values.

How do we meet this challenge? Hopefully, one of the University experiences you take away with you today is the excitement of learning, of keeping up with the world, of learning what is new and absorbing and evaluating it as part of your life's experience. In a world dominated by images, you must learn to look beyond the image for the reality it represents—or fails to represent.

But to know the world, you must first know yourself. This is an increasingly difficult task in a period when impersonal relationships between strangers in an urban society and between man and machine have superseded the more traditional person-to-person form of communication.

I once interviewed a very wise director in the theater and asked him if he did not agree that love was an individual's most important motivation. "No," he replied, "first must come self-realization. For until one knows one's own self, he or she cannot give love." It was an interesting concept and a modern restatement of Shakespeare's dictum to "Thus above all to thine own self be true; thou canst not then be false to any man."

One of the dangers in a society where so much information is free and available is that we will believe that we are free when we are not. The French philosopher Rousseau once commented that "There is no subjugation so perfect as that which keeps the appearance of freedom." And often, in accepting the material benefits of our system, I am afraid we fail to retain that freedom and unwittingly make ourselves servants of the system rather than its masters.

In a Bicentennial essay in Time magazine, historian Neil Harris wrote that "A flood of facts that presents the illusions of control without changing actual power relationships is no necessary help to the democratic process." Or, as Kingman Brewster [formerly] of Yale admonished us: "The refinement of talent is of no avail if it is not infused with purpose. . . A career of effective service requires first the aspiration to responsibility."

This admonition applies to the press as well as to its public. We must use our freedom to be more responsible. We must be accountable in analyzing and explaining as well as in accusing. We must recognize that the public soon tires of accusations; it looks for solutions and not continuous scolding. But the press is only part of the web in which we are all enmeshed. You, as citizens going your separate ways, are also part of the solution. Knowledge is more than information; it results from the ability to digest and evaluate information. And out of knowledge comes the values so necessary to a successful and happy life.

In his essay, Neil Harris suggested that "creating values that help us organize our unceasing stream of facts is the job of both press and public, of political, intellectual and spiritual leaders. The first step may simply be to exercise greater self-scrutiny about our appetite for information."

Your education at Valparaiso has given you the tools for that first step. I hope it will be only the first step in a life-long excitement about coming to terms with the new world that is in the making every day.
PIED PIPER

The Pied Piper was playing in the square, the rats were grooving in broad daylight stoned by the set. "Outta sight!" crooned Rat Jill to Rat Jack, "Man, can that cat ever blow!" The fat burghers of Hamelin smirked in relief. The Pied Piper laid down some unearthly tunes, the rats they were in transports.

The kids watched quietly, old women rolled their eyes knowingly: "That'll fix them."

The Pied Piper jived out of Hamelin still playing his heart out, still blowing the rats' minds. The kids just watched in silence.

The ratpack followed the Piper, enthusing, "wow, the greatest riff we ever heard, o man let's follow that man!" O the Pied Piper piped such a set as never yet was heard in Hamelin, the rats went sheer crazy, the kids they were as silent as stones.

The Pied Man piped his heart out all through Hamelin to the town gates and beyond, the rats followed in droves, mind-blown and then the little kids traipsed along on tiptoes, ever so quietly, never to return.

In the town square of Hamelin the fat burghers smirked, and the old women slapped their sides.

EUGENE L. STELZIG
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LOVE AND MARRIAGE

A WEDDING SERMON

I. Cor. 13
John 15: 5-17

THE GOSPEL TEXT FOR TODAY invites us to reflect on the relationship between friendship, obedience, sacrifice, and love. But the occasion of the day invites us to try to understand how friendship, obedience, sacrifice, and love are important for marriage. This seems to present no great difficulty, as we naturally associate these aspects of our lives with marriage—indeed we tend to think marriage is the paradigm instance of love—they go together like a horse and carriage. It is therefore tempting simply to take the texts for this ceremony as an excuse to wax eloquent about the relation of love and marriage, friendship and marriage, etc.

Yet to follow such a strategy avoids the force of this text from John, for as so often in John, Jesus does not just tell us to be loving—he commands us to be loving. Nor does Jesus say that he is ready to be our friend without reservations; rather we are his friends if we do what he commands. For, as he reminds us, we did not choose him, we did not claim him as our friend, but he chose us that we might bear fruit. Thus, Jesus does not make some general recommendation that it would be a nice thing if we were to be loving in a manner consistent with being his friend. Therefore, the question cannot be, what is the relationship between marriage and love, but between marriage and the kind of love and friendship that Jesus commands.

RATHER THAN TAKING ON that question directly, I would ask us to reflect a little on our assumption that there is a natural relationship between love and marriage, friendship and marriage, sacrifice and marriage. For in spite of our strong assumption that love is connected with marriage, indeed that it is the very essence of marriage, it is unclear what we mean by this. For example, we soon learn that the feelings, emotions, and choices that we call love in the first blush of our relationship often have little in common with what we find marriage necessarily must become. The sheer joy we feel at being recognized by another often gets lost in the tedium of our lives; or worse, we find such recognition can only be sustained at the exorbitant price of the loss of self. We will do almost anything to command the gaze of the other, even if it means leading the life they choose for us, rather than the life we would choose for ourselves.

For genuine love requires the recognition of the other as other—i.e., as a being not under our power. Instead, we often assume that that love is greater the more each shares in a common purpose that diminishes our otherness. Such a notion of love gives the basis for the most perverse forms of love as the self avenges its loss by hating as well as loving the other. Thus, as we become the object of such perverse love (a love, to be sure, that is often celebrated as the highest ideal because it asks great sacrifices from us) we are recognized as somebody who has our name and our looks—but who is denied recognition as the other.

Such perverse love is often represented as the deepest kind of friendship between a husband and a wife. But often such friendship is bought with the heavy price of preventing the other to grow or to have friends. For even though we know how marvelous friendship is, we know it also is transitory. The move to another town, the reading of a new book, the development of another friendship can cause vast changes in, or even destroy, an old friendship. Such
changes threaten friendship because they genuinely change the self and thus change the terms of the friendship. Thus, friendship can limit us as much as it provides the context for flourishing, for often we choose not to grow in order not to threaten the friendship we do have. It is a strong friendship that can stand the threat of a new friend! Indeed that is exactly why marriage is such a significant event, for after this day, those being married cannot and should not ever be able to love their mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, or their friends the same again.

Not only does marriage affect all our other friendships, but even to think of marriage itself as a friendship is an odd thing. For marriage must be the strangest of friendships, as it is undertaken exactly with the assumption that even though each will change, the friendship must endure. Of course, marriage can be sustained by the purposes of the institution, a viable economic unit for the having and good rearing of children in a manner that does not demand love or friendship. Yet we in the Christian tradition are obligated to hold to the notion that marriage must also take the form of friendship—to be sure, an obligation that destroys as many of us as it helps.

For the flaw in personal love, even without its romantic perversions, in marriage and without, is its particularity; that is, its incapacity to embrace many individuals at once. The relationship between lovers cannot be repeated an indefinite number of times in an individual’s life; it will be overwhelmed by the strangeness of persons to each other.

THE LIMITS OF OUR ABILITY to love, however, help us to see the extraordinary claim made about love and friendship Jesus declares he has for each of us. For it is exactly the characteristic of divine love that it can be both personal, that is particular, and universal; that it can reach out to everyone without losing the character of a unique relationship to each person if not to each thing in the world. The miracle of God’s love is that he can and does love each of us as other than himself without becoming less of a friend to any of us. Thus, we are commanded (John 15) to love the other, but to love as those who are first loved of such a God. For God’s love stretches our souls as he makes us his friends by freeing us of our preoccupation with ourselves and thus opening us to friendships with others. It is this kind of love that provides the means for marriage between Christians, for it forms us into a community that must be ready to accept the challenge of new life to which such love must give birth.

It is God’s command to love, therefore, that has given Christians the courage to demand that marriage involve love and friendship. For the love that we bring to marriage must be the love that is based on, trained, and made fast by the conviction that we can regard the other as other without being destroyed. We do not have the capacity to love all as God loves, but by making us his friends, he has at least given us the confidence that such a love is not impossible in this existence.

Thus we are commanded to love one another, not because we do not wish to love, but because we must learn to love as he has taught us—namely in a way that does not use the sacrifices love occasions to control and gain power over the other. For just as we must be trained to love without regret, so we must be trained to know how to sacrifice in a way that is not another form of manipulation. For the love that Paul praises—that which is patient, kind, that is not jealous or boastful, arrogant or rude, that does not insist on its own way, that is not irritable or resentful, that bears all things—can be a terribly destructive love if the self is not trained to bear it.

But our friendship with Christ trains us in those skills of regarding others in a manner that increases our friendship with husband or wife. For Jesus has made us participants, his disciples, in his task by sharing all he knows about the father with us. And what he has shared with us is that God loves us without controlling us, that his love is all-powerful exactly because it is freely given and thus does not need power to be fruitful. As husbands and wives, therefore, our friendship has a basis that can provide the trust that not only allows us to grow in friendship with each other, but gives others a standing to be our friends.

Thus, it seems right that we associate these passages about love with marriage, but we must remember that it is not just any love that we speak of here, but a love that is based on the command of Christ. Such a love does not seek power or security, but seeks to rejoice in the sheer existence of the other. Moreover, as H. R. Niebuhr suggests:

Love is gratitude: it is thankfulness for the existence of the beloved; it is the happy acceptance of everything that he gives without jealous feeling that the self ought to be able to do as much; it is a gratitude that does not seek equality; it is wonder over the other’s gift of himself in companionship. Love is reverence; it keeps its distance even as it draws near; it does not seek to absorb the other; it desires the beloved to be what he is and does not seek to refashion him into a replica of the self or to make him a means to the self’s advancement. As reverence, love is and seeks knowledge of the other, not by way of curiosity nor for the sake of gaining power, but in rejoicing and wonder. Love is loyalty; it is the willingness to let the self be destroyed rather than the other cease to be.

But such a love of respect, gratitude, reverence, and loyalty is possible in marriage exactly because of the commitment we share as friends of Christ. Thus, in the name of Jesus, and speaking for the church gathered here today and throughout the ages, to those being married, I command you to love one another. We pray that God will give you and us the power to fulfill such a command.
Ignatz is gone, poor beast, and won't be back—
His white-on-gray savaged by poisoned meat.
The stubborn world runs steady in its track.

He lay in a prim heap, clearly out of whack,
Through one blown March day, holding in his heat.
Ignatz is gone, poor beast, and won't be back.

We found him angled like a skew-struck tack
Waiting for us, or waiting, halfway down the street.
The stubborn world runs steady in its track.

Too early for wigglers or the mousy claque,
He drooped to rest in a mud winding sheet.
Ignatz is gone, poor beast, and won't be back.

His joyous rump went limp, his whiskers slack;
His turbulent heart pressed to its last beat.
The stubborn world runs steady in its track.

No matter, now, whether insomniac,
Or local loony laid the fetching cheat.
Ignatz is gone, poor beast, and won't be back.
The stubborn world runs steady in its track.

STUART SILVERMAN
cane tucked on lap
wind moves through
grey hair
cracked unpainted
wooden stairs
immobile
in the sand
watch the sea
hunting for pebbles
intent children
sift the beach's
sunburnt granary
pale eyes betray
a thousand memories
with an unnoticed
smile

"I WAS LUCKY," A WELL-KNOWN EUROPEAN DRAMATIST SAID TO ME THE OTHER DAY. "NOTHING SEEMED TO HAVE OCCURRED TO THE RÉGisseur WHO STAGED MY PLAY." AND, AS AN ANSWER TO MY UNDERSTANDING SMILE, HE ADDED: "THEY ARE SO INVENTIVE THESE DAYS THAT YOU CAN'T RECOGNIZE YOUR OWN PLAY ANY MORE; EVERYTHING IS SHEER THEATRICAL MADNESS."

Live theater is undoubtedly characterized by a total immediacy creating a strong tie between a known actor on stage, who speaks for the author, and a number of unknown people representing mankind as audience. A dialogue takes place between the two, even though it seems to be one-sided. Events happen on stage, symbolic and suggestive through the mere power of their being, whatever meaning these events may convey. Throughout dramatic history a struggle for prominence between actor and dramatist can be discerned, and they are the happiest moments in our histrionic experiences when actors emerge in the role of the dramatist, as the examples of Sophocles, Shakespeare, and Molière prove.

Today the theater has no longer the needed function it once had. It no longer has only to compete with itself, but also with such theatrical potentialities as created by the development of technology. The days when the radio play had an incredible fascination for the public are gone. Film and television have revolutionized our theatrical sensibilities, and the consequences of our growing visual-mindedness are not yet predictable.


This phenomenon goes back to the histrionic revolutions in the late nineteenth century, with Antoine's Théâtre-Libre in Paris, Brahms' Freie Bühne in Berlin, the attempts of Grein and Barker in London, and, above all, with Stanislavsky's history-making concepts of acting at the Moscow Art Theatre. From then on the great names registered in the annals of the theater are not those of dramatists and actors as much as of stage directors. It is one of the curiosities of history that, with the simultaneous development of the film in which the director—despite all glamor of acting personalities—plays the most decisive role, the stage director's
influence and control have grown in an unrestricted manner. Such names as Reinhardt and Piscator, Meyerhold and Tairov, Copeau, Jouvet, or Barrault come to mind.

Ever since the surprise element has come to dominate taste and direction in all artistic expression, directional excesses on the world stage have become routine. To be sure, while one sees or reads about relentless mayhem all over our globe, one can still point to a few good deeds in our world. I can remember easily a few theatrical experiences over the years, great stage creations. And these came about because, not in spite of the imaginative genius of the stage director. Years have passed, but such productions as Peter Brook's A Midsummer Night's Dream or Giorgio Strehler's King Lear have remained constant and refreshing experiences.

ALL THESE THOUGHTS plagued me while seeing Maxim Gorki's play Vassa Shelesnova at the Neumarkt Theatre, known in Zürich as a rather experimental stage. This is one of Gorki's weaker, but also shorter, plays about economic injustice in life and greed in man, and about the amassment of money for money's sake, or rather for the sake of power over other people. There is a demon in this woman Vassa who, once badly treated by life, gets back at life with a calculating mind and a ruthless heart. This play is a clearly designed study of the senselessness of an existence keyed to no higher purpose than empty ambition and enrichment, giving full reign to one's lowest instincts.

This play has neither the creative breadth nor the dramatic power of Gorki's The Lower Depths. The characters are drawn as a sketch in black and white. But only one figure in white: a revolutionary girl who walks through the moral morass created by the excesses of capitalistic society. And yet her words sound wooden and banal, almost like clichés of a small-town politician.

Why should anyone wish to produce this play today if not to show certain features of the establishment, the products of a sick society whose children turn against it and are freaks and dropouts? This is one's immediate impression. Surprisingly, the play is less than thirty-five pages in print in contrast to the customary full-length plays of 80 to 120 pages. Nevertheless, the production at the Neumarkt Theatre took three hours. Whether it was a dramaturgic mistake to show this play today seemed, at the very end, of little consequence to me. What struck me as symptomatic was the way in which it was directed.

The most insignificant stage business was extended ad nauseam. The pauses between the spoken lines were intolerably long. (And they had nothing of Pinter's pauses of menace about them.) At the least provocation, a verbal image of anger turned into an orgy of physical brutality. Never before have I seen so many actors being thrown to the floor. Crossing the stage appeared to be a voyage into nowhere. A passage slightly alluding to eroticism was translated into the most obvious obscenity. This list could be continued. But let me say this: the scenic design, in contrast, was airy, clinically clean, even beautiful.

DO WE ASK FOR SENSATION at all costs, also at the expense of good taste and a sense of proportion? Are we invited to play the eyewitnesses of directorial madness? All this reminds me of a scene at the office of the late stage director Erwin Piscator at his President Theatre on Broadway. It must have happened in the very early 50s. Piscator had discussed the possibility of having Thornton Wilder write a dramatic version of Franz Kafka's The Trial for him. At one point of the discussion Piscator told Wilder that he must have the right of making changes in the script as he would see fit. "On stage only the director is master, not the dramatist!" Piscator said, to make his point unmistakably clear. Whereupon Wilder got up and walked out with a few dramatic words of an outraged poetic writer for the theater.
examines a characteristic eighteenth-century mode of reasoning—Trowbridge calls it probabalism—as reflected in the work of a major literary figure, Samuel Johnson, and a minor naturalist, Gilbert White.

This survey of the contents of the book indicates something of the range of Trowbridge's interests as well as the fundamental consistency of his approach. Nine of the fourteen essays deal explicitly with literary criticism, and virtually all of them attempt to define the philosophical climate out of which the works grew. In his preface Trowbridge acknowledges his commitment to intellectual history as an approach to literary scholarship. Though he does not quote him, he clearly agrees with Pope that it is the critic's business to try to understand the literature of the past as its authors and original public understood it. Thus, for example, he analyzes Dryden's critical essays in the light of seventeenth-century literary theory, and rejects as irrelevant and misleading romantic or pre-romantic concepts which did not emerge for more than two generations after Dryden's death. Similarly, he examines Pope's "Eloisa to Abelard" in the context of its own literary tradition—the heroic epistle of the Roman poet Ovid—in order to provide the grounds for a more just evaluation of the poem than it has generally received in the past two hundred years. Likewise he argues that a proper understanding of Jane Austen's novels depends on our recognizing how completely they assume a system of objective and reasoned moral values.

AS A COLLECTION OF INDEPENDENTLY CONCEIVED ESSAYS ON A VARIETY OF SUBJECTS, THE BOOK MUST NECESSARILY BE JUDGED ON ITS PARTS PERHAPS MORE THAN AS A WHOLE. ALSO, THE READER'S OWN INTERESTS WILL NATURALLY MAKE SOME ESSAYS SEEM MORE WORTHWHILE THAN OTHERS. TO MENTION THESE FACTS, HOWEVER, IS IN NO WAY TO DISPARAGE TROWBRIDGE'S ACHIEVEMENT. THOUGH, AS HE HIMSELF FRANKLY ACKNOWLEDGES, SEVERAL OF THE ESSAYS DEAL WITH MINOR SUBJECTS, A NUMBER OF OTHERS ARE OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE. THE THREE ON DRYDEN, ESPECIALLY THE FIRST TWO, PROVIDE A STILL-NEEDED CORRECTIVE TO A LOT OF MUDDLED THINKING ABOUT DRYDEN'S CRITICAL PRACTICE. "SWIFT AND SOCRATES" DEMONSTRATES NEATLY ONE OF TROWBRIDGE'S MOST VALUABLE SCHOLARLY TALENTS, HIS ABILITY TO GO SIMPLY AND DIRECTLY TO THE HEART OF A QUESTION. WHERE MUCH CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF SWIFT OBFUSCATES RATHER THAN CLARIFIES HIS THOUGHT, TROWBRIDGE BOTH RECOGNIZES AND FOCUSES ON ITS ESSENTIALLY MORAL CHARACTER. AND THE ESSAY ON JANE AUSTEN, ONE OF TROWBRIDGE'S MOST RECENT STUDIES, MAY WELL GENERATE A WHOLE SUCCESSION OF ARTICLES BY OTHER SCHOLARS. CLEAR AND CONVINCING, IT NEVERTHELESS ONLY BEGINS TO EXAMINE SOME VERY IMPORTANT IDEAS; IT SHOULD INSPIRE HIS COLLEAGUES TO CONTINUE THE TASK HE HAS BEGUN.

THOUGH MOST OF THESE ESSAYS HAVE BEEN PUBLISHED PREVIOUSLY IN SCHOLARLY JOURNALS, NONE OF THEM IS TOO TECHNICAL FOR THE NON-SPECIALIST; AND THOSE ON MAJOR WRITERS—MORE THAN HALF THE TOTAL—ARE OF GENERAL INTEREST. MOREOVER, BECAUSE OF HIS INTEREST IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND OF THE LITERATURE HE IS DISCUSSING, TROWBRIDGE HAS GIVEN US IN THESE ESSAYS AN INSIGHT INTO THE CHARACTER OF AN AGE WHICH STILL HAS SOMETHING VALUABLE TO SAY TO OUR OWN.

NOLA J. WEGMAN

WHY ARE YOU NOT A CRIMINAL?


FOR DECADES SOCIAL SCIENTISTS HAVE Sought, WITHOUT CONSPICUOUS SUCCESS, FOR ANSWERS TO THE QUESTION, WHAT CAUSES PEOPLE TO COMMIT CRIME? IN RECENT YEARS, MORE AND MORE PROFESSIONALS ARE ASKING THE REVERSE OF THAT QUERY: WHAT CAUSES PEOPLE TO CONFORM TO SOCIETY'S RULES? JOSEPH W. ROGERS, THE AUTHOR OF WHY ARE YOU NOT A CRIMINAL?, REPRESENTS THE FIELD'S MOST RECENT ATTEMPTS TO ARRIVE AT A BREAKTHROUGH IN OUR UNDERSTANDING AND PREDICTION OF DEVIANCE BY STUDYING CONFORMITY.

ROGERS' MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO THE FIELD OF CRIMINOLOGY IN THIS BOOK IS HIS ATTEMPT TO INTEGRATE SEVERAL OF THE MORE POPULAR AND PROMISING CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF CRIMINALITY AND CONFORMITY. THE MANNER IN WHICH COMPLEX AND SOPHISTICATED THEORETICAL ISSUES ARE PRESENTED IS A COMMENDABLE EFFORT FOR SUCH A SMALL BOOK. THEORIES AND CONCEPTS ARE GENERALLY EXPRESSED IN A COMPREHENSIBLE FASHION, ALTHOUGH TO FULLY UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF MANY OF THE CONCEPTS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO ONE ANOTHER ONE MUST READ THE BOOK VERY CAREFULLY; THIS IS NOT A BOOK WHICH LENDS ITSELF EASILY TO BEING SKIMMED.

FOR THOSE WITH SOME TRAINING IN SOCIOLOGY THEORY, ROGERS MAKES PROLIFIC USE OF EXTENDED FOOTNOTES TO FURTHER CLARIFY AND EXPOND UPON STATEMENTS MADE IN THE BODY OF THE TEXT; HE ALSO DOES AN ADMIRABLE JOB OF CITING REFERENCES FOR THE READER WHO MIGHT WISH TO UNDERTAKE OUTSIDE READING IN SELECTED AREAS.

THE DATA THE AUTHOR USES IN HIS BOOK CONSIST OF "ACCOUNTS" OR EXPLANATIONS OFFERED BY COLLEGE STUDENTS ON WHY THEY CONFORM TO THE NORMS OF SOCIETY. UNFORTUNATELY, ROGERS RELIES STRICTLY UPON QUOTES FROM THESE ACCOUNTS TO SUPPORT THE THEORETICAL POSITIONS OF WHICH HE SPEAKS. AS ANY WELL-READ PERSON IS AWARE, ONE CAN EASILY "PROVE" ABOUT ANY POSITION BY USING THE PROCEDURE OF SELECTIVE QUOTING. THEREFORE, HIS DATA SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN AS ANYTHING MORE THAN ILLUSTRATIONS; THEY DO NOT, AS PRESENTED IN THE BOOK, LEGITIMATELY SUPPORT OR REFUTE ANY THEORETICAL POSITION. HOWEVER, THE HEAVY USAGE OF QUOTES IS GOOD IN AT LEAST ONE RESPECT—THE READER CAN IMMEDIATELY EMPATHIZE WITH MANY OF THE STUDENTS' ACCOUNTS. WHEN SIMILAR BOOKS AND STUDIES HAVE BEEN DONE USING CONVICTED FELONS AS SUBJECTS, EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IS OBIQUOUSLY MORE DIFFICULT FOR THE LAW-ABIDING CITIZEN IF, INDEED, IT IS NOT PRECLUDED ALTOGETHER.

WHILE ROGERS LEGITIMATELY CRITICIZES PAST STUDIES ON CRIMINAL ACTIVITY WHICH
asked criminals to explain their behavior, the same problem is present in asking conformists to explain theirs. From simply being a deviant (or a conformist) it does not necessarily follow that the person is aware of all the social and nonsocial factors which influence his behavior. Unfortunately, this philosophical and methodological problem is not fully addressed in the book.

Rogers' writing style is fairly comprehensible though the further one gets into the book the more laborious the reading becomes, primarily due to the presence of more and more sociological jargon. This may make the book somewhat more difficult for the non-sociologist to read; however, it is not incomprehensible and, with just a little extra effort, the reader can fully appreciate Rogers' work.

Finally, the book seems in reality to be two in one. The first part is concerned with explaining his students' accounts and showing how sociological theory can offer some understanding of their behavior patterns. The second part of the book (Chapter V—the Epilogue) is by far the more interesting in my opinion. Here, Rogers takes twelve propositions about crime and criminals which are relatively widely known and offers evidence from other studies as to their validity or falsehood. Most readers will probably be surprised to discover that some of their belief on criminal activity is not supported by the research literature.

All in all, Rogers' book will win no prizes for its research design or analysis of the data. However, it is certainly a useful book in terms of outlining some of the most promising contemporary theoretical positions in criminology in a relatively simple and straightforward manner. And, as stated earlier, the epilogue alone is worth the price of the book.

BILLY WILLIAMS

GATEWAY.

POHL HAS ALWAYS BEEN A reliable name if you're looking for a good story, and on that score Gateway won't disappoint you. In this one, though, Pohl tries to do more than just tell a good story; he tries to get inside the head of the protagonist, one Robinette Broadhead. As a psychological novel, it is a much better adventure story.

Broadhead, apparently always something of a schlemiel, is guilt-ridden. By a stroke of 'fortune,' he is also rich enough to go to the best psychiatrist in town—a machine he knows as Sigfrid von Shrink. The story of Broadhead's fortune is also the story of his guilt, and we find out the lot as Sigfrid and he struggle to "get out" what is troubling him.

There are some interesting ideas in the novel. Gateway is a kind of interstellar space-station, left behind by a lost and incomprehensible race called the Heechee. At Gateway thousands of spaceships, all aimed and fueled and ready to take off, sit waiting for men brave enough to try. The problem: you never knew when you got into a ship previously unused where you might wind up—near a planet full of treasure, or inside a star. Most people came back empty—or not at all. Still, there will always be those who are willing to risk everything in hopes of striking it rich. . . . Enter Broadhead out of the food-mines, alternately ready to go and quaking at the thought, but unwilling to return to Earth and poverty.

Robinette's guilt has to do with another interesting idea: what happens to someone who falls into a black hole—where time stops?

Gateway was serialized in Galaxy magazine in 3 parts: November and December, 1976, and March, 1977. If you're unwilling to plunk $8.95 for the hardcover, could be UPD Publishing Corp., 235 East 45th St., New York, NY 10017 will sell you the back issues for $3.75 total. Or watch for the paperback. Pohl will have to work a little harder to achieve the kind of psychological depth he seems to be after; but the book has enough fresh ideas and dramatic tension to be worth a read.

WALTER R. RIEDEL

Aficionados of Pohl will be interested to learn that an alternate ending to Gateway has been written and is scheduled to be published in the August or September 1977 issue of Galaxy magazine.—KFK.

DEATH, DYING, AND THE BIOLOGICAL REVOLUTION: OUR LAST QUEST FOR RESPONSIBILITY.

THE FIELD OF MEDICAL ETHICS has a relatively long tradition, at least in Roman Catholic moral theology. However, the changes in medical technology in the past two decades have been so great that the contemporary study of bioethics is almost like an excursion into virgin territory. Keeping up with the current literature in the field is frustrating; not so much because of the volume but because of the unevenness of the quality. Such uneven quality is to be expected as ethicists attempt to chart a course through the complexity of the medical data. Such will be the case especially as they single out the ethical issues and keep such issues distinct from the medical judgments. Thus it is like a breath of fresh air when a
book like the above appears on the market. It is a comprehensive, clear, and eminently readable study of the ethical implications of modern medical technology for the meaning of death in our time.

Robert Veatch is, in my judgment, the best among current authors in the field of medical ethics. He is presently Senior Associate and Staff Director of the Research Group on Death and Dying at the Institute of Society, Ethics and the Life Sciences, the institute which publishes the best periodical in the field, The Hastings Center Report. Until recently Paul Ramsey has been the most prominent Protestant ethicist in this area, and his well-received book on The Patient as Person deals with many of the same issues as does Veatch. Ramsey's writing style, however, is so turgid and at times vague that the reader has to struggle for the valuable insights that are inevitably found in his analysis and critique of current issues. Veatch has the ability to pull together all the relevant data, identify the options, determine appropriate criteria, and state his own position—all with a clarity and precision of expression that make the book a delight to read.

Veatch covers a broad range of issues beginning with a definition of death. Veatch is very helpful in distinguishing between technical and ethical problems in a definition of death. He is able to show the fallacy in simply leaving it to the physician to determine the meaning and thus the time of death, a fallacy that is an unfortunate flaw in Ramsey's work. Veatch deals with the issues prominent in current debates about euthanasia, focusing especially on the use and misuse of artificial means of life support. One of the most helpful chapters in the book deals with the right of patients to refuse treatment, an issue that became prominent in the Karen Quinlan case and one that is crucial in determining policy on decision-making. This leads into a discussion of public policy alternatives and the proposal of a clear set of guidelines in determining the line of authority for decision-making. Veatch treats the topics of truth-telling and the use of organs from the newly dead in his characteristically lucid style, though there is little new here for anyone familiar with the literature.

The last chapter, "Natural Death and Public Policy," is an intriguing analysis of a concept that is close to the center of the debate on death with dignity. We need to understand what we mean by "natural" death and what might be considered a violation of the same. Though Veatch is dealing in this chapter with what is a philosophical and theological problem, i.e., whether death is essentially an evil to be conquered, he does little more than open the door to what could be a companion volume written from a theological perspective on the meaning of natural death. Though not written to address the questions that Veatch is raising, Helmut Thielicke's book on Death and Life would provide at least a point of departure for such a volume.

THOMAS DROEGE

CORRECTION

In my review of I KNOW IT WHEN I SEE IT: PORNOGRAPHY, VIOLENCE AND PUBLIC INSENSITIVITY by Michael Leach [The Cresset XL:5 (March 1977), pp. 23-24], an error was made.

The Westminster Press has not recently acquired the Seabury Press. Therefore, it is incorrect to call the book an "in house" job.

I regret this error, and I offer my apologies to the Westminster Press, the Seabury Press, and Mr. Leach.

David G. Truemper

COMMUNICATION: IV

(continued from page 28)

communication consciousness. Questions need to be asked, suggestions received, sensitivities developed, gaps identified, bottlenecks broken, archaic procedures scrapped, new techniques tried out. To be defensive about present or past routines in communication strategy is not only inefficient; it is stultifying.

The vitality of contemporary institutions can ill afford the luxury of administrators who can only travel in bureaucratic ruts.

Furthermore, the development of improved communication strategy should be a group process. Effective communication strategy, it must be emphasized, is a multi-directional street. Most complaints deal with "from the top down" communication barriers. But "from the bottom up" or "from side to side" communication snags are just as debilitating. Unless everybody "buys into" the logic of maximum communication streets and strategies, traffic snarls are not likely to be decreased that much.

Finally, every organization needs special procedures for crucial issue communication. On some matters critical emotion ratios reach explosive levels almost instantaneously. To defuse the bomb, virtually immediate information-sharing sessions, face to face, if possible, are required. Without this organizations can find themselves in the middle of fiascos which could have been prevented if swift communication procedures had been followed.

Clearly communication is one of our most vexing organizational problems. But, just as clearly, creative minds can fashion constructive structures and procedures which give promise of significant improvements. Enlightened organizations should have this as a priority objective.
COMMUNICATION: IV

SOME COLLEGE STUDENTS were interviewed on a local radio program and were asked what if anything, needed to be improved at their institution. Without hesitation they answered: “Communication.” A group of college administrators was asked a similar question. They said: “Communication.” Employees in a large business organization were surveyed. They named communication problems as their chief complaint.

The regularity with which communication emerges as the most annoying problem area for institutions and social organizations never ceases to amaze me. Yet it shouldn’t. Communication is one of our most basic needs. As conscious, thinking, alert human beings, we all want to know somehow hurts our ego.

Are communication problems universal? It would seem so. No one has ever devised a system to get all the information that people want to all the people who want it all the time. Until they do (an unlikely prospect) someone will inevitably be dissatisfied.

Yet groups vary. Some will generate more dissatisfaction than others. All humans are inherently curious, but expectations for curiosity satisfaction are subject to conditioning.

WE ARE AN OPEN SOCIETY.

And open societies train people to expect a maximum of information. In fact, any concealment (with the possible exception of national security information) carries a strong stigma. American presidents, to illustrate, are becoming so sensitive to this cultural reality that they are bringing in photographers to expose even their private and family living to the public.

In this environment, all organizations become victims (not the best word, perhaps) of what Adlai Stevenson labeled a “revolution of rising expectations.” Curiosity satisfaction needs rise to near insatiable levels.

This presents enormous problems for large, complex institutions. The amount of information data generated by institutional participants and programs on any given day is huge. To share all of it with everybody every day would challenge the most sophisticated news dissemination system and, in addition, would quickly run the treasury dry.

Yet I believe that institutions ought not turn away from the challenge. I believe that the aphorism about information being power is true. Therefore, to deliberately and systematically contain, control, limit, or manipulate information is an authoritarian practice, not worthy of groups who value individual worth and democratic decision-making processes. I believe that “good” institutions, in the American sense, should strive for maximum distribution of information that will help people make their own judgments about what course of action an institution ought to follow in any given situation.

(Note: It should be self-evident in religious organizations that absolute, God-given standards are not subject to group decision-making. Here the challenge is maximum effective communication of what God teaches, not man deciding what God’s standard ought to be.)