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What's Going On Here?

This magazine has given reluctant but consistent support to our country's involvement in Viet Nam. We have done so on the assumption that we have one simple objective in being there: to ensure the people of South Viet Nam the right to work out their own destiny without interference on the part of their neighbors. The obligation to protect the weak against the strong is, we believe, one of the obligations which power carries with it, whether the possessor of power be an individual, a group, or a nation. It is this obligation which, as we understand Secretary of State Rusk, we are attempting to honor in Viet Nam.

We have never assumed that we were in Viet Nam to make it an outpost of American cultural, economic, political, or military colonialism. We can see, of course, extending our involvement there to include helping the people of Viet Nam reconstruct as much as possible of whatever the war has shattered. But it is not, in our judgment, any part of our business to remake Viet Nam along the lines of what we think it ought to be.

It is therefore disturbing to us to see us building an "embassy" in Saigon which seems remarkably large for the amount of business which we would normally transact with such a small country and which might, indeed, be mistaken for the headquarters of a high commissioner if Viet Nam were an American colony. It is disturbing to see us building a military headquarters so large and impressive that some news men have already labeled it "the little Pentagon." (Official sources have assured us that it is a "temporary structure," designed for a 25-year lifetime. We do not get any impression of temporariness from the pictures we have seen of it.) It is disturbing to us to hear talk about the "nation-building" which we must undertake as soon as we have the military situation under control. Was it not our stated purpose to rid Viet Nam of outsiders so that its people could get about the business of building their own nation?

We want to continue to support our action in Viet Nam, but we want some reassurance that we have not escalated our objectives there. We want to hear someone in a position to say it assure us that after we have compelled the North Vietnamese and their allies to let their South Vietnamese neighbors alone, we will do likewise. This reassurance would, we think, allay not only some of our misgivings but also many of the fears and suspicions of friendly governments which have refused to support our Vietnamese policies because they have mistrusted our long-range objectives.

The colonial era is past, irrevocably past. It would be tragic if we tried to resurrect it under the guise of a benevolent and generous, but intrinsically authoritarian, paternalism.

Investment in Apartheid

We were at a dinner meeting recently at which an exile from the Republic of South Africa gave us some interesting and disturbing insights into our government's reluctance to support various proposals that have been made in the United Nations for sanctions against South Africa and its cruel policy of apartheid.

Item: United States interests in South Africa are drawing some $100,000,000 a year on their investments there.

Item: General Motors is in the process of investing $32,000,000 in additional plant facilities in Port Elizabeth. The vehicles turned out by this plant are, incidentally, easily convertible to military purposes.

Item: Ten New York banks are presently organizing a consortium which will furnish up to $40,000,000 to the government of the Republic of South Africa.

From the foregoing, it would appear that there is a certain mutuality of interests between the power structure of the United States and the Afrikaaner establishment which overrides those considerations which have ostensibly justified our playing the role of moral preceptor in other situations. Given the dimensions of this mutuality of interests, it would be unrealistic to suggest that we take any firm action to cut off the support which we are presently giving to South Africa. But we think a good case could be made for not increasing this support.
by way of further investment in the South African economy.

Purely from the standpoint of self-interest — forgetting, that is, the moral responsibility which we assume by helping to underwrite a cruel and oppressive regime — it might be wise for us to avoid too large an economic commitment in South Africa. It is the best judgment of those who are acquainted with the situation there that sooner or later the rigors of apartheid must produce an equal and opposite reaction in the form of a bloody revolt on the part of South Africa's ten million black people against the domination of the three million whites. To foresee this is not to wish it, but the desperate black man really has no other way of achieving his freedom. The law is against him, the Church is against him, the police are against him, and there is hardly a single influential white voice to speak for him. If we can not or will not speak for him, we might at least dissociate ourselves, as far as that is possible, from his oppressors and thus, perhaps, minimize the danger to American lives on the dies irae.

The Prayer Amendment

We have not commented until now on the proposed "Prayer Amendment" because we found it hard to believe that we were supposed to take it seriously. But when two of the nation's most popular entertainers (Senator Dirksen and Pat Boone) join forces to whip up enthusiasm for the amendment and claim to have the support of some three and a half million people one has to reckon with the possibility that the thing might get off the ground. This would be most unfortunate.

It would be unfortunate because prayer, as a mere form of words, is blasphemy and if, in our religiously pluralistic society, we can not agree on the object of our worship and obedience we can at least agree not to blaspheme.

It would be unfortunate because it would rekindle religious hostilities which do nothing to further the proper ends of any religion — Christian, Jewish, Moslem, or Buddhist — and would play directly into the hands of those who, for one reason or another, would like to pit believer against non-believer, Christian against Jew, Roman Catholic against Protestant.

It would be unfortunate because it would tend to reinforce the idea, already far too prevalent in our country, that "God" (whoever he may be) is the American tribal deity and that those who deny or doubt his existence are, in some sense, traitors to the state and to our institutions.

It would be unfortunate because it would violate the consciences of many devout adherents to all of the great religions who consider common prayer a form of common confession and who could not, therefore, participate in such prayers.

It would be unfortunate because it would leave the impression that the worship of God is merely instrument-
al to some higher good: reduction of the crime rate, a greater measure of national unity, better interpersonal relations, better discipline in the schools, or whatever. In the Christian and Jewish traditions, at least, God is to be feared, loved, adored, and obeyed — but never used.

We raise these objections as one who can feel considerable sympathy with the motives of the sponsors of the proposed amendment. Like St. Paul (and like Senator Dirksen) we wish that all men were as we are, persuaded that God is, that He loves and cares for us, and that He welcomes our prayers and intercessions. We wish with all our heart that we really were one nation under God. But we aren't, and any attempt to pretend that we are involves doing violence to the consciences of large numbers of our fellow citizens. We have churches and homes to pray in, and some of us support schools in which prayer can be offered, as it should be, within the fellowship of the Faith. Why must we needlessly offend consciences when all of these other opportunities for prayer are open to us?

Guaranteed Annual Wage

When the bargaining committee of the United Auto Workers presents its demand for a guaranteed annual wage to the auto manufacturers next summer it will, we presume, have at least the moral support of a friend of ours who is a millionaire and the president of a very successful manufacturing company.

This friend of ours would go even farther than the UAW is going. He insists that the time has come when we should guarantee every American family a reasonable minimum income, not as an act of charity or even of common decency but of pure economic good sense. His argument runs as follows:

American industry is producing far below its potential because an out-moded Protestant work ethic denies men the moral right to consume unless they also produce. But while human beings as consumers make the economic wheels go around, human beings as producers (at least in industry) are so much sand in the wheels; machines are much more efficient. From the purely economic standpoint, the thing to do therefore would be to go all out for automation and get as many human workers as possible out of the shop. But this could be done only if they were provided with enough money to buy the things these highly efficient, fully-automated shops turn out. So, reasons our friend, pay people to stay away from work but penalize them for failing to spend their allowances.

We don't argue economics with millionaire corporation presidents, although we sense some flaw in this argument. Nevertheless the major premise seems to be valid: in a consumer economy the first thing you have to have is consumers. From this it would seem to follow that a guaranteed annual wage would also have the effect of creating a guaranteed annual market. The same
people who are involved as producers in the making of automobiles constitute, we suppose, a sizeable part of the potential market for automobiles.

More persuasive for us than the economic argument, though, is the social argument. We take it that our society has long since rejected the idea both of the classical economist and of the Marxist that workers are merely tools of production. Capital, management, and labor are quite obviously partners in the industrial enterprise and no one of the three should be exploited to the advantage of the others. It seems to us that the man on the assembly-line is as much entitled to job and wage security as is the man in the executive suite. What we do not know is whether the profits of the automobile industry are such that a guaranteed annual wage is possible without working an injustice upon those who risk their capital in the industry. Lacking that knowledge, we must reserve our judgment on the UAW demands.

**Accounting for our Stewardship**

We have just been through the interesting experience of having our Federal income tax return audited — apparently our income no longer falls under the "de minimis no curat lex" — and we are happy to say that we passed with flying colors.

The happiness is tempered somewhat, though, by the thought that we have, if only tacitly, consented to a strange reversal of values, for there is no escaping the fact that we have more or less willingly submitted to some civil servant in Indianapolis what we surely owe, but have never given, to any father or brother in Christ: a full accounting of the stewardship of our income for the year 1965.

One can, of course, argue that the State ought not demand this kind of undressing of its citizens. But most of us do send in our records upon demand and few of us object to the demand so strenuously that we would rather go to jail than accede to it. But if the Church made a similar demand, we would almost certainly protest violently that what we make and how we spend it is our own private business and no concern of the Church. So, in effect, we are conceding that the body politic is entitled to a fuller accounting of our stewardship than is the Body of Christ.

This is a claim which we think ought to be contested. Caesar does, indeed, have a right to use all reasonable means to ensure that we have rendered to him the things that are his. But if we concede him this right, on what grounds do we deny God the right to ensure that we are rendering to Him the things that are His?

There are, of course, in most congregations whole file drawers of financial records. But as indices of the spiritual health of their members they are practically meaningless, in some cases even misleading. The records will show that Brother A contributed $1,000 last year to the Church. But $1,000 out of how much? And was this the full extent of his response to the claims of his Lord Who asks His help not only to keep the congregation solvent but also to feed the hungry and clothe the naked and heal the sick and plead the cause of the friendless and the oppressed?

It is one of the many heresies of our day that the disposal of our income is a matter which lies exclusively between the individual Christian and his God. But "we are members one of another," and surely this membership implies some accountability one to the other. We therefore propose a new kind of confessional. We propose that each year, after we have filed our annual income tax return, we take our taxpayer's copy to our pastor or to some brother whose faith and discretion we respect and invite his evaluation of our stewardship. Any takers?

**End of the Affair**

"The case is closed."

So read the "final" official statement by relieved Big Ten Commissioner Bill Reed minutes after University of Illinois coaches Pete Elliott, Harry Combes, and Howard Braun announced their resignations for their roles in the now-famous Illinois slush fund scandal. Unfortunately, Mr. Reed strongly resembled an Indian Fakir hastily clapping the cover back on his basket of snakes after one had escaped.

How can the case be closed?

What about published reports that Elliott could blow the lid off the whole Big Ten if he chose to do so? What about published reports that some Illinois athletes honored early commitments to Illinois although they received far juicier offers later? What about the little man in Illinois who has been contributing $75.00 a year to some athletic slush fund, but doesn't know where? (Membership in the exposed slush fund was restricted to givers of $100 or multiples therof for "ease of bookkeeping."

What about published reports in a Chicago newspaper which specifically spelled out the "cleans" (universities which are obeying the rules) and the "not-so-cleans" (universities which regularly bend the rules) in the Big Ten as a matter of common fact and knowledge?

The case is closed? Really, Mr. Reed.

Actually, the Illinois case is insignificant — other than for the part it has played in crystallizing the issue — to the total problem. The hypocrisy in intercollegiate athletics, chiefly the major-school programs, but not exclusively so; the huge over-emphasis on the recruitment of gifted students (and here the efforts to get some gifted non-athletes would make Illinois look like a small-town Sunday School picnic); the pirating of faculty members; institutional jockeying to get every loose dime from the Federal gravy train, regardless of whether the institution is equipped to do the job which the grants call for — all of these abuses plague higher education today and, worse still, reflect the moral climate of the nation.

Most disturbing in the Illinois thing was the almost
universal, or at least the overwhelmingly majority, public reaction: "Poor Illinois! Why pick on such a nice school when those other guys get away with murder?" (Cf. "My poor wife! Why did they have to pick on her when she was only going 30 in a 25-mile-per-hour zone and never drives any faster while everybody knows those other guys speed there all day long?"

Another big winner in public reaction was the complaint that these "outstanding character builders," virtual pillars of virtue, and "ideal men to have your sons play under" (quote one Chicago columnist) were guilty, indeed, but that the penalty was too harsh. Little weight was given to the fact that there were repeated violations over a five-year period, at least when records were kept, and not merely an isolated instance or two. No one seemed to remember that this code of regulations had been formulated and placed into operation, fully ratified, by all member schools of the Big Ten. Apparently the code was not too harsh on paper — in fact, it made nice window-dressing — but it was another matter when it came time to enforce it.

Enter now Dr. David Dodds Henry, president of the University of Illinois since 1955 and, presumably, around long enough to know what was going on. He fought to save his coaches since the penalty was "too harsh" and the men were "acting on orders from higher up." "The institution," Dr. Henry intoned, "should be held responsible — not the men" (although they were fully aware of the rules.)

He hung the dirty linen on recently-resigned Athletic Director Doug Mills, who had left the scene "voluntarily" "for personal reasons" entirely separate from the scandal which was exposed later that same month. Published reports say that the letter of resignation was written for him by someone higher up in the Illinois hierarchy and that he was given the choice of signing or being fired. (Is the case still closed, Mr. Reed?)

Once the coaches had resigned before the ultimatum from the Big Ten faculty representatives, the statement was made that they had been fired by the Big Ten. It seems more realistic to suggest that they were fired by the present-day hypocritical Don't-get-caught American moral climate.

There were a couple of bright spots in the encircling gloom that deserve mention, though.

There were the Big Ten faculty representatives, who knew that the only course open to them was to act as they did to preserve the integrity of old-fashioned concepts of right and wrong; if nothing else, the scandal reaffirmed the absolute necessity of final faculty control of inter-collegiate athletics in higher education.

And there were a few journalists, notably the Illinois student newspaper and Jack Mabley of the Chicago American, who endorsed the Big Ten action all the way.

But what are these among so many? Perhaps no more than a pinch of salt, a grain of leaven in a rotting society. Meanwhile, thank Heaven for the many small colleges and universities — and a few great ones — that still naively believe that it "isn't if you win or lose, but how you play the game."

Local Boy Makes Good

Our good friend and colleague, Dr. Victor F. Hoffmann, has been granted a two-year leave of absence by Valparaiso University to take on the job of executive director of the Commission on Religion and Race of Greater Milwaukee. Dr. Hoffmann is already working at his new job on a part-time basis. In August he will move to Milwaukee to begin working full time.

For The Cresset the temporary loss of Dr. Hoffmann's services as associate managing editor and general books editor will be a very considerable one. Happily, he has assured us that he will continue to write his monthly Editor-at-Large column. He has also accepted an appointment to our board of Consulting Editors.

The assignment which Dr. Hoffmann has taken on in Milwaukee is one for which he is uniquely equipped. Long before most people were even aware of the problem, Dr. Hoffmann was deeply concerned about the injustices which have been visited upon the Negro in our society. This concern is only one manifestation of his lifetime concern for the underdog. No one in our acquaintance has done more than he has to plead the cause of the poor and the needy and no one has shown a greater capacity for distinguishing between love and sentimentality in responding to their needs.

In Milwaukee, we believe, Dr. Hoffmann has found what may be the best of all possible opportunities to use his background and talents effectively. Milwaukee is one of the few major cities of our country that are still fit for human beings to live in. This is not to say that it does not have its problems, but it has also a long record of good, foresighted political and community leadership, supported by the criticism and encouragement of a responsible press. It has been characteristic of Milwaukee to anticipate problems and do something about them before they escalate to the point where rational solutions are no longer possible.

It is only fair to our friends in Milwaukee to warn them that we are sending them Dr. Hoffmann on loan, and we expect him back. He has by no means contributed all that he has to contribute to Valparaiso University and to The Cresset. Least of all can we afford to lose him as critic, counselor, and friend. And we still believe, perhaps more deeply than we have ever believed before, that the great battles of our time will be fought not on the streets or in committee rooms or in legislative chambers, but in the classroom. Knowing as we do Dr. Hoffmann's need to be where the battle is, we can send him off with an "Auf Wiedersehen" rather than a "Good-bye."
Next to serving on a local draft board, the most thankless task going must be to serve on the committee planning a World’s Fair. Although EXPO ’67 has just opened in Montreal, plans for EXPO ’70 in Japan have been underway for the past two years and are in a hopelessly snarled state, with the members of the sponsoring group, the Japan World Exposition committee, under fire from all sides.

I am indebted to the Kwansei Gakuin Times, the newspaper published by the English speaking students of Kwansei Gakuin University in Nishinomiya, for this vital information. If I understand my source correctly, almost everything the committee has done so far is wrong, but I must point out that Japanese college students have the tendency to look with some suspicion on most of the activities of their elders, a point of view which they share with their U.S. counterparts.

The Japan World Exposition committee has already begun an advertising campaign and has plastered the windows of street cars, motor cars, shops, and “pinball saloons” with the Fair symbol, a diamond-shaped sign with a picture of what appear to be five chipped billiard balls arranged in a circle and with printing in Japanese and English. The signs have confused motorists because they have been planted along highways and in the center of rice fields and their diamond shape is the same as the warning signs for Japanese motorists.

But the big problem is over the site. After looking around the country, the committee decided to build the Fair in the Senri Hills outside of Osaka. And wouldn’t you know it, the 85-unit Yamada-Kami housing development is right in the center of the plot. The Exposition committee has offered to exchange land with the residents and move them to Satakedai, which, if the tenants can be believed, must be something like our Okefenokee Swamp in Florida.

The exchange just won’t do, because, according to Mr. H. Orita, who is the spokesman for those occupying the development, Yamada-Kami is “where bush warblers make sounds neighbors’ ears in early spring,” whatever that may mean, while Satakedai is “not sunny, has very bad conditions, and is area of which housewives complain.”

And the farmers in the area are complaining too, because the Exposition committee is also buying up land around the Osaka International Airport in order to lengthen the runway so that overseas jets can bring in the customers. Twenty-six farm families have organized themselves into “A House of Unity” to fight the land grab.

The amount of land needed for the runway extension is 33 chobu and, if you are not acquainted with this figure of measurement, I can tell you this amounts to 810 square chain. If you are thinking of these farmers as desperately poor coolie types, let me point out their objection is not so much to the money involved as it is to the interference of the planes with their television reception and “speaking by phone.”

As if this weren’t enough, the citizens of Settsu City are fighting the Fair’s location in the Senri Hills, since they are at the bottom of the drainage system for that area. As you probably know, the drainage for the hills is through the Rivers Ai and Taisho. What with cutting down trees and increasing general activity on the fair grounds, an extra 200,000 tons of drainage will descend on Settsu City. This city is unfortunately on low ground and the Rivers Ai and Taisho have a tendency to flood, so the citizens are naturally alarmed that their town will be the depository for all of the garbage and night soil from the Exposition grounds.

Even the theme for EXPO ’70 has run into criticism. The themes for all of the official world fairs were set some time in the 1940’s and the one assigned Japan is “Progress and Harmony for Mankind,” a theme almost no one, including the members of the committee (who are ignoring it), understands. It is a theme about which the journalist on the KG Times says, “If we really think much about it, we are obliged to reconsider it.” He suggests as alternative themes “Toward More Beautiful Fruit from Nature” or “Fuller Engineering of Our Living Environment.”

Certainly the Japanese people haven’t been sold on the value of an Exposition, or else it is a project too vast to comprehend, for “the master of a traditional store of old standing” in the Osaka area is quoted as saying, “EXPO ’70 is a fair unrelated with us of medium and small enterprises.”

By way of suggestion, I would recommend attending EXPO ’67 in Montreal if at all possible, since the way things are going, there may never be an EXPO ’70.
Some Issues In Contemporary Family Life

By ARMIN GRAMS
The Merrill-Palmer Institute

The extent of a topic like “Contemporary Family Life” demands that in an article of this length we select some areas of special interest to us and leave the rest untouched. The problem of enormous and unmanageable topics reminds me of a predicament I faced once as a graduate student in psychological measurement. It happened in the final exam, and although it was disconcerting, the point was made very well. The instructor had been trying to get us to understand and to avoid the dangers of test questions which were too general and vague. The final question on his exam read, “Define the universe and give two examples.”

Now to some extent that is the feeling you get when you look at the area of family life. It is a “universe,” and we can concentrate on only a few issues which relate to it. Even those here selected for attention cannot be treated exhaustively, but at the same time we will try to avoid the easy alternative of superficiality. I want to consider the following topics:

1. Earlier marriages and larger families
2. Child rearing practices
3. Changing roles for parents

Although each of these will be treated separately, some overlap is inevitable. Furthermore, there is a unifying factor which cuts across all of these considerations and that is the matter of human values. Perhaps the chief challenge which confronts the family today is to find meaning in its existence. Now, I don’t mean this in any vague philosophical way. I mean simply to be able to see why it is doing what it is doing, or, in other words, to see how what it is doing is linked to what it hopes to accomplish.

It seems to me that almost every one of the above topics is related to the purpose which we see in our life. Are we sufficiently self-conscious? That is, do we stop to consider occasionally how all the pieces fit together? Now all of this can, of course, be over-done. We can become so occupied with orderliness, priorities, and reasonableness, that we lose all spontaneity and vitality. We can become so introspective about all of our motions that we never “get off the ground,” as it were. But I am not too worried about such excesses. I am much more troubled by the inability of many individuals to answer the question, “Why am I alive? Is there any purpose, any meaning to it all?” Some critics have referred to us as an aimless, wandering society — a people come loose from its moorings, now hopelessly adrift. No doubt in many respects this is an accurate description of our contemporary situation, but I object to the overwhelming pessimism which accompanies it and the fatalistic outlook on life which is fostered thereby.

I am convinced that informed individuals can derive maximum benefits from participation in a relatively meaningful endeavor in which certain aspects are seen in terms of their relationship to the whole. Again we must guard against rigidity. The problem here is not occasional incongruity between means and end, or between specific behavior episodes and long-range goals in life. It is, rather, the consistent lack of awareness that incongruity exists. Such obliviousness may be due to not knowing where we are or the direction we are trending or both. It is for this reason that I believe so strongly that each of us who lives in a family must be helped to see what we are doing in each of the areas we will consider here, and in all of the other areas of family behavior in relation to the basic decisions we must make about the purpose of it all. I intend to spell this out in more detail in this discussion.

Earlier Marriages

The number and rate of teen-age marriages has increased markedly since World War II. While in 1890 about 25% of teen-age girls were married, in 1950 this figure had increased to 40%. Since 1950, or in this past decade 1950-60, there has not been as rapid an increase, and what increases have occurred were in the 18 and 19-year-old group rather than in the younger ones. It has been suggested that future increases in young marriage will be mostly among those who are out of school. In 1960, the National Office of Vital Statistics reported the median age of marriage for women was 20 years and for men it was 22 1/2 years. Interestingly, this downward trend in the average age runs counter to some other trends or indications. We know, for example, that the average age at which an individual or couple can enjoy relative economic independence is increasing. More years of schooling, specialized vocational training, and service in the armed forces are some of the factors which contribute to the postponement of total self-support and financial self-sufficiency. Thus it appears that although one of the very important hurdles to be overcome before an individual can really join the ranks of adults is encountered at an even later date, young people are entering into a very “adult like” relationship at an ever earlier age.

Why the trend toward earlier marriages? Is this related to the fact that children are maturing at an earlier age than formerly? Have we created a society in which
adult status is so highly valued and sought after that we find children forfeiting the prerogatives of childhood in order to take on the trappings of adulthood at a time when they are socially and emotionally very immature? If early marriage, going steady at an early age, and beginning to date while very young are all linked, then the desire for security, which has been suggested as a factor in early dating, could be thought of as an important element in early marriage as well. But these things are not always related. Some evidence indicates a sequential relationship here, but there is other evidence to the contrary. The likelihood, of course, is that the trend toward marriage at an early age is very complexly generated and that we will not know the causes until much further study of the problem is completed.

It has been suggested that the matter of young marriages might best be understood within the context of marriage in general. Recent decades have witnessed an increased emphasis on marriage and the family and this emphasis has tended to idealize the role of marriage partner and parent. By rendering many of our other adult roles less important we have set up a situation which has quite logically resulted in a general increase in marriage and birth rates. A second suggestion is similar to that made earlier, that this is just a part of a general acceleration of social development. Children today are experiencing many things at younger ages than they used to and so perhaps we might "naturally" expect them to marry and become parents sooner as well. As we mentioned earlier, this should lead us to serious reconsideration of our goals and aims and the values these reflect.

We do, however, know something about the corollaries of early marriage, and these form further arguments against the trend we are witnessing today. We know, for example, that the divorce rate is many times higher among couples who marry in their teens. This, too, is not a simple cause and effect relationship, but a many-faceted problem all of its own. We know also that teenagers who are married have great difficulty remaining among those who, for varied reason, do not heed it. A number of things come to mind which may fulfill some of our obligations in this regard.

In the first place, we need to separate marriage from mature adult status. Today, the latter is accorded those who are gainfully employed, relatively established, contributing members of a community and of our society at large. Where once married life may have been synonymous with these things, or even prerequisite to them, in our day this is not necessarily true. Where marriage failure may in the past have spelled finale for one's adult status, this is increasingly not the case. Our point here, though, is not so much that marriage and adult status are not always related, but rather that early marriage does not mark a change in developmental status, but simply a commitment to a relationship which will need much nurturance and support if it is to grow into what it may in time become.

Actually, what we are saying is that particularly in the case of early marriages we are talking about adolescents who are married and we should anticipate that both parties will behave very much like adolescents and not much like "married adults." In other words, it might be a good idea to look at our aspirations and expectancies for such young couples for we may find that our ideals of what married people should be like and what they should do are biased and stereotypical. Using such criteria to evaluate the quality of a marriage in its beginning years, especially when the partners are still in their teens, is not only unfair but such criticism can lead to disastrous consequences for the marriage.

A second point follows from this. Marriage has both static and dynamic dimensions, but we are not always aware of their intertwining. Let's look at it this way. When two individuals marry they take on a new identity. At one moment they were single and at the next they are married. There is much to learn, there are many adjustments to make and there is great need for patience, forgiveness, and hope. It seems, then, that very early marriages unnecessarily multiply the number of adjustments and make enormous demands upon the capacity of all to nurture and sustain the embryonic relationship. For this reason early marriage is often discouraged by those who have seen how short we often fall in our attempts to provide sufficient nurturance. It seems logical for us all to reconsider this issue in terms of the particular strengths and weaknesses which we can see in the specific context which surrounds these experiences.

### Larger Families

Another notable trend in family statistics is increasing
family size. It is interesting to note and important to remember, however, that this pattern is also highly complicated. For example, recalling our previous discussion, we find that the average number of children for girls marrying before 18 is 3.4 as compared with 1.9 for women 25 years or older. Although there has been a general increase in family size for all socio-economic levels, the differences which existed before the population explosion still do exist and in some cases are even more evident. Rainwater's book about this bears the appropriate title *And the Poor Get Children.* This is not the occasion for a thorough airing of the problems associated with our rapidly enlarging population, but each of us as informed and concerned persons has a very real stake in this issue and in its ultimate solution.

If we ask about the impact of increasing family size on family behavior and the personality development of family members, we shall have to be satisfied with tentative answers. We know only a little about the effect of group size and what we do know has been learned from the study of other-than-family groups. We know that the ordinal position of the child relates to the noticeable difference that his advent makes in the family. We also know that there is a relationship between the number of people in a group and the amount that each contributes in a discussion, and, thus, would guess that there would be greater opportunity for self-imposed isolation in the large family. Such a reduction in communication could, of course, have good or evil effects, and we will need to follow this lead a lot further before we can make any more definitive statements.

**Child-Rearing Practices**

There is a story about an old history professor who was strolling through Old Main on Homecoming Day with a few former students. Finding their history classroom, the old grads squeezed into the desks they had occupied twenty years earlier. "Would you like to see the quiz I just gave my class?" said the professor. "Say," said one alumnus after studying the questions, "this is the same exam you gave us twenty years ago. Don't you know better than to use the same questions over and over again? They get around, you know." "Oh yes, I know, but don't let it bother you that we use the same questions year after year. It doesn't make any difference." "How come?" queried the skeptical alumnus. "We keep changing the answers," was the perfunctory reply.

At times I am sure that parents must think that child psychologists are like the old history professor. Parents have been asking questions for years and years, and although the questions stay about the same there is no denying that we have changed the answers from time to time. Our efforts have resulted in "changing American parents" and there is quite a lot of interest in what the most recent model of American parent looks like, and what differences these parental changes have made in our children.

Bronfenbrenner, a professor of child development at Cornell, summarizes the major changes in parents in the following ways:

1. Greater permissiveness toward the child's spontaneous desires;
2. Freer expression of affection;
3. Increased reliance on indirect "psychological" techniques of discipline (such as reasoning or appeals to guilt) vs. direct methods (such as physical punishment, scolding, or threats);
4. A narrowing gap between social classes in their patterns of child-rearing;
5. Relative position of father vis-a-vis the mother is shifting with the former becoming increasingly more affectionate and less authoritarian and the latter becoming relatively more important as an agent of discipline, for boys especially.

There is, of course, some question about the accuracy of these observations, since we have only imperfect records of family life in former years, which, in all likelihood, would not stand contemporary tests of historicity. Consequently, our reflections on these changes are somewhat inconclusive and we emerge knowing that there are more ways than one to look at these matters.

Whether parents are more permissive today is difficult to ascertain because urbanization requires us all to be more conscious of the presence of others and, whether we like it or not, in some ways to be more involved with them. Small houses, crowded neighborhoods, and more leisure have increased the amount of time and number of situations that require parents to exercise permissiveness or restrictiveness. What this means is that parents are called upon more frequently to decide to be permissive or restrictive, but it does not necessarily mean that children are freer to express spontaneous impulses. In the rural and small town world of the last century, life space and living quarters lent themselves to spontaneous expression, and it was expected that children would manage large portions of their time without consultation with or supervision from adults. Today we are literally under one another's feet, more permissive perhaps because we find ourselves forced to make more decisions where our forebears made none at all, but not necessarily more permissive in the sense of placing no limits on children's behavior. The point here is to approach a generalization like this one with care. There are many intricate aspects which must be taken into account.

If we review the various editions of a child-rearing manual like *Infant Care,* we find that increasingly parents are being counseled to hold and caress infants and young children, and not to worry about spoiling them thereby. In the 1930's and early 1940's, child care advice reflected the popularity of behavioristic theory and it was suggested that children were better off with quite strict routines and minimal adult intervention. Although we hear about children being fed and changed by the clock rather than in response to their own needs, we are not able to document the amount of affection of which they
may have been deprived. What parents actually do may be quite different from what prevailing expert opinion dictates. It may be an unwarranted assumption to believe that parents are more generous with expressions of affection these days just because baby manuals and child-rearing pamphlets say they should be. Similarly, to assume that this is the case from parents' own reports may be risky also, since parents have been known to give answers which they believe reflect current approved practices rather than to state accurately how they go about things in the privacy of their own homes. Again, the conclusion seems warranted that this change in parents is not as straightforward as it first appears. It seems that if we change the contextual frame which surrounds this issue, we effect interesting changes in the view which we obtain and the conclusions we draw.

The next two changes are linked. Differences between social classes in child rearing have always been most clearly seen in the area of punishment. Middle class parents have always reported using less physical punishment, scolding, and fewer threats than lower class parents. Since the trend is toward a middle class standard or pattern of child rearing, we can predict that there will be increased use of indirect techniques. Incidentally, although space does not permit a discussion of this matter here, the relation of these indirect techniques to the development of conscience and healthy guilt is a most important contemporary issue. The need for a guilt morality rather than one based on shame is being stressed repeatedly by writers who are exploring the dynamics of life and behavior in the metropolis with its invitation to impersonality and anonymity.

The final change suggested seems to lend itself more appropriately to discussion in the closing section of this article. Shifts in parent role performance reflect shifts in the vocational and social life patterns of adults and we can look for continued change and adaptation in this area for many years to come.

Bronfenbrenner suggests an equivocal answer to the question of the effect of these changes on children. "It has both negative and constructive aspects. While fostering the internalization of adult standards and the development of socialized behavior, they may also have the effect of undermining capacity for initiative and independence, particularly in boys. Males more conforming and anxious, less enterprising and self-sufficient, and, in general, possessing more of the virtues and liabilities associated with feminine character structure."

We gather from this that some of our best and most recent research makes an answer to the question, "Shall there be more or less regimentation for the child?", impossible to answer. This is, of course, a popular topic for discussion — even argument — which has no simple answer. Instead, we must ask ourselves what we are trying to accomplish with our children. Are we talking about boys or girls? Which parent will do the major share of the controlling? Every so often we read that a prominent person advocates clamping down on our youngsters, and just because he is a respected person in the community his opinion may carry a lot of weight. Some time ago our Detroit papers carried a series entitled "Suburbia's coddled kids" which implied that we have been too soft too long, and we are all going to suffer for it in the end. Nothing angers me quite so much as these "experts" who make sweeping generalizations about issues which are extremely critical, with little or no appreciation of what is really involved. By and large, the available evidence supports the change away from punitive, hostile, and excessively authoritarian treatment of children, but, as we pointed out just a little while ago, the effects are not always uniform and individual variability can disclose important exceptions.

In talking about techniques of discipline or child-rearing, I always like to point out that simply restricting a child's activity does not solve many problems in the long run. Telling a child what he may not do is not the same as telling him what he may do, although I suspect some parents think that when they say "Don't!" or "Stop that!" or "Cut that out!" to a child, the youngster automatically knows what he should do. If, by regimentation, we mean positive guidance and direction, then I think this has much merit in contrast to letting children drift along rather aimlessly. If, however, we are simply talking about more external controls being asserted, more restrictions and prohibitions imposed by authorities outside the child, then we are talking about a technique or approach which is ultimately self-defeating. If our ultimate goal is to create a self-disciplined person who can assume responsibility for his own behavior, then we, as parents, will have to grow gradually, and we must be prepared to offer them opportunity (time and space) in which to practice internal controls, even though this may occasionally be pretty hard on our dispositions as parents and on the furniture we have worked so hard to accumulate.

**Changing Roles for Parents**

We have just spoken about the changing American parent and have pinpointed a few of the changes which have specific bearing on the disciplining or regimenting of children. As one might have expected there are many other changes taking place which influence profoundly the manner in which we live together as families. As a matter of fact, social and technological changes are occurring with such rapidity that we are for the first time conscious of the need to invent new patterns of behavior within the adult life span. The way our parents did things, which they in turn adopted from their parents, will simply not suffice us in certain areas.

Certainly, the role of the father is changing. He is free to spend more time with his children, and he accepts his responsibility not only because he is no longer embarrassed by the child-rearing role, but also because
he is more aware of the importance of the father in the
guidance of growing children. Research in child develop-
ment is only beginning to rediscover the father, but this
underscoring of his importance is likely to effect his
behavior in the family in the coming years.
The final change suggested by Bronfenbrenner refers
to another aspect of the father's role. Traditionally he
has been referred to as the disciplinarian in the family.
His power is legendary. The male role is described as
instrumental and the female as expressive, referring to
the manipulative and acquisitive aspects of the former,
and the emotionally supportive and socially sensitive
aspects of the latter. Now comes the suggestion that
this distinction may no longer be as valid as it once was.
Recent studies of children's perception of their parents
still report findings which reflect the more traditional
view, but there are very good reasons why we might
expect some change in the direction specified by Bron-
fenbrenner.
In the first place, mothers can less reasonably threaten
children with "wait till your father gets home." if his
job keeps him away from home until late in the evening
or if he only gets home on weekends. Consequently,
they are administering the punishments which seem
formerly to have been the function of the father.
Another interesting by-product of father's being away
from home for greater portions of time is that this in-
creases his novelty. The old adage "absence makes the
heart grow fonder" might be rewritten today in terms of
the valence of novel or unusual stimulation. Father is
enjoyed because the children are not satisfied with him.
His directions and suggestions are more likely to be
heeded, not because his power is feared, but because
they represent a fresh and different experience for the
child. If father becomes a "break" in an otherwise dull
routine day, it is easy to understand the increasing ten-
dency to view him as somewhat less foreboding and
somewhat more warm and nurturant.
Another much-discussed area of changing roles is
that of the new position of women in the family. The
working wife and working mother are no longer rather
suspect or the objects of much pity. Today, employment
outside of the home for the mother is getting to the point
where it is almost considered "the thing to do." This,
too, of course, would be an unfortunate consequence of
our excessive "groupiness" and conformity, just as
fear of community disapproval was a poor reason for
their working in our present-day world. There can be
little doubt, however, that as we provide more exciting
educational opportunities for young women we will
ignite ambitions which will not be satisfied by marriage
and motherhood. College campuses have long served
to introduce potential spouses to each other, but are we
to assume that an eligible male is the only thing about
the whole place that stimulates most of the females?
If marriage results among those who have studied to-
gether, pursued research together, attended lectures
and concerts together, and even worked together after
college, should we expect that they totally abandon
what has been a highly satisfying life style and replace
it with one about which they know very little and which
makes the wife almost completely dependent upon the
husband? What can we expect other than that the col-
league family will follow from the earlier colleague rela-
tionships — colleagues in school, colleagues at work,
and colleagues in their marital relationships? The trend
from camaraderie to colleagueship is an interesting
one to speculate about, and not nearly as threatening as
it may sound at first. There is probably greater simi-
larity than difference here, with the major distinction
being one of emphasis or accent.
There are a number of issues relating to maternal
employment which could benefit from a little clarifi-
cation. First of all, there is the matter of the effects
upon children when mother works. We have all heard
the one extreme position — "A woman's place is in the
home; if she stayed there and looked after her children
we wouldn't have all this delinquency." I have yet to
hear anyone enunciate the other side with the same
vigor. Truly vocal advocates of the idea that maternal
employment improves the climate in the home and the
personality of youngsters are rarely found, and all the
better that this is so since such a position is as untenable
as the other.
We have learned that whether a woman is employed
or not is a less significant factor than why she is or is not
working, how adequately the couple provides for the care
of the children while mother works, whether her work is
quite regular or spasmodic, and what the attitude of the
husband is regarding her employment status. Let us con-
sider a few examples relating to these points. We all
know of families where the mother works and the child-
ren are disturbed and perhaps in trouble. To the casual
observer this may be support for the argument that ma-
ternal employment is at the root of all of our problems.
But might it not be that both the child's troubles and
the wife's working result from a third factor, namely,
the presence in the home of an inadequate and irrespon-
sible father and husband?
Another point to bear in mind is that the working
mother is not a new phenomenon. The typical rural
family of fifty years ago contained a working father, a
working mother, and young children being cared for by
substitute mothers varying greatly in age and in the
quality of care which they provided the young. Mother,
of course, was in the fields or in the barn helping father.
We should remember in this connection that leaving the
care of children to people other than the mother is also
a time-honored practice. I would hazard a guess that
some of mankind's greatest personalities were reared
in homes where extensive provisions were made for their
welfare, but the majority of the care they received came
from persons other than their own parents. It seems
that what matters is not so much the identity of the
caring person as it is the quality and consistency of the
care which such a person provides for the child.
The Death of the Renaissance Man

By WALTER SORELL
Theatre Editor

It is difficult to find one's bearings in a time in which scatological words are scribbled over eschatological questions facing man; a time in which a toilet seat, with or without its flushing implements, or a Brillo box for that matter, is presented as an object of art. In a world in which life, as mirrored by the artist, is denuded to the ugliness and banality of its reality, the only values left are those of shock, alienation, and non-communicativeness.

This trinity, hallowed by the pontiffs of the arts, has been accepted by the masses, who have been conditioned gradually to confusion for quite a few decades. But the impact of shock has a way of wearing off and numbs our response; one feels alienated and after a while cannot help but ask oneself whether the awareness to which we are aroused is not too high a price paid for the loss of identification and affection. Non-communicativeness, in an age that has perfected communication, that has penetrated the cosmos as much as the mechanics of mental behavior, seems like the game of a child that wants to spite and punish himself for having discovered that life is not a child's game, but one that adults play as if they had remained children.

The anti-cliche' has become the cliche' of our time. The rebels against the establishment have created their own establishments which, in turn, have generated their own rebels. We have muddled through a period conveniently called transition, we have waded through jungles of "isms" and crept through tunnels whose goals have often revealed themselves as their very points of departure. We have arrived at destinations without having made a journey.

The question remains: How did we get to where we are now and which forces will drive us to become what we have set out to be? A great cycle has been closed. The history of modern man begins with the Renaissance man. He has come to his end. We have dethroned him and saw in the use of light not only a unifying element but an expressive medium. One does not have to be a soothsayer in order to realize that, in the last third of this century, lighting will be prominent in shaping the physical stage image. If Appia was a prophet, Gordon Craig was his more articulate apostle. Even though failing to the early Greeks for the atonal mode of musical expression, Picasso learned to squint cubistically from Congo masks. Isadora Duncan threw off the yoke of the artificiality of the nineteenth-century dance, the very balletic form born in the last years of the Renaissance. These were ten years which shook the foundation of the world gradually built by Renaissance man.

The stage was set. It was set also for the stage. Adolphe Appia's "La mise en scene de drame Wagnerien" appeared in 1895. Followed by a series of shorter studies. Appia's approach was a denial of the entire concept of naturalism in the theater. He went beyond changing the realistic scenic image into one characterized by fluidity and suggestiveness. He wanted to create a single stage effect through the synthesis of all the theater arts and saw in the use of light not only a unifying element but an expressive medium. One does not have to be a soothsayer in order to realize that, in the last third of this century, lighting will be prominent in shaping the physical stage image. If Appia was a prophet, Gordon Craig was his more articulate apostle. Even though failing as a practical scene designer, Craig preached the supreme law of suggestiveness in the theater and the inviolability of an overall design. He even wanted to eliminate the actor as an unreliable, because emotionally volatile, factor from the stage and use a super-marionette, a concept which was taken up by the balletic experiments of the Bauhaus in the Twenties and which was finally realized as a stage image by the dance theater of Alwin Nikolais in our days.

Stanislavsky founded the Moscow Art Theater in 1898. His "theater of inner feeling" was destined to do away with the hollow pathos of the classical method of acting or its surficial realistic counterpart. If Stanislavsky's basic idea was to train the actor in character analysis,
he did in Moscow in the reality of the unreal theater world what Sigmund Freud did in the magic world of man's unreal-real dreams. Stanislavsky saw in each man as well as in each theater character the microcosmic projection of a universe and believed that the actor could find the ingredients of any role within his own personality and "feel" his way into the character he must become. In a way, the aim of training actors was to achieve a shamanistic ability to create a second, a coexistent identity for oneself that can grow its own biographical personality.

Although Stanislavsky's American disciple, Lee Strasberg, may have blown up the Russian's system into a dogmatic "method," the principles that governed Stanislavsky's ideas on stage coincided in a most natural way with the development of the psycho-analytic principles which have changed twentieth-century man's approach to his self in all its complex ramifications. On the other hand, the total awareness of our selves coincided with man's escape from himself by seeking refuge in the masses. With the collapse of all established values during and after World War I and the need to re-evaluate values constantly within a relatively short span of time, several phenomena left their mark on history. Man's uncanny, seismographic reactions to the ever-present challenges of a life which never stands still, to the consequences of political stigmas of an ism-plagued existence, the face of which changed rapidly with the growing importance of the mass media of film, radio, and television.

The essential feature of the Renaissance man and his driving force was action. His active-minded self led him from conquest to conquest in all spheres of life, from dreams of conquest to the realization of his dreams. Twentieth-century man is Renaissance man's dreamt-of fulfillment. But the technological tools that have been helping him to the total fulfillment of his dreams created a schizoid condition in him. The mass media are turning him into a passive animal. He no longer articulates his thoughts, they are "massaged" into passivity. He does not talk, he is talked to. Jules Verne's, H. G. Wells' and Aldous Huxley's science-fictional dreams have become the nightmares of our daily existence.

Renaissance man discovered for us the world which reached a point of saturation at the turn of the century. Seeing no slice of the world left to be cut, divided, and re-divided, man turned to the cosmos. Up there where there is nowhere and everywhere, we grope our way through spheres which weigh as light and are as fraught with destiny as no previous illusion of man. With each new drug developed in the laboratories of our maniacal imagination we stand on the threshold of molding man's mind and moods, of correcting what was yester-century's concept of man's soul as much as the moon is no longer a subject for poetry but an object of conquest. While the deputy of God presides over the Roman Catholic Church's self-styled Reformation of the twentieth century, the debate about whether God is dead has become a rhetorical question and is being tolerated as ecumenical self-indulgence. This question is a concomitant to the split atom which can now mushroom the world into yet undreamt-of marvels or into self-annihilation.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, ruthless, self-assured, greedy Renaissance man had freed himself from living with the notion of his sin-crushed self. He was intoxicated with the joy of life, with the joy of his body and power. His guilt feelings were very private, if at all noticeable, and could be easily swept aside. The problem of twentieth-century man is the feeling of collective guilt. The fear of his own power has become traumatic and led to his realization of futility. Early Renaissance man lived with death as a daily guest during the bubonic plague; scheming, poisoning, knifing, hired murderers were the hallmarks of his time. With the growing destructive skill of man we have turned the duelling spirit, with its aristocratic gesture, into mass murder with ideological pretenses. Today it makes little difference whether Roger Bacon or Berthold Schwarz invented gunpowder in the fourteenth century, or whether the idea was filched from the Chinese who have known it as early as in the ninth century and certainly before white man has perfected the means of playing football with the fifth commandment.

Aeschylus and Sophocles could still believe in the inevitability of fate. A flaw in man made it easy for the gods to dictate his tragic end. Renaissance man saw man in conflict with man. His was a drama of the individual will. Gods no longer intervened and decided the fate of man. The villain was defeated because he had sown the seeds for his own destruction. When the sun began to set on Renaissance man with the advent of the Mechanical Revolution man was in conflict with himself as the product and victim of the environment which he himself helped to create. Nowadays the playwright realizes that nothing is inevitable, that man is the master of his own fate, and that it is his own power over himself which renders him helpless and frightens him into a feeling of futility. The tragic end of man is now an accident caused by a machine created and mastered by man himself.

Renaissance man intended to revive the classical ideas and forms of antiquity. By feeding his imagination with pre-mediaeval concepts, he created a new world. We have gone back to pre-classic forms, to the mediaeval, to the archaic and primitive and, in many cases, to the Oriental arts. We have done so in order to find a new point of departure, to ignore the classic and its rebirth in the fifteenth century, to pooh-pooh all romantic exaltation. For many decades now we have been searching for vital new directions. The desire to deny the last four centuries and to demolish what man has busily built within that time has become obvious.

Paul Klee once said: "I want to be as though newborn... knowing no pictures, entirely without impulses,
almost in an original state.” Martha Graham said to her pupils: “Come down into the earth with your heels! Walk as if for the first time!” This is the urge of the twentieth-century artist: to find his way back to the realization of innocence. John Cage shouted: “We must begin from scratch!” and banged the piano between endless intervals of silence or some sound effects at an ear-shattering pitch. “The modern dance has thrown aside everything that has gone before and started all over again from the beginning,” John Martin wrote. And its influence on the graceful, air-born ballerina was so strong that she now twists her body in Balanchinesque contortions and rolls on the floor.

Thornton Wilder saw in the proscenium stage — built by Andrea Palladio in 1580 — the straitjacket of the modern dramatist and borrowed from the Oriental theater his stage devices for “Our Town.” The rebellion against the feudal concept of the doll house theater began in the Twenties in Germany with Jessner’s and Piscator’s innovations which tried to do away with a centuries-old yoke. The new theaters built in the last three decades mainly have been multiple-, open-, and thrust-stages showing the tremendous urgency with which man (read: author-through-actor) tries to communicate with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE</strong> of Renaissance Man at his End 20th Century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renaissance Man</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunpowder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing (Gutenberg, 1436)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation of the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Structure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feudalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress on individuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of and rebellion against authority (Pope)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the old order of medieval life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of an elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genius of universality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copernicus, Galileo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonardo sketches a flying machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanism and return to the classical ideas and forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (16th century):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paracelsus (chemicotherapist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambroise Pare’ (surgeon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Vesalius (anatomist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture: Forms and ornaments of antiquity in new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New art forms: Ballet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palladio’s proscenium stage, horseshoe theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenery: Serlio, Inigo Jones, Torelli (cloud machine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music: Ars Nova, polyphony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance man’s visual-mindedness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Satire of the Disloyal Opposition

By WALTER SORELL

Walter Kerr wrote recently in one of his Sunday columns in the Times that one can't even speak of a bad season since to be bad one has to be bold and aim high in order to fail and fall deep down. I wholeheartedly con-Kerr. It will turn out to be a mediocre season — pale, lukewarm, limping along the Great White Way if nothing really stunning happens in the very last two months. Without the English — "Old Vic," "The Homecoming," "The Killing of Sister George," and the hilariously serious Michael Flanders and Donald Swann in "At the Drop of Another Hat" — one would have despairs of ever again seeing good theater.

Some of the flops were honest attempts at something that looked like something but then fizzled out. Arnold Sundgaard's "Of Love Remembered" is a rather common story told in flashbacks. The constant switch back and forth and the readjusting to past happenings worked as a handicap for both the actors and the audience. The Swedish movie star Ingrid Thulin, who did the remembering, must have thought of how easily the flashbacks would have worked if filmed and how wonderful the picture would have been had Ingmar Bergman written the script. Arnold Weinstein's "Dynamite Tonight," a musical in the Brechtian vein on the horror of war, failed because its satire was not sharp and not well enough focussed on its target. Only the song of the blind soldier toward the end of the show gave an inkling of what the musical should have been like.

Political satire is nothing new, but, strangely enough, there has been no satiric play of any consequence around for a long time. It seems to be more at home in Europe. We should be alarmed when widespread recognition and money awards go to a person who writes a "satirical" piece of trash which maliciously defames the President of our country and insinuates he murdered his predecessor.

"MacBird!" is a sensational success at the Village Gate Theatre and also in print, selling several hundred thousand copies. It shows how hungry a great section of Americans has been for someone to attack the political Establishment. The play is a satiric parody of Macbeth, and the two things one can hold against the dramatist are the unevenness in her writing and the obvious lack of ethical purpose. She only rises when, borrowing from Hamlet, the Egg of Head — her sympathies lie with Stevenson — says:

To see, or not to see? That is the question.
Whether 'tis wiser as a statesman to ignore
The gross deception of outrageous lies,
Or to speak out against a reign of evil
And by so doing, end there for all time
The chance and hope to work within for change.

But otherwise her taste is appalling, as in the witches' dirge — in her version the witches are no longer the neutral Shakespearean soothsayers but radical revolutionaries — or in the reaction of the first reporter's reaction to MacBird's press conference: "What a shit!" Miss Garson not only turns against the style of Johnsonian politics; she is equally rough on the entire Kennedy clan for its boundless ambition and calculating opportunism.

In order to make its point and to hit hard, satire has outraged power to exaggerate and even to distort the truth. My qualms are with her lack of taste and stature, with-out which no satire succeeds in being taken seriously. In coming to Miss Garson's defense, Peter Brook, co-director of the Royal Shakespeare Company and director of Marat/Sade, said:

Her intention is deadly serious but her idiom is a Pop art in which every element is potential scrap. . . "MacBird" is a horror comic, crude in its puns, jangling in its rhymes . . . A sense of outrage provides the energy that makes the show explode with theatricality. It is exuberant, intensive and, in their context, the words take on a biting edge.

Pop, crude, jangling, even exuberant and intensive — yes, but the bite is missing. Crudeness does defeat any higher purpose.

It became known that, in the beginning, the play had difficulties in finding backers. Whether perhaps an angel helped out, not knowing that his money came from the CIA — after all, satire is a difficult business and should be supported, whomever it may concern, even though it speaks with the voice of the disloyal opposition.
Pentecost — Old and New

By EDGAR P. SENNE
Assistant Professor of Theology
Valparaiso University

And when the day of Pentecost had come, they were all together in one place. . . . And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. . . . telling . . . the mighty works of God. . . . ‘Of that we all are witnesses. . . . God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified’. Acts 2:1,4,11,32,36.

Pentecost is an ancient festival, dating far into pre-Christian times. In Jewish circles it was more often called “The Feast of Weeks.” The earliest recorded directions concerning its observance are recorded in Exodus 34:22 and Deuteronomy 16:9-11. It came at the very end of the wheat harvest, seven weeks and one day (sic, pentecost, the fiftieth day) after the beginning of the work of harvesting. Though it was in these earliest times a true agricultural festival, it gradually took on additional historical meanings. It is probable that by the time Jesus lived Pentecost was being celebrated primarily as the anniversary of God’s giving of the Torah at Sinai. In its aspect as a commemoration of that great historical moment, it was surely a celebration of God’s goodness in creating for himself the “holy nation,” the congregation of Israel, the church of the Old Covenant. In the first century A.D., Pentecost, with its twin themes (harvest and Sinai), attracted great multitudes of Jews to Jerusalem. People gathered here from all the scattered Jewish communities which dotted the ancient world, and Jerusalem was swarming with pilgrims.

It is interesting and instructive to note that it was during this particular festival that the “new Israel” was created and a “new harvest” begun. For these few followers of Jesus, Pentecost would forever be a new and fulfilled celebration. The covenant of Sinai had now been superseded by the new covenant in the blood of the Lord Jesus, the Risen and Exalted Lord. The harvest of wheat had now become a world-wide harvest of men, to be gathered into the granary which is Christ’s own Body.

And how had all of this new meaning been poured into the old Jewish festival of Pentecost? It had all happened as they were praying and waiting together, praying and waiting for the Spirit whom their ascended Lord had promised to send to them. When the Holy Spirit would come upon them, then they would have power to be true witnesses for Jesus. When the Spirit of Truth would come, “he will lead you to all truth.” That Spirit for whom the disciples waited and prayed was the same Spirit about whose coming the prophet Joel had spoken when he said, “And in the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.” Now all of these promises have been fulfilled for them. “They were all filled with the Holy Spirit,” and were all compelled by that Spirit to speak the mighty things that God had done through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Little tongues of fire danced over their heads that day, and they suddenly found themselves talking of Jesus in languages they had not spoken before. For these Spirit-ed men of Jesus and for all of those who would ever come to faith by their witness, Pentecost was a festival made new by the coming of God’s own Spirit, the Spirit who bears witness to Jesus. Pentecost would still be the festival of the fiftieth day, but those days would be reckoned from the day of the Lord’s resurrection. Pentecost would still be celebrated as the birthday of God’s “holy nation,” but it would now be the “holy nation” constituted in Christ rather than in Sinai. Pentecost would still be a harvest festival, but from now on it was to be a harvest of men into Christ, the harvest which is Christ’s Church.

What about the observance of Pentecost in our churches of today? It really hasn’t quite made the grade in American culture. It is still on the liturgical calendars, but not on the one the grocer gave us in January. Christmas has made all of the calendars, and so also has Easter, but not Pentecost. Since it hasn’t made the grade as a first class holiday in our culture, it has a hard time making the grade in the churches. After a six-week shopping spree and endless rounds of holiday parties, people know what to expect when they walk into their churches on December 25. The same is true for Easter. No lilies in the chancel, no trumpets in the balcony, no choirs marching down the aisle and no catchy sermon titles can surprise us. But when Pentecost comes, we enter our churches for worship only if we would have gone that day anyway. No special crowds are gathered. The usher hands us a service folder covered with splashes of red flaming tongues, and in the center is a pure white dove. The pastor comes in wearing a bright red stole, and now we are getting curious. The time has come to look inside the service folder — sure enough, today is Pentecost.

The little attention often given to the festival of Pentecost in American churches reminds one of that strange little episode which took place when Paul made his first stop at Ephesus (Acts 19). “Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?” asked Paul. “No, we have never even heard that there is a Holy Spirit,” was their
answer. Another story comes to mind, a very old story which might have some application to our situation. Perhaps you have heard it many times before, but I must tell it nevertheless. The teacher in a parish school had developed a little routine with his pupils as they prepared for a public examination. He lined up the members of the class and had them speak the Apostles Creed clause by clause. The first boy began, “I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.” The second child said, “And in Jesus Christ, His only Son our Lord.” Then followed the third child and the third clause, and so to the last of the second article, “from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.” There followed a long and painful silence. Finally, the boy next in line spoke up and said, “Sir, the boy who believes in the Holy Ghost is absent today.” The silence about the Holy Spirit in so many of the churches of today makes one wonder whether “the boy who believes in the Holy Spirit is absent today.” Perhaps we are too ready to take what the Fourth Evangelist says and to let it go at that. “The wind blows where it wills and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know whence it comes or whither it goes.” (John 3:8)

Surely there is much more to be said about the Holy Spirit in the life of the Church. Every body must have its life, else it is a mere corpse. So it is also with the Body of Christ, that visible congregation which is his Church, the New Humanity. The old humanity, we are told by the Genesis writer, came into existence when God formed the man out of the dust of the earth. Yet it took more than this divine sculpture to create the “living being.” It was still necessary that God breathe into those sculptured nostrils “the breath of life.” That breath was God’s own breath, and it was the same breath as that which came upon the prophets when they said, “The breath (Spirit) of the Lord is upon me.” Thus, it was God’s Spirit which changed the clay model into a living humanity.

It is also this way in the creation of the New Humanity. It was first molded and shaped for many months by Jesus himself. It was made up of ordinary men whom he wished to make into his own real body on earth. But that new creation was not completed until God breathed His Spirit into that body. Then it became One New Man, a living organism, the living presence of Christ in the world. That is what was happening on that first day of the New Pentecost in Jerusalem, and that is what has been constantly happening since that day.

The Spirit of Christ is the life force of the Body of Christ. He is the Holy One who enables us to see Jesus as God for us in the midst of death. He is the Holy One who shines a bright light into the empty tomb and leads us to the living and exalted Lord Christ. He is the Spirit of truth who gives to us the things that belong to Jesus. If Jesus is God’s beloved Son, it is the Spirit who leads us to say with Jesus, “Abba.” If Jesus’ death was a servant’s death for sin, it is the Holy Spirit who makes that death to be our death for sin. If Jesus’ resurrection was his victory over his last enemy, it is the Spirit of Christ who makes that victory our source of life and daily assurance. If Jesus has an inheritance of glory with the Father, it is the Spirit of God who makes us to be heirs with Christ. All that Jesus has is ours, for it is the work of the Holy Spirit to make us participants in Christ, to make us in truth the living, working, redeeming Body of Christ in the world today. The Spirit does nothing for us apart from Jesus, for his sole task is to link our lives to God through Christ. Thus, he is our faith, our hope, and our joy. This is what Jesus means when he says of the promised Spirit, “He will lead you into all truth.” Jesus himself is the Truth, and it is into the Truth of his life that the Spirit leads the Church.

If this is the Pentecost we celebrate, then the words of the introit for that great festival will be adequate to convey the Church’s praise: “The Spirit of the Lord fills the world. Alleluia! Let the righteous be glad; let them rejoice before God; yea let them exceedingly rejoice. Alleluia! Alleluia! Let God arise; let His enemies be scattered; let them also that hate Him flee before Him.”

HONEYSUCKLE

Were it in larger proportion its strands could be mistaken for Medusa’s hairdo.

From its chaotic undergrowth, however, comes an order inhabited by fragrance closer than a rose, much more the commoner’s choice of perfume, not cheap (though free by the season), but something less than stilted.

It can be marvelled by a man or inhabited by a hare or a chicadee.

Its greatest gift however is that it is what it is and the glory that it becomes the morning after rain.

—ROBERT PARHAM

The Cresset
Music

Pope Paul’s “Instruction on Music”

By WILLIAM F. EIFRIG, JR.

In the weeks preceding Easter in this Year of Our Lord 1967 there was issued by the Congregation of Rites at the Vatican and with the approval of Pope Paul VI an "Instruction on Music in the Liturgy." These sixty-nine articles are further implementation of the worship reforms suggested by the Council in 1963. The publication at Easter of an encyclical dealing with the more pressing concern for the impoverished swept the Instruction from the pages of the newspapers and distracted the attention of almost all observers of the ecclesiastical scene. Those charged with the responsibility of overseeing the music of the Church will perhaps be the only ones to sense the remarkable change in attitude demonstrated by the document on liturgical music.

Pronouncements regarding the music used by the Church in its worship which have come from the papal office—since medieval times at least and perhaps even earlier—have been addressed to abuses of the art. The language of the promulgations tends to be restrictive, reforming, and reactionary.

The reforms of Gregory I around 500 were an expurgation of extraneous notes in plainsongs and a constraining of musicians in all of Europe to imitate the musical practices of the Roman church. To this end Gregory established a school for singers at Rome from which were sent out musical missionaries to superintend the execution of the reforms.

In 1325, from his Babylonian Captivity, John XXII lashed out against the abuses his papacy would not tolerate:

There is a new school...preferring their new inventions to the ancient songs of the church:...they inebriate the ears without soothing them:...decent devotion is held in contempt and a reprehensible frivolity is paraded for admiration.... We have long held that this requires correction. We hasten to banish and eradicate this thing from the church of God....we prescribe this condition, that the integrity of the chant itself remain undamaged....

The Council of Trent, engaged in its counter-reforming task from 1545 to 1563, sought to purge church music of anything "impure or lascivious." A secular spirit, the complex polyphonic structures, and the use of noisy instruments were singled out for reprimand. A new edition of the traditional chant of the Church was undertaken and a conservative style of polyphony was approved which did not obscure the sacred texts. The legend of Palestrina’s Missa Papae Marcelli saving the day for non-unisonal song contains in its fiction the fact of Trent's admonitions to conservatism.

The papal decree which established twentieth-century norms for music in Catholic, as well as non-Catholic, churches until the recent innovations of Vatican II is Pius X's Motu proprio. This encyclical of 1903 is the cornerstone of that movement which would insist that the music of the Church be distinct from secular art and which would base its practice upon traditional forms and styles.

Sacred music must possess the qualities of holiness and beauty, from which its other characteristic, universality, will follow spontaneously.... These qualities are found most perfectly in Gregorian chant, which is therefore the proper chant of the Roman Church.

Since the polyphonic music of the late sixteenth century, perfected in Palestrina, agrees very well with the highest model, plainchant, it therefore "deserves, together with plainchant, to be used in the more solemn offices of the Church." The theatrical style of much modern music is "by nature the most unlike plainchant and therefore the least compatible with the laws of good sacred music."

The Instruction, which will become effective on May 14, speaks in a language quite different. It is not condemnatory but hortatory, not restrictive but expansive. For the first time it would appear that the papacy means to encourage and suggest the development of new kinds of music for worship rather than to act only as preserver of the traditional. In order that "every celebration (of the mass) should, above all, respect the participation of the faithful" by insuring that the people sing the service, it is urged that hymns be sung in modern languages and that instruments native to different countries and customs be employed. Experimentation with new instruments and musical forms is permitted, though "the culture and traditions of individual temples must be taken into account" and those used solely for secular music must be avoided.

While maintaining with his predecessors that all music in the Church must "contribute to the edification of the faithful" and must not degrade "the holiness of the place, the dignity of the liturgy and the devotion of the faithful," Pope Paul has suggested that music become a liberalizing force in the Church. Music created under this authority will nonetheless have to prove itself to a history of artistic conservatism.
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Marcel Duchamp

By RICHARD H. BRAUER

I can still remember when as a student at Valparaiso University I heard a talk by President Kretzmann in which he discussed the common experience of the incompleteness of life, the sense of never being quite caught up or really getting finished with something, or really fully understanding. This seemingly fragmentary quality of life has been seized upon by many artists. In their work, classical balance and perfect completeness of form have been abandoned.

Marcel Duchamp (1887), by his work, and by his life, has become a legendary figure and exemplar in the thought and activity of many of these artists. Change and movement is a major concern of his work. When he painted NUDE DESCENDING THE STAIRCASE he went beyond cubism by making the subject move rather than the beholder.

The overlapping, transparent sequence of positions in the unrelenting, impersonal, robot-like mechanical descent down a spiral staircase with no beginning or end has melancholy overtones. One critic calls it “an hour glass of the modern age.” Contrary to the attitude of most cubists, Duchamp felt that the subject matter and its related feelings and ideas were much more important than the aesthetic structure.

The LARGE GLASS is the last painting he made. In the process of planning and painting it he wrote many notes to himself about what it should mean and what the different parts represent. It all is too involved and difficult to try to describe here, but the gist of it is that the painting is a mechanical diagram of a love making machine. The Bride is on the top half with her withered body mechanism on the left, faintly reminiscent of some of the forms in NUDE DESCENDING, trying to excite...
the bachelors in the bottom half to grind their sperm and try vainly to reach the bride. Obviously, love-making to Duchamp was an impersonal mechanism without any real spiritual or even physical union between the two unique and utterly separate parties.

For Marcel Duchamp life is basically indeterminate, endless, with no predictable goal or inherent design. Man is an isolated random element in the boundless incongruity of everyday events; a unique being among unique events. Conventional values, even the so-called fixed “laws” of science, are to be seen as merely approximations.

To express this idea, Duchamp, with ironical seriousness, established his own “yardstick” based on the “laws of chance.” Three times Duchamp dropped a one-meter-long cord held horizontally from a height of one meter. He then cut the boards, on which the cords dropped, along the shape of the line that accidentally formed. He felt that to live in harmony with nature is to establish conditions for chance to assert itself. In 1922-23 he had a geometry text hung outside upside down exposed to the action of wind and rain so that it could experience the “facts of life.” The hanging textbook and the mounted bicycle wheel were called readymades.

These were simply commonplace, often industrially made, objects which he signed or slightly altered (such as placing this bicycle wheel upside down on a kitchen stool) and by these arbitrary, personal selections and actions conferred on the object the “sacred” qualities of art. His serious act was mockingly derisive of the fixed aesthetic traditions and excess importance given to some works of art. According to Duchamp, in this world of random order value in art is what each person declares an object has for himself.

Duchamp stopped creating art before he was forty. When asked what he did he once told a reporter that he was a “breather.” When asked to comment about a criticism his art had received, he said he thought the criticism was “insufficiently lighthearted.” In short, his detachment from the conventional goals and successes of society is matched only by his commitment to the chance and random vitality of everyday life. It also seems to me that in many ways such a combination of detachment and commitment is similar to that of the Christian, although the basis for such an attitude would be quite different.

The March article, “Abstract Expressionism: Symbolic,” was, in manuscript, too long, and therefore the first paragraph was omitted in the printing. Apologies are in order for the confusing, seemingly derogatory references to former that resulted.
**Books of the Month**

**Fictional Misrepresentations of America**

In *Jeffersonianism and The American Novel* (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1967, $3.25), Howard Mumford Jones, truly one of America's scholars and certainly an interpreter of the American scene in the grand style, has again demonstrated why he deserves such a reputation. This small book, really a set of working papers, comes after a long line of outstanding works like *America and French Culture, 1750-1848; The Theory of American Literature; American Humanism: Its Meaning For The World, Reflections on Learning; and O Strange New World.* In 1964 Jones was awarded a Pulitzer Prize for *O Strange New World.* A teacher, a scholar, a writer, Jones has also served with honor as chairman of the American Council of Learned Societies, as president of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and currently as editor of the Harvard Library Bulletin.

*Jeffersonianism and The American Novel* is perhaps the more auspicious because it is a part of a series of studies under the direction of General Editor Martin S. Dworkin "devoted to education in its most comprehensive meaning, embracing the activities of formal instruction and learning carried on in schools, and all the forces of social influence upon the development and behavior of individuals and groups." This series of studies, aptly termed Studies in Culture and Communication, bears watching as much as Jones' book in the series bears reading and study.

The key to an understanding of the book is perhaps the seventh chapter ("Conclusions in Which, Perhaps, Nothing Is Concluded") where Jones asserts that we in the United States are undergoing a literary revolution and lists "some of the more powerful components" of that revolution. One of these powerful components is the fact that American novelists have permitted some of the European authors, scholars, and thinkers to walk across their pages in the likes of Dostoevski, Kierkegaard, Sartre, Joyce, Eliot ("an expatriate American"), Lawrence, Freud, and Jung. In the process American novelists have rung the changes on the themes of these people: the subconscious, rootlessness, alienation, "the blackness of evil in a Manichean universe from which Christianity had disappeared," frustration, perversion, and "a denial of mature sexuality in American literature." And in many instances, of course, the Oedipus complex run rampant has become "the basis for cultural analysis." Jones, in the estimation of this reviewer, is partly correct in insisting that the components of alienation, rootlessness, anxiety, and all their psychic relatives do not really offer adequate bases for a description of what is happening in America, certainly do not always offer an adequate meaning pattern for either writing or living; and the American novelist, in employing these themes, weakens "the concept of the adult American as a being capable of both rational and moral choice." As anyone in the know understands, Mr. Jones does not go for such a set of perspectives and for the novelist, he implies (for the novelist above all), a compulsive and almost inclusive insistence upon these themes is anathema.

Apparently Jones feels much better about the period 1870-1920 which he refers to as being "in some sense...the golden age of the American novel," graced by the works of authors like James, Howells, Twain, London, Norris, and Dreiser. This golden age, according to Jones, was notable because of its devotion to a craftsmanship that attempted to counter and correct "the sentimental and romantic indiscipline that had preceded it." In reality Jones is making pleas for practices that require "special attention to plot and structure." He also wants his novelists, as they did in this golden age, to discuss the moral issues and that very vigorously. It might for all of that be appropriate for the novelist to call "conventional judgments into question," but never to call "the possession of the moral sense into question." Even the novels in this age dealing with "political expose" and "political reform" — muckraking as many of them were — were designed "to improve political life north and south," to turn the rascals out, to ferret out the malefactions of so-called leaders in the political and economic worlds. By and large these novelists wanted to reconstruct the new day in terms of the Jeffersonian past as Jones himself interprets the matter: "Almost invariably these books want to turn back to the simplicities of the Jeffersonian world."

On the road back to Jeffersonian democracy, these novelists of the golden age took passing swipes at materialism, the mechanical interpretations of the universe and of human existence, industrial immoralities and economic royalists, and the diminishing sense of the novel "as a responsible work of art in a democracy struggling to achieve its ideals in a world that seemed leagued against the existence of the democratic-republic in the Jeffersonian sense." The reviewer cannot help but feel that this book by Jones is more than a description of the relationship between Jeffersonian democracy and the American novel and that it is really making a case for the revival of democracy which, to Jones, seems to be on the downgrade. For Jones, this is serious business as he implies in his Preface: "modern teaching and modern criticism must find some way simultaneously to protect the autonomy of art and to warn readers that art may conceivably betray the political republic. It may betray the political republic by naively assuming that a primary duty of the political republic is to protect the republic of letters but that it is no duty of the republic of letters to protect the health and safety of the political republic." In short, the future of the republic, its health and safety, are at stake and it is the beholden duty of the novelist to preserve the republic's life.

With the health of the republic in mind, Jones sets the problem question for his set of essays: "In what manner and to what degree has the American novel in the last two centuries supported or denied the current assumptions that ideal life in America presupposes what we talk about sometimes as democracy and sometimes as Jeffersonian democracy." Accordingly, it is the purpose of art as Jones deals with this question not only to describe and reflect what is happening, not only to tell a story and interpret, but also to teach and remodel — to support or to deny democracy. Howard Mumford Jones seems worried about writers who are mere storytellers and, as mere storytellers, are "placating the very dissatisfactions they expose in providing a catharsis of entertainment." (Cf. Dworkin's Foreword.) Why then should one be happy with novelists who "assume that the artist is merely a passive screen" and that the "whole duty of the artist has been performed "when he reports what he sees upon the surface of the mirror or the reflector"?

"And what is (the) point?" writes Jones. "Simply, that the teacher fails to live up to his highest ethical obligations if he accepts uncritically current moral values and all the fashions of the present tense. The humanities exist to remind the artist that, although he has no duty tojoin any political party, he has a duty to recognize civic responsibility as a component of freedom." The contemporary novelist has denied the tenets of Jeffersonian responsibility and certainly does not take any responsibility for the state and condition of his culture. To revive the sense of civic responsibility in the writer is a major aim of *Jeffersonianism and The American Novel.*

Obviously, and obviously this has been the reviewer's point. Howard Mumford Jones wishes to perpetuate the American heritage — and its name is Jeffersonian democracy, but Jeffersonian democracy in terms of an enlightenment that idealizes the rational, the moral, the responsible side of citizenship. In making this return, we are once again supported in the hope that has conquered for us through all these years over "casual fornication and insanity," "over typhoid germs, industrial selfishness, and medical hypocrisy." Thinks and believes Jones: "The Jeffersonian belief in man is, though darkened by time and
trouble, still the basic belief of the Americans, who have repeatedly turned down attempts to establish a different form of society in the United States." Man will prevail in the United States, if not also in the world (seems to be the implication), if only he pursues the Jeffersonian way.

To this reviewer it does not seem to be as simple as all that. But Jones makes a good case before the bar of common sense.

In answer, then, to the ways and styles of the contemporary novelists who have sinned the sins of subjectivism and irrationality and who have been corrupting the republic, Jones is aggressively asserting the role of the intelligent man. One of the major duties of the Jeffersonian man was to cultivate the innate sense of justice with which nature and nature's God has endowed him. Man in this sense is not an undirected man, at loose ends in this world, but "a rational man," a man who "could be restrained from wrong and protected in right, by moderate powers, confided to his own choice, and held to their duties by dependence on his will." Nature has written moral laws within man and every man is able to read them within himself and for himself. In a 1799 letter to William Green Munford, Jefferson waxed strong about the matter: "I am one of those who think well of human character generally. I consider man as formed for society, and endowed by nature with those dispositions that fit him for society...I join you, therefore, in branding as cowardly the idea that the human mind is incapable of further advances." The basic assumptions of Jefferson and Jones are clear: man is a rational creature, endowed with reason and the capacity to think.

Man is what the classical American novel depicts him to be, an orderly man who behaves rationally. The drama of the classical novel, like life, is insisted, pursues a structure and a series of regularized steps - "through times and passions toward some sort of denouement, climax, resolution, or crucial decision that ends the book." The characters who structure and order the drama in classical novels "act from intelligible motives and seek intelligible ends" and such basic ideas "rest upon an assumption:...that time and place, thought and communication are parts of an intelligible world-order."

"To every one of Jones' thrusts in Jeffersonianism and the American Novel there are major counterthrusts. For example, just how important is the novel in democracy as an agent for teaching and remolding? Will the novel really teach and remold if the people are not reading and listening? The novel, as Jones contends, might be central to American literature but is it central in the lives of the American people as advocates of American democracy sometimes imply with all their talk about the grass roots, small classrooms, control by local units and with all the talk of writers and thinkers about a literate citizenry that is necessary to democracy? The assumption that the American novel is a potent teaching and remolding force in the life of the American citizen might be a doubtful one.

In the second place, Jones does not really confront the problem of adjusting Jeffersonian democracy to big government and big institutions in American society, though he skirts the subject while writing about Herbert Croly and the Jefferson-Hamilton tensions in American life. If strong central government is a necessary part of American life (and how can one carry on the functions of modern society with the dwindling resources of some of our local units?), how can we really go back to Jeffersonian democracy, an emergent primarily from an agrarian age? The synthesis of Jefferson and Hamilton as implied in the Croly discussion might be the answer, but it is not articulated very well in this book. A political scientist would probably want to rewrite this section.

With respect to Jones' aversion for the irrational interpretation of man, it almost suffices to say that many a scholar, as significant as Jones and just as competent, is disagreeing with him. But many social science analysts will not let it drop at that. In a book just out, An Introduction to Political Theory: Twelve Lectures at Harvard (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967) Carl J. Friedrich, also of Harvard and an eminent scholar in his own right, states the case quite sharply: "After the writings of Marx and Freud it has become virtually impossible for a thoughtful person in the mid-twentieth century to accept the rationalist image prevailing in the early nineteenth century." One might argue that it is fine and noble to talk of the rational man and to speak of the common man endowed with reason and intelligence common to all men, but it does not always work out that way. Without question, some people are more equal in accepting the common gift of reason than others. It is hard for us to believe today that if you give the common man the facts, or even give them to the aristocratic man, he will see the reasonable way out. Current society is much too complex and complicated for that. Mass psychology and recent social science investigations are throwing shadows on the once brilliant image of the rational man. So the contemporary novelist cannot be all wrong on his views of man. And make no mistake about the matter, as Friedrich insists: "With the exposure of non-rational man has come the questioning of popular sovereignty, since at its center stood a belief in the rational man."

Why return to the age of Jeffersonian democracy? What else can the novel teach for the health and safety of the republic whether political or literary?

With Nathan A. Scott Jr., in The Broken Center (cf. The Cresset, February, 1967) we sometimes wonder whether the center will hold.

Yet - with Howard Mumford Jones and Thomas Jefferson, in both cases good company, we do indeed believe with certain limitations that man will prevail and we have high hopes for Jefferson's "courage based upon intelligence."

VICTOR F. HOFFMANN

The Renewal of Hope

Two years ago in Germany the theological best seller was a book on the theology of hope by a relatively unknown Protestant, Jurgen Moltmann. Its popular reception confirmed the development of an important new fashion in theological conversation: futurity.

It is not surprising that Harvey Cox has called this to the attention of Americans in a number of notices and himself seems to be exploring the notion of futurity and hope for his own theological work. Cox is a leader in that burgeoning school of theologians which is turning away from pessimistic existentialism to embrace the more optimistic gospel of progress. Borne along by the experience of rapid change and taking a positive attitude toward the promise for man offered by cybernation and technology, these men dare to ponder whether or not we are entering a new phase of the history of salvation.

This new broad trend in theology derives from a number of sources. Younger men who have not participated in the great civil wars of the Western World seem especially open to it. The rapid transformation of the globe, unprecedented, cries out for interpretation. Theologians in a pluralistic-secular world must practice apologetics again, or at least take the faith into the marketplace of ideas and there engage in the battle for men's souls. The world is becoming future-oriented. Technological promise arouses new hope and expectations in Europe. Christians have been in conversation with Marxists for a long time; both communities proclaim hope and the appearance of The New Man. Secular scholarship has turned to the phenomenon of futurity, has analyzed its forms and appearances. It has been noted that an irresponsible hope everywhere marks human activity; man is above all a being who hopes and is drawn to the future. The biblical writers dealt often with hope; eschatology is central in both Testaments.
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Israel was a people of hope; the New Israel hoped in the Lord whose return was imminent. The failure of the return led the community to ponder the meaning of Christ's coming and presence as already fulfillment of Israel's hope, at least for faith. Future orientation has always accompanied Christian life and thought. The Church Fathers combined futurity with the past into a doctrine of progressive revelation, or a series of covenants in the history of salvation, Jesus Christ being the New Race.

From time to time in Christian history these elements have been the basis of fiery criticisms of society or of the Church. In the thirteenth century, for example, Joachim of Fiore revived old elements of Christian apocalyptic, and in the name of the imminent New Age of the Spirit denounced the forms of the Church as belonging to the old age and obsolete. Three centuries after this far reaching outburst subsided, Thomas Muentzer read Joachim and led his protest against civil authority in Germany. For his revolutionary ideas Muentzer was the hero of the Reformation for Marxist historiography, but his inspiration was Christian eschatology.

Much illumination for the present discussion is furnished by the historical survey published by Marburg church historian Ernst Benz in Evolution and Christian Hope: Man's Concept of the Future from the Early Fathers to Teilhard de Chardin (Doubleday, 1966, $4.95). Benz locates Teilhard's relationship to Teilhard de Chardin (though not as distinguished as his admirers suggest) he is able to bring the latest results of his discipline together with the great amount of new confirming evidence (brain research, etc.) for the evolutionary hypothesis into a future-oriented Christian synthesis. Some of his ideas are, therefore, new. They reflect his meditations on the irreversible technological evolution, its impact on the human spirit, the creation of new freedom for man and the drive towards human unity, a summing up of all things in Christ, which this produces. For Benz there is much in Teilhard to be criticized, but finally to be appreciated. Teilhard is not for him a new Thomas but a new Leibniz who, in an age of pessimism, provided an optimistic vision. He also has the same problem of too lightly disposing of the problem of evil, which seems to be only a temporary necessity in the service of an inevitable triumph of human-divine goodness. Thus war and Nagasaki are finally for Teilhard hopeful stages of the struggle onward and upward. Tension between Athens and Jerusalem nearly disappears.

For Benz, Teilhard's greatest contribution is to have opened up the dimension of hope in a dramatic way for a world and a theology whose thought has been petrified by the sickness of dubious introspection. Here is how Benz states the problem of his book, surely a central problem for theology today:

Does technology form part of the history of salvation and, if so, in what sense? Is it, as Augustine taught, an expedient, a crutch, given man to make his life easier despite original sin, or is it, as Hugo of St. Victor claimed, a remedy against original sin? Is it, as Teilhard de Chardin explained, the springboard of man's evolution into the super-human?

In a time like ours, in which the technological progress of human life has reached such a high level and in which man uses technology to give direction to his own evolution, the time has come for theologians to rediscover the eschatological perspective of hope in this central area of anthropology and to work out a proper theology of technology adapted to our times.

RICHARD BAEPLER

Worth Noting

The Norman Conquest: Its Setting and Impact

By Dorothy Whitelock, David C. Douglas, Charles H. Lemmon, and Frank Barlow (Charles Scribner's Sons, $4.50).

This is a slim book commemorating the Ninth Centenary of the famous Battle of Hastings, published on its actual anniversary, October 14, as a British climax to the prolonged celebrating, and compiled officially by the Battle and District Historical Society. What can one more volume contribute to the spate of analyses, discussions, theories, and conclusions which center upon this landmark occasion in world (not only English) experience? That it was not England's finest hour is obvious; none the less, these four interpretive essays capably present the why of it all, instead of repeating the what. Thus this expository fulfillment of the assignment in social history embodies what indeed may be the best of recent scholarship in its balanced assessment of likewise how it all happened.

Professor Whitelock of Cambridge summarizes the achievements of six centuries of English civilization: the Anglo-Saxons were more advanced than their adversaries, but the Normans imposed a new top level on medieval English society, lay and clerical, to end Britain's comparative isolation from European development. Professor Emeritus Douglas of Bristol University describes the complexity of William's character: a great ruler, he was noted for both brutality and piety. Lieutenant-Colonel Lemmon gives topographical and chronological data about the campaign: the relative capabilities of the English and Norman forces and leaders, plus Harold's impetuous mistake tactically and the Conqueror's pacification of England. Professor Barlow of Exeter University explores William's policy of "feudalism tamed by royal power": the ultimate continuity of Norman articulation of the body of Anglo-Saxon practice, which became a crucial factor in the subsequent development of the English mind and constitution. These four parts are thematically unified by a brief Introduction written by Vice-President Chevallier of the earlier mentioned B and DH Society. There is a useful index and selected bibliography.

The hard facts that far back are few: the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the random jottings of assorted monks, the works largely imaginative and from hearsay by William of Malmesbury, etc., a few later records by Norman and Scandinavian writers, — and the famous Bayeux Tapestry. Some history, but more of folklore. Now add this kind of valid research, for zest and meaning.

HERBERT H. UMBACH

The Cresset
Financial crises come and go. The church lives on — staggering a little, perhaps, and even progressively blinded — in the grace of a living God. But in the manner of cyclical processes, the cycles begin to deepen and contract. They come at more frequent intervals and they are more intense. Then the effects of crises in the attitudes of the people of the church begin to intensify. Then it is necessary for the Lord of the church to speak again a contemporary word, in His own way and in His own time.

One of the saddest attitudinal effects of crisis is fear. We human beings are not raised so high above our common social plane that we can see our history with the flattening perspective of space. Our world does not look like a smooth round ball to us, but like a series of increasing hills and canyons. We come finally to the range of snow-capped mountains that bar our way and we begin to tremble. At this point we turn against one another and ask: “Who has led us out into the wilderness to die? By whose fault are we here at crisis again?” Then we begin to carry men — and their wives and children — outside the camp to stone them.

The clergy and the leaders try to be objective. Their attention is turned to the record of the mighty acts of God; they have entered into the counsels by which God has made Himself known; they speak, when they speak, in the knowledge of the living God. So at crisis time they speak to their separated brethren (not theologically trained) about the duty of a Christian to his God and about the kind of acts that a man who is grateful for the Word will perform and about the doors which God has opened to the church through which we must pass.

Everything they say is correct in its own right. But have we forgotten that we live in the New Covenant of our God? This is the day when He has filled the church with His Spirit. The Word has lived among us. It is no longer whispered in the ear of a single man or a separated group. It is shouted from the housetops by the mighty army of God’s reconciled people. It is through the church that our God speaks. It is no longer the lonely voice of one crying in the wilderness. It is like the sound of many waters, the murmuring thunder of a multitude.

There is a possibility that at crisis time the leaders of the church should listen to the voice of the living God at the place where He speaks today — the combined decisions of the 144,000. There is a possibility that the failure of our best laid plans is not a failure to hear the Word and a refusal to follow. It just may be that God in His own chosen way is speaking a Word in action which the church has heard and follows. Have we laid our plans in our own great wisdom and said, “Thus saith the Lord”? No single man or self-appointed group of men may, since Pentecost, pretend that they own a tongue of flame which has not touched us all.

THE BENJAMINS

Up the mud road, always alone, the Benjamins fed on lonesome porcupine, and all the hidden winter, they tribed round an iron stove, gnawing gristles and smelling of dough. But Spring trooped them out along the wall to gawk at accidental cars that wallowed past like hogs. The smell of dung and greens rode on the wind’s back for miles. Yet the Benjamins, slow-footed and sullen, heavy as bread, had not been herded into believing a sour wind could dance with a light step.

—JOHN STEVENS WADE
Editor-At-Large

Going To Milwaukee

By VICTOR F. HOFFMANN

As some of the readers of The Cresset already know, I have been appointed the first executive secretary of the Greater Milwaukee Conference on Religion and Race. I take over on this appointment full-time next September.

In this new position I will be held administratively responsible for the following purposes as stated in the articles of incorporation: 1. "to express and spread the shared beliefs and convictions of the members that all men are brothers and created by a single God, that God has conferred upon all men those qualities and rights which constitute the human dignity”; 2. to "convene public convocations to promote a clearer understanding of the relevance of the various biblical faiths to the legitimate needs and the just aspirations of all the people of (the) community”; 3. to “engage in constant study of the specific problems which arise out of racial differences through workshops and other appropriate devices, and . . . sponsor other practical activities which will express . . . concern to and for men of all races and religions”; 4. to promote propaganda and the influencing of legislation.

More specifically, I will be directing research in those areas where social problems and racial tensions emerge with particular consistency, as, for example, in housing, education, jobs, the thought-styles of the churches and some their leaders, and in the political arena. An important and significant side of the job will be the opportunities for ecumenical involvement. I am especially looking forward to working with people of many different denominational persuasions. Some of my energies will be directed to the funding of the Conference, a hard job but one that must be done. A tremendously exciting aspect of my work will take me into the important decision-making processes of the community and will move me into contact and consultation with community leaders. In this capacity I will be involved with some rather important and responsible people in the leadership patterns of the political, educational, welfare, and ecclesiastical structures of the community. Suffice it to say, I am looking forward to directing such a wide range of activities.

I am also looking forward to living in a metropolitan community. The transition from a small, somewhat agricultural community that is trying to make up its mind about being urban to a large metropolitan complex will not be altogether easy for my family, but we will manage it in time.

What makes the transaction agonizing is the fact that we have lived in the Valparaiso community for twenty years where the people have been unusually kind to my wife and to the family. My twenty years with Valparaiso University — in spite of a relatively long list of psychic grievances — have really been pleasant. I owe Valparaiso University a great deal in terms of the contributions it has made to my development and to the general health and safety of my family. I will miss the daily coffee breaks each day with Cresset editors Strietemeier and Baepler. Nor can one ever forget what President Kretzmann has accomplished at Valparaiso University. These have been twenty great years — dynamic, exciting, irritating, disappointing, and rewarding — twenty years that kept me alive and alert. I am thankful both for the kindnesses and the irritations.

However, the two years at Milwaukee will also be exciting and dynamic, irritating, and disappointing. The work will be hard but important.

Living in Milwaukee — this in itself is attractive. Milwaukee has a population of about eight hundred thousand. A large share of this population is native-born (but with foreign names) and most of the foreign-born people are either German or Polish. More and more, however, the city, once heavily German, is beginning to look like the United Nations. According to calculations I have heard, only eighty-five thousand Negroes live in Milwaukee. The cultural life of the city is maintained with an extensive educational system, with a network of parks and museums, and with libraries and recreation centers. Add to this art galleries, schools of art, zoos, auditoriums, and athletic arenas and you have added it all up to a very interesting city.

It is a working town, producing commodities like malt products, beers, hosiery, meats, trucks, paints, varnishes, and almost anything else. There are eateries, taverns, and night clubs.

Milwaukee is a church town and apparently the people take religion seriously and conservatively. I have been told that it is a well-run town, that its transportation system is excellent, that the city operates with a minimum of corruption, and that the Germans have made people forget the Indians from which this territory was taken.

Meanwhile we will miss Valparaiso and will be looking forward to returning in two years.
Henry Luce, Emperor of Editors, founder of *Time*, *Life*, *Fortune*, and *Sports Illustrated*, has been dead for two months. News of his death elicited tributes from great men and parting shots from fond foes. Luce's two big ideas, one for news magazines and the other for group journalism, made their mark on our world. I would like to note Luce's passing by saying some things about objectivity in journalism.

Few readers of *Time* have not had occasion to hurl their copy of a week's issue against a wall in protest to the rank bias that so often taints the columns of this publication. On that subject, Luce once remarked to his staffers: "There is a persistent urge to say that *Time* is 'unbiased' and to claim for it complete 'objectivity.' The original owners-editors-promoters of *Time* made no such fantastic claim." A nice disclaimer, that, but I don't think it will do. As a matter of fact, the magazine calls itself a *news* magazine, and it is customary in our circles to distinguish between a periodical of this sort and, say, a *journal* of opinion. When I pick up a newspaper or weekly summary of the news, I want news—not points of view. I share Joe Friday's concern for the truth or, if we are so inclined, to the theologian or the philosopher—if we are very bold indeed, we might even look to ourselves for the final truth. But in any case we expect our newspapers to give us the little truths, the facts of the day; and, generally speaking, the more of them there are in the paper, the better it is. A *newsmagazine* is in a position to give us middle-sized truths, because deadline pressures are not so severe; a story that takes several days to unfold, bit by bit, in the daily paper can often be cohesively reported in the magazine. For the big truths we look to the historian or, if we are so inclined, to the theologian or the philosopher—if we are very bold indeed, we might even look to ourselves for the final truth. But in any case we expect a magazine that gives us more than middle-sized truths, though of course we're disappointed with one that gives us only little truths.

*Time* is a brash magazine, though my elders tell me that it has become more respectable with the years. The freshness of its approach and the consistency of its copy make it a highly readable magazine. But sometimes *Time* over-reaches itself, and so in a recent *Saturday Review* Cleveland Amory slapped Luce for "biting off not only the news but also history into highly prejudiced, bite-size versions of Groupthink." Luce, of course, would change the metaphor. In reflecting on *Time*'s genesis, he said: "The one great thing was simplification. Simplification by organization...simplification by condensation...and simplification by not being ashamed to say, 'Babe Ruth is a great ballplayer.'" No doubt he conceived his goal as the distillation of the juices of truth from the pulp of data.

It would be nice if facts came to editors—and to us—with a cosmic assessment of their worth stamped on their face. They don't. So editors select some facts for publication and reject others. Furthermore, they put some of the facts on page one, and others on page 83, underneath the truss advertisement. They are very often right in so doing, for some facts are just right for page 83, but of course editors have to interpret the significance of the facts at their disposal to determine that. The problem becomes much more acute in the national news media, however, because space and time are vastly more expensive there. An editor of a national medium, be he Walter Cronkite or Henry Luce, must cut to the heart of the matter very quickly. Dramatic incisions like this are more impressive than local cuts and bruises, but they run a correspondingly greater risk of damaging the organism.

There is no blueprint for objectivity in journalism, though there are rough guidelines for it. For example, fact and opinion can to some extent be distinguished and where possible opinion should be designated as such. On this score, *Time* could perhaps take a cue from its copycat sister, *Newsweek*, which recently began to append identifying notations at the end of its theater, movie, and book reviews. Surely the whole *Time* staff does not troop out of its offices and trek over to the local cinema to watch the latest flick—so why shouldn't the magazine tell us who (if anyone) did see and write about it? I can appreciate the difficulty of trying to credit every news story to a certain person in an organization so top-heavy with editors, but there must be *some* stories that deserve a by-line, even in *Time*.

The size of the truth does make a difference. At the time of JFK's assassination, it was commonly recognized that he had gone to Dallas on a political trip—a trip, that is, which was designed to enhance his own standing for the election a year hence. Now Manchester tells us that Kennedy was sucked into the messy situation in Texas by a petty squabble between Yarborough and LBJ, that he went against his will and found the prospect of the trip distasteful. The difference? On the first account, Kennedy is not diminished, for we understand what it is to mend political fences. But on the second reading, Kennedy is vastly enhanced, as volitionally above politics, while LBJ is vilified as having set the scene for the assassination. How do you know?
The New Hermeneutic

The season of church conventions will soon be upon us and it appears likely that a considerable part of such floor time as is not devoted to the real business of the Church — budgets, committee reports, elections, and the like — will be spent in debates revolving around the new hermeneutic. (For the benefit of my readers who speak only English, I should explain that “hermeneutics” is Theology-Talk for “principles of interpretation.”) In all my born days, no one has ever accused me of being a theologian — much less a good one. It is therefore possible for me to contribute my little all to these debates without fear of landing in the pages of any respectable theological journal. Of course, my observations are not the result of many years of hard study; they are only the conclusions of an observer who stands by the Way, watching the parade of theologians to the Throne of God, asking and finding forgiveness. So now I shall present the hermeneutics of such an observer and my son Stephen, age fourteen.

1. The Bible is the Word of God, speaking in words, in history, in life itself — always directly and unerringly to the hearts of men.

2. What the Bible tells about is always directly and unerringly Jesus Christ, Lord and Savior and King, Desire of Nations, Alpha and Omega. This I learned from Luther.

3. Some parts of the Bible seem to speak of Him more directly than others. This is probably due to the fact that I have let the Spirit of God get too far ahead of me and I have lost the clarity of His voice somewhere along the way. This means that I must listen again, just as the first man whom He addressed listened. For example, when He speaks to Samuel, I must put myself in Samuel’s house, listen with Samuel’s ears, and obey with Samuel’s heart. My ears must be sharpened only by what my hidden God has been saying these thousands of years. For me to try to intrude on the conversation between the Holy Spirit and Samuel only as a twentieth-century third cousin of Samuel is the ultimate arrogance. And to read into the Word things at which Samuel would have rubbed his sleepy eyes is the ultimate nonsense. The avoidance of this arrogance is, I would suggest, the ultimate purpose of all honest Biblical study. Here theologians go wrong in two ways. Either they claim to hear more than Samuel heard or they refuse to hear all that Samuel heard. The first group becomes hard, rigid, opinionated super-orthodox men.

The second group becomes shoddy, shallow, partially deaf humanists. In both cases they become rationalists, continuous static on the wave length of the Holy Spirit.

4. In our study of the Bible we will probably never solve the mystery of the relationship of the human to the divine in the writing of it. The very same Holy Spirit was talking in the prison cell in Rome and on the isle of Patmos. For the time being — until the last lesson in hermeneutics at the Golden Gates — this is all I know, and all I need to know. Stephen agrees.

5. The Word of God to man must be sought in, with, and under the words of the Bible, in much the same way that we discern His Body in, with, and under the elements of the Eucharist. Take, for example, the hundreds of times the sacred writers refer to water — the still waters, the living waters, the quiet waters, counsel like deep waters, casting bread upon far waters, a cup of cold water, the water of life, and so forth. To a learned hermeneutician these references are all perfectly understandable. Our ancestors in God were always in a dry land, face to face with the Negev, waiting for the rainy season when the Jordan would run high and the Kidron would flow between its rugged banks. They had only to look around them to see the ever-present tragic need for water. But while we can grant that the writers were expressing their own sense of immediate need, we must understand that they were reflecting a cosmic, universal need. The world needs water. Humanity — all of it — needs water. As a consequence, many passages formerly localized in their background by our limited scholarship now take on a new and unusual significance. The city dweller in New York or the farmer in South Dakota now can understand — given our nation’s growing water problem — what the sacred writers mean by “still waters” or “waters of life.” Here is something global and cosmic. Even the surface of the moon, we discovered a couple of years ago, is dead because it has no water. All the Scripture passages about water begin to glow and surge with a new, universal meaning. We have come a little closer to God’s view of the universe.

This suggests a question: As we advance into the hidden corners of science, as we explore the secrets of space, as we learn more about our own being, is it not possible that our understanding of certain passages of Scripture will assume new dimensions of depth and grandeur, the heights and depths of the hidden God, a vision of the ultimate truth of history as God has always seen it?