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Many things about the day were as they are every day, at least every work day. But when the morning news brought a special bulletin about the collision of two commuter trains on the south side of Chicago, something happened to the day. It was something like the reply of an expectant mother to her doctor when he tried to reassure her that giving birth was "an every day experience." She noted, however, that fortunately she did not give birth to a child every day.

The wreck brought terror and carnage, tears and anxiety; it also brought forth heroic efforts by police, firemen, doctors, nurses, ambulance drivers, helicopter pilots, commuters, and motorists who, passing by, stopped to help. But does not every day bring forth its tears and terrors, its anxieties and death? Indeed. Each day also brings forth its share of courage and surprises about living and serving. And yet the disaster, which brought death for 44 people and injury to more than 300, although it is not the sort one goes through every day, did underscore much in the day of everyman.

In our home we sat at breakfast, listening to the first reports. We prayed for the injured and for those who cared for them, for the dying and the grief stricken. And then we began to wonder how it had been that morning in the lives of the men and women and children who were involved. How was it for these people when they had first awakened that day? Were there prayers of thanksgiving, or were there only burdens, coercions, and the dullness of continuing boredom? Were there prayers of thanksgiving? Was the first movement of waking consciousness that morning nudged by dread or fear of the day? Or was there a movement into assurance, confidence, and courageous freedom to live?

How were the people with each other that morning?

And how were the people with each other that morning? Was there a gathering in community at that basic communal action of eating? Did they have any food to eat? If they did, how were they together at table? Was each hiding from the other, isolated behind an impenetrable "paper" barrier, silenced from each other in the habituated prison of no conversation? Did each one pass by the table to grab some "fuel" for the body, taking not even time enough to wipe the fog and dust from the vision of each other, giving no attention to those courtesies that lubricate human existence?

How did the people that morning leave each other? Was there the noise only of silence? Was there anger and pouting and self-pity? Were the last words of spouse to spouse, parent to child and child to parent, the words of curse? If they spoke of God or of his Christ, did they invoke him to do damage and harm to others? Or was there in each "castle and kingdom" an interchange of royal largesse, husband and wife blessing each other in their respective work areas, parents blessing children, and children, in the courtesy of a true "castle," blessing the parents?

Linking our suffering and grief to God's Sufferer

The mayor of Chicago, adjudged by some to be a hero and by others to be a villain, stood at least four
hours at the wreckage. He is also a
baptized man, and whatever else
he said, two statements attributed
to him deserve our notice: he said,
"Jesus," and he said, "God, help
us." He was not cursing; he was not
evading pain. He wept at the loss
of life and at the pain. We wonder
if his words could not remind us
to link our suffering to the suffering
of that one who is our life and sal-
vation, the conqueror of death for
us. Can we learn to nail our grief
down to the "Man of Sorrows" who
is "acquainted with grief," and thus
learn how to express our grief and
to overcome it?

That kind of disaster happens
(somewhere) every day, although,
praise God, we do not each have
to go through it every day. But
every day does have its tears and
terrors, its anguish and its losses.
All human beings feel the "pres-
ence of death" in the form of lone-
liness, defeat, and boredom. Every
human community has its hatreds
and angers. Surely, then, in the day
of Everyman — and especially Chris-
tians — there is a call for the train-
ing and discipline that opens up
the day by standing anew in the prom-
ises of God. That life in Christ is
not one damned thing after another,
with curses ringing in the ears. It
is rather a life of one blessed thing
after another, with words about the
good care of God ringing in each
other's ears. Can we not learn to take
our food with thanksgiving and en-
joyment? Surely, we can continue
to help each other in the community
of conversation, lubricating our lives
together with the practice of
courtesies and joy. Since we are a
priestly people of God, the begin-
n ing of the day should be the in-
itiating point for our great priest-
ly work: husband and wife, parent
and child, friend and roommate,
blessing each other as we go apart
to our respective places of work.
Life in peace and in community is
seen so often in the "big" affairs
that we miss the essential building
blocks of the little things each day.
The net result is that we miss both
peace and community in all places.

Do we have the patience for
a truce?

The announcement that a truce
in Viet Nam is at hand, although
not yet "in hand," has aroused some
predictable responses about such
things as the political timing, about
inadequate machinery for enforcing
a cease fire, and about the political
future of Viet Nam. Some few voices
have noted the painstaking work
of the President and his staff. But
the mixture of feelings about the
announcement seems to be coupled,
in part, to the diffuse passions there
have been for peace. One passion
that does not seem to be running
high is that of hope, not only for
a truce but for a peace. Rather than
hope, which breeds patience, there
seems to be largely either the an-
ticipation of impending relief or
sheer cynicism.

Many people have grounds for
their cynicism. There has been an
excessive abundance of righteous-
ness, condemning exclusively one
side or the other, one party or the
other; the charge has been repeated
that leaders were serving their own
ends; there have been too many
promises made and ignored or made
and broken; there are the claims
that what is being done should have
been done long ago; and there are
suspicions that inadequate provi-
sions are being made for the complex
problems of a cease fire and a truce.

Like many others, Christian peo-
ple also have the passion for peace,
and they, too, suffer the cynicism
about the announcement of the im-
pending truce. Is this because the
Christians, too, have been sucked
into the mire of ideological abso-
lutes? Too many have tackled
the church and her good news onto
the programs of false expectations
and excessive demands. Thus, Christians
"had to" join the anti-war move-
ment because the war was "immoral"
or Christians "had to" support the
war because the logic of fighting
godless communism became the
absolute ideal in the war. In both
cases the issues reduced themselves
more and more to a discussion of
the moral quality of the opposing
party. Whoever one's "enemy" was,
finally became the sheer embodi-
ment of evil.

Christians ought to be more shrewd
in nurturing their passion for peace.
They ought to do this because they
have different categories for inter-
preting the conflict, a different
context into which to place the strug-
gle, and a different grounding for
the fact of peace.

If peace depended on our praying for
it, would we have it?

It has been astonishing how little
prayer there has been for peace, un-
less one would want to classify that
as prayer which is a kind of bul-
letin board for God on which he
receives his instructions for the
day's work. How little of prayer,
and exhortation to pray, has been
noted the painstaking work
of the President and his staff. But
the mixture of feelings about the
announcement seems to be coupled,
in part, to the diffuse passions there
have been for peace. One passion
that does not seem to be running
high is that of hope, not only for
a truce but for a peace. Rather than
hope, which breeds patience, there
seems to be largely either the an-
ticipation of impending relief or
sheer cynicism.

Many people have grounds for
their cynicism. There has been an
excessive abundance of righteous-
ness, condemning exclusively one
side or the other, one party or the
other; the charge has been repeated
that leaders were serving their own
ends; there have been too many
promises made and ignored or made
and broken; there are the claims
that what is being done should have
been done long ago; and there are
suspicions that inadequate provi-
sions are being made for the complex
problems of a cease fire and a truce.

Like many others, Christian peo-
ple also have the passion for peace,
and they, too, suffer the cynicism
about the announcement of the im-
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our hatred of his ways and our unwillingness to be judged by him. Christians, at least, ought to be aware of the reality of God’s wrath (in what Ionesco perceptively calls “the time of wrath”) and the execution of his judgment upon nations by means of other nations. But even those who neither know nor fear God’s wrath do not thereby escape living lives in that wrath.

This reality of the righteous wrath of God, as a factor in our individual rage and in the fury of conflict among peoples, should sober us in our absolute demands and expectations about power, war, and peace. Too long we have been the victims of our own super righteousness in demanding “unconditional surrender,” “unconditional withdrawal” and the like, as if we could wipe out evil by our choices, overcome wrath by our peace plans, or destroy evil by wiping out the evil-doers. We can’t even remake ourselves. The ideological dream that we shall somehow remake “the other” is part of our delusion for which we shall be justly punished.

Sustaining patience for a truce

The church has the death of another to talk about when she wants to talk about peace; she has, therefore, a different dynamic for and definition of peace. The reconciliation of God with men and men with God through Jesus Christ (and in him, the reconciliation of people with each other) occurs at the point of repentance and the reception in faith of the word of forgiveness. This reconciliation of antagonistic parties is not to be confused with the truces and peace treaties men make. Neither is the one to be substituted for the other. Diplomatic negotiations are not grounded on repentance nor are peace treaties the root of faith.

Christians who live in peace with God do well therefore (on the one side) to avoid the impatience of absolute expectations. On the other side, they ought to be much busier and more single-minded both in living and preaching the word of reconciliation in the name of Jesus Christ, without turning that message into a plank in the policy for diplomatic negotiation. By succumbing to the imagination that the church ought to lead in that kind of diplomatic peace, the Christians have become disoriented and intimidated about the preaching and living of peace in the midst of war.

And knowing what they do about wrath, both in God and in the inner lives of people, and knowing the difference between the reconciliation received in repentance and faith and that made by truces and treaties, Christians ought to know that truces and treaties must be accompanied by enough machinery to effect workable restraints upon greed and hatred. Patient support for such a truce, together with the machinery for helping people to return to a life of work, study, play, and production, is better to offer than cynicism, excessive expectations, or an impatient grabbing after relief.

In perpetuity!

In the years between 1958 and 1972 there has been a dramatic increase in the amount of federal and state money made available to colleges and universities, as well as directly to students in the form of grants and loans. Church-related institutions of higher learning also have been recipients of loans and matching grants. Many educators, as well as some legislators, agree that the private and church-related college or university will have to receive more such money if it is to survive. But some educators are also warning that this relationship to the federal and state government is, at best, a mixed blessing, and at worst, may spell the death to such schools, if by nothing more than homogenization.

We agree with the advice of Dr. Carlson when, in this issue of The Cresset, he urges us to exercise vigilance and participation. Such exhortation, however, unless it is accompanied by direction, only compounds our sense of impotence. Dr. Carlson does suggest what seems to be a good direction: federal and state support (assuming it is given at all) ought to be to the consumer, not the producer.

One fact about our own university impels a comment on the need for such vigilance, participation, and radical re-direction. This fact arises out of the Higher Education Facilities Act which made matching grants and loans available to schools like ours. On the basis of guidelines, the loans and grants contained restrictions on the use to be made of the buildings constructed with such monies: for 20 years the building was not to be used for worship and sectarian instruction. In the course of litigation on the constitutionality of federal grants and loans to church-related colleges and universities, the Supreme Court ruled that it was not a violation of the constitution to make such grants and loans. The Court also struck the 20 year restriction on the use of the building, substituting rather the restriction, in “perpetuity.” This language of the Court has been taken into the legislative language of the Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1972.

This ruling and this language should be a warning to us and to schools like ours, for it already has had baleful consequences. There was a time in our university when theology classes were held and taught in rooms interspersed throughout the buildings of the campus, thereby affording much more ready interchange with colleagues. Such symbolic interspersing and such actual interchange were mutually beneficial. They contributed to the strength of our academic life and to the enhancement of the thought of individual thinkers. As it is now, the classes in theology are restricted to those buildings on campus which have no federal or state money involved in their construction.

In the interest of keeping the government from establishing religion by supporting a university such as ours, it appears to me the
Court has laid down a restriction which hinders the free exercise of that which helps make our university what it is. If some one were to argue that our university should receive no federal or state financial subsidy, I might be inclined to agree.

But the fact is that the government has granted the money, the Court has ruled it constitutional to make capital grants and loans to church-related colleges and universities because they are engaged also in a valid "secular" work, and many colleges and universities have accepted such money. But isn't it an excessive encroachment, a violation of civil rights to restrict the use of the buildings, especially when money is involved which is on loan and is being repaid? Even if there were a restriction during the time of repayment (which I would not grant), what about that time after the loan is repaid and the building continues to be used?

We do well to heed the warning. The experience does underscore the need for vigilance, for active participation, and for redirecting the form of federal and state subsidy to private and church related institutions of higher learning.

---

**WITHOUT WORDS, WITHOUT SILENCE**

I

It is bright with dawn
Now, but the light is always
Blooming in the self.

II

The days are strung out
Like pearls on a golden thread,
One after another.

Ernest C. Stefanik

---

**BEYOND THE LAW**

**THE CHURCH COLLEGE AND THE LAW:**
**VALUE-CENTERED EDUCATION AND PUBLIC POLICY**

**EDGAR M. CARLSON**

I come to this assignment fresh from a meeting of the Board of the National Council of Independent Colleges and Universities and a day's conference with executive directors of state associations like our own. Since the text of what I shall be saying had to be prepared in advance of that meeting, it will not reflect whatever recent information may have been gained there. However, on three days of last week I participated in a seminar on "The Mission of the Church in Post-Secondary Education" at Princeton, involving the secretaries and directors of church boards of higher education and a dozen or more invited guests from the academic area and from church and educational organizations. Since I was receiving preparatory papers for that session and preparing my remarks to them at the same time that I was preparing for this assignment, what I say today may well be influenced by considerations germane to that discussion.

I understand my role in this discussion to be two-fold:

1) **I am to focus attention on "value-centered education" and what that implies for the church-related college, and**
2) **I am to try to assess the nature of present and future developments in the field of public policy which will affect education of that character. The time span mentioned has been the next twenty years.**

I see myself as a sort of Janus-figure with one face directed toward the church and the other directed toward government and public agencies, and asking what the educational institution can and may take from each of them, without threat to its integrity.

**Value-Centered Education and Church-Relatedness**

As a theologian I am skeptical about the language of "values" as the bearer of distinctive Christian meanings. There is a tendency to level out the concretely Christian into universals where one form of commitment merges into another. But for education in our situation and time, I think it is a proper approach and a proper way of speaking. This is so partly because the great thrust currently is toward a job-centered view of education, generally referred to as "career-education." This is generally conceived to be education in which you do not waste time on any other value
than getting ready to take a job. There is generally not too much concern about where you will be should permit on planning. Commends some of their programs offered in order to provide a proper colleges but it is apparently what is typical of most community-type education. I don't really think that graduate. A recent report from a neighboring state quotes the analysis of what the job requires for a better job (as assistant in the corset department of a retail store) who cites the fact that she didn't have to take courses in "history and things like that" as one of the great advantages of community-college type education. I don't really think that is false? The primary value to which education is committed is truth. I am aware that truth is simple or single thing; it is not capable of a single or simple definition. Indeed, it is part of the distinctive role of the college that it concerns itself with what the word "truth" means, as well as with whatever things are true. For instance, does it mean only that something has been observed to work? Or that it is consistent with other things we hold to be true? Or that it conforms to the requirements of rationality? What is that mysterious quality which demands that we affirm that which we believe to be true and prevents us from really believing that which we think is false?

This is not the occasion for that inquiry, but I do want to assert that a college is a place where truth, however we define it, is pursued with seriousness and with purpose. Learning needs a home where it may be pursued without having to justify itself. The primary value to which education is committed is truth. Truth may be defined in different ways, but college is the place where it is pursued with seriousness and purpose. Learning needs a home where it may be pursued without having to justify itself.

"The primary value to which education is committed is truth." Truth may be defined in different ways, but college is the place where it is pursued with seriousness and purpose. Learning needs a home where it may be pursued without having to justify itself. The primary value to which education is committed is truth. Truth may be defined in different ways, but college is the place where it is pursued with seriousness and purpose. Learning needs a home where it may be pursued without having to justify itself.

So "value" is a proper first line of defense for a view of education which I think all of us embrace. I predict that a decade from now, or less, students are going to be quite dissatisfied with training programs that are exclusively job-directed.

The primary value to which education is committed is truth. I am aware that truth is simple or single thing; it is not capable of a single or simple definition. Indeed, it is part of the distinctive role of the college that it concerns itself with what the word "truth" means, as well as with whatever things are true. For instance, does it mean only that something has been observed to work? Or that it is consistent with other things we hold to be true? Or that it conforms to the requirements of rationality? What is that mysterious quality which demands that we affirm that which we believe to be true and prevents us from really believing that which we think is false?

This is not the occasion for that inquiry, but I do want to assert that a college is a place where truth, however we define it, is pursued with seriousness and with purpose, and where we are trying to develop in others the capacity to recognize and use it. This is education's distinctive role. It cannot allow itself to be diverted from this goal by giving priority to any other function. It must maintain a degree of autonomy over against government, economy, the home, and the church. If it allows their own functions, the result can only be the malfuctioning of both education and society as a whole. Unless learning has a home in which it does not need to justify itself in order to be pursued, it will be pursued only when and to the extent that it serves the interests of others. There is great need today to understand and to emphasize the distinctive function of education because of the hazards that exist in our present situation precisely in the direction of sub-ordinating educational goals to political and economic interests or to self-chosen objectives of selected groups of individuals and families. There may have been times when there was substantial risk of such subversion through church influence, but I think this is virtually non-existent today. I have the impression that both institutions and the churches to which they are related are quite explicit in wanting to avoid any semblance of such undue influence.

What I have said about the pursuit of truth as such and the development of the capacity to recognize and use it, applies to all education which makes any pretense of being comprehensive in its educational undertaking. When we speak of "value-centered education" we are focussing especially on the liberal arts tradition, which will include most church-related colleges, but certainly is not limited to them. I agree wholeheartedly with the position which Lloyd Averill expressed in a brochure which the Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities put out a few years ago (1969) entitled "Church Colleges and the Public Good," when he said that "Religious and moral questions are the very substance of that tradition, and failure to take such questions with radical seriousness, subverts the tradition itself." He pointed out that "humanistic intent" was "generic to the liberal credo in education." It determines the curriculum and the shape of the academic community. This commitment to the human and the humane is the characteristic center of the liberal arts approach to learning. Unfortunately—or perhaps fortu-
nately—interpretations of the human vary and vie with one another. They are not self-evidently given in experience or demonstrable to objective examination. Interpretations of the human are parts of a total world-view, which is not a theoretical construct so much as “a lived response to life which catches up a funded experience of profound historical range and human depth” (p. 7). Consequently, “to ask what it may mean to enhance the human is to locate oneself precisely at the point where the religious and the moral converge most acutely.”

If this is true, then it seems one must say that all institutions that claim to be educational within the general meaning of the liberal arts tradition must concern themselves with the kinds of questions properly described as moral and religious. The only way institutions can be totally secular is to avoid all basic questions about what it means to be human. Institutions cannot claim to be educationally serious unless they are also morally and religiously serious. As Averill puts it, for an institution “to be serious means to commit itself to some answers to the human questions—answers about which there is no universal consensus—answers which can shape its curriculum and its style of life so that the human is enhanced. To be a liberal arts college at all means to be ‘sectarian’ at least in this sense, that some meanings of the human and the humane are embraced while others are rejected” (p. 7).

Now, if one reflects on this a bit in the light of Tilton v. Richardson some interesting questions emerge. Clearly the serious raising of moral and religious questions is not distinctively Christian. If one comes down on the side of some “meanings of the human and the humane” by virtue of being serious, and those meanings of the human and the humane coincide with and have been traditionally attached to the Christian tradition, will this alter the case in any way? Or, if on the other hand, one deals with moral and religious questions and does not present in an adequate and authentic, or even sympathetic fashion, those meanings of the human and the humane which are involved with the Christian tradition and message—if he does not do that—will one then have violated that condition laid down by the Chief Justice, namely teaching “according to the academic requirements of the subject matter and the teacher’s concept of professional standards”? Could one possibly meet that requirement in dealing with moral and religious questions in the western world if he did not in some sense teach “the distinctive doctrines, creeds or tenets of any particular Christian or other religious sect,” to use the language of the Minnesota state constitution which forbids that any such shall be “promulgated or taught” in any school receiving public money?

“The church-related college which wishes to have integrity with regard to its church-relatedness will seek to find coherence and congruence between its view of the human and how it may be enhanced and the church’s view of the same.”

But what about the question of taking sides on values? Individually, most will agree that we should embrace some meanings of the human and the humane over others, but can an institution have such a commitment to a set of values or beliefs? This is the most troublesome issue in higher education today. John Knox, in a recent issue of Religion in Life (Winter, 1971), grants that there could be such a thing as a “Christian university” in principle, just as there could be an “English university” having a common set of cultural assumptions and still being genuinely devoted to free inquiry, but in fact no such consensus is possible. It is not possible, because it could not be staffed. “Where will be found,” he says, “the men and women with the exceptional scholarly abilities and attainments in particular fields, with the personal character and cultural orientation, and with the understanding of, and commitment to, the Christian educational ideal, which together would qualify them for conducting or guiding the Christian university?” Before being wholly persuaded by that rhetorical question, however, one ought to ask whether even a “university” is really possible in fact in the fragmented world of academic specialists and departmental rivalries. It is not necessarily any more devasting to the idea of the Christian university, or at least the Christian college, that we can only approximate that ideal than it is for the idea of the University.

Here at St. Olaf a Centennial Task Force has been at work this past year and I have been privileged to have a somewhat peripheral relationship to it. There are two ideas which have come out of it that seem to me to be very helpful. One is that an institution has several “identities.” It has a “constitutive identity”: what it was chartered to be and cannot cease being; a “contingent identity”: what it indeed has been and is but could exist without being; and “empirical identity”: the snap-shot view of what it is and is becoming; and an “intentional identity”: what it chooses to do with its heritage in view of its situation and in the light of its understanding of the needs and possibilities of the future.

The other idea which I find helpful is a distinction between the kind of commitment which is appropriate to people and the kind that is appropriate to institutions. Ultimate aims refer to people and only in a secondary sense to institutions. They are likely to refer to all persons and therefore are not appropriate in defining the particular purposes of education in general or institutions in particular. What institutions need is a set of proximate aims for assisting persons in the pursuit of their ultimate aims. For instance, self-fulfillment or service to humanity are proper goals for persons, but educational institutions may do well to define their purposes in terms of processes and skills and attitudes which assist people to achieve self-fulfillment and enhance their ability to serve humanity.

Time does not allow me to pursue this part of the assignment farther. But this is where I think we have come: Integrity for the church-related college seeking to pursue value-centered education requires that the institution be performing that function which is uniquely and distinctively assigned to educational
of truth as such and the development of the capacity to recognize and use it; it must take moral and religious questions seriously and it must deal with them in a manner which utilizes the full resources of the Christian tradition. I think an institution must intend to be some kind of institution and the intention must cover the kinds of values and commitments to which moral and religious seriousness gives rise. These are primarily questions that relate to persons in any ultimate sense, but institutions must determine their proximate goals in the light of the ultimate concerns of those who share in the life of the college. The church-related college which wishes to have integrity with regard to its church-relatedness will seek to find coherence and congruence between its view of the human and how it may be enhanced and the church's view of the same.

I am tempted to pursue farther the question about who has the best sense of direction for the college - i.e. who is best qualified to shape its "intentional identity" — but I shall drop it with the observation that a mounting body of evidence points to students rather than faculty and administration as having the soundest instinct about what educational institutions are really for.

Value-Centered Education and Public-Relatedness

We are talking, of course, about "value-centered education" as represented by the church-related college and are not implying that this is the only place where it exists.

First, I want to emphasize that the distinction between public and private has always been rather blurred and is becoming more so. I do not agree, however, with the comments which I frequently hear from people in the public sector and sometimes from higher education statisticians that the differences have been practically wiped out in actual operations. I don't believe that any one who has to make decisions about the price to be charged the student, or who has the job of recruiting students at that price, or finding the resources for financial aid so that students can attend at that price, is likely to think there is no longer any significant difference between public and private institutions.

Statisticians are sometimes able to use large enough categories in producing their averages (e.g., per cent of costs carried by students nationally, per cent of moneys coming from federal government to public and private institutions, etc.) to obscure real difference that the two-price system makes. But no local institution, from the smallest liberal arts college to NYU, needs much instruction on how the two-price system affects them.

"... the distinction between public and private has always been rather blurred and is becoming more so." The result of that blurring is incongruities in the spending of public funds.

What I mean, rather, is that a definition of "public" has been institutionalized and bureaucratized in the case of education, at all levels, in a manner which is increasingly difficult to defend in theory and whose utility in terms of the public good is being increasingly challenged. Just this past week I was alerted to a growing body of research in public elementary and secondary education in the great cities (Boston, New York, etc.) which attributes the incapacity of the system to respond to the needs of the changing city to the city-wide and state-wide educational bureaucracies which had been firmly established as early as the last decades of the previous century.

It is characteristic to define the "public" institution in terms of either the ownership of property or the election of governing boards. If a public body owns the grounds, what goes on at that place is "public." Or if control is vested in a board elected in a general election or by people so elected (as by a legislature), then whatever is done under the aegis of that board is "public." When one actually looks at the funding of programs through public dollars, however, he finds many of the dollars going for services that do not involve either of these elements. At least half of the state's welfare budget is spent for programs which do not take place in public property and in many cases pay for services which are not controlled by any public body, except in the sense that they are deemed to meet the standards set for operating that kind of service. One interesting consequence is that hardly any part of the state's welfare appropriation is used for constructing buildings. On the other hand, the immediate benefactors of the training of engineers and welders and dental technicians would appear to be the students and those private parties who employ them. Contrast this, for instance, with the education of teachers in private institutions who, when jobs are available, go almost entirely into the public schools.

There are a lot of incongruities in the way this blurred distinction actually works out. For instance, public funds are equally available for Medicare and Medicaid whether the medical care is administered by a public health agency or a private practitioner, but the education of that practitioner (nurse, physician, etc.) is a public concern and eligible for public funds only if it has occurred at a public institution. The Federal government will sue a county which seeks to require its welfare clients to use only public hospitals, agencies, or pharmacies, for violating the "free choice of vendor" provision in the federal law, but the federal courts are still very cautious about allowing the most limited free choice in the field of education. The reason, of course, is that in the one case the characteristic form of subsidy is the subsidy of the consumer, while in the other the characteristic form of subsidy is the subsidy of the provider. This is particularly true at the state level, from which most of the appropriations for education still come.

The basic question in public policy, with regard to the spending of funds, is the "proper distribution between provider and consumer subsidies."

Other illustrations of incongruities which could be mentioned are these: institutional care for a mentally retarded child can be paid for with public funds whether he is placed in a public or a private home, but his education can be paid for only if it is received at a public in-
stitution. Day-care centers, wherever they are placed, are eligible for federal funds, and in this case the guidelines provide that preference must be given to programs which contain educational objectives and components and are not merely custodial. The state welfare department has had as many as a hundred employees attending graduate or professional programs at one time, paid for with state welfare funds, without inquiring whether the institution attended was public, private, or church-related. This was wholly in accord with the Welfare Department's way of operating, but it would have no counterpart in the expenditure of educational funds.

The basic question in public policy which must be resolved within a very few years is the proper distribution between provider and consumer subsidies. Channeling public funds for education exclusively to providers, as was done in most states until very recently, requires a two-price system. The spread in that two-price system is now so large that it threatens the collapse of the private sector. NYU with a $14 million deficit, selling off its campuses, dropping two hundred faculty members, is just the most current and glaring example of what is inevitable unless adjustments are made soon.

"The meaningful survival of private higher education cannot be assured through anything that colleges do to change themselves; it will depend on what is done in the area of public policy."

In the volume Public Policy and Church Related Higher Education I have tried to bring together some of the relevant information and I shall not repeat it here. Let me simply summarize the position taken with a few dogmatic assertions:

1. The meaningful survival of private higher education cannot be assured through anything that colleges do to change themselves; it will depend on what is done in the area of public policy.

2. The two-price system in a high-priced service will destroy the unsubsidized service system, in education as it would in any other field; but there is in fact no other field in which it is still operating.

3. Across-the-board subsidies for higher education are not now and will not be an effective means of providing equality of educational opportunity; they have in fact resulted in the transfer of funds and earning capacity from the poor to the more affluent, rather than the reverse.

4. The attempt to handle the costs of higher education as a current expense, to be fully paid for by current students and tax-payers, is neither realistic nor desirable. Education should be considered an investment rather than a current expense.

5. To the extent that education requires subsidy, major emphasis should be placed on the subsidy of students, allowing for at least that degree of choice which other segments of society enjoy with respect to other publicly supported activities.

6. The most rational and efficient way to achieve our national objectives in education would be the subsidy of individuals on the basis of need, with a relatively liberal definition of "need" and with opportunities to shift the cost which is assigned the student to his productive years through some kind of income-contingent loan program.

7. Since we do not have the opportunity to start from scratch but must work within a system which has made heavy investments in plants and programs and in which the vested interests and bureaucracies are impressive, it is probable that any such eventual goal will have to be reached by stages and by interim programs that ameliorate discrepancies but do not cure them.

I want to describe now some of the things I see happening in the field of public policy during the next few years.

1. The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (to the degree that it is funded) will have an important impact on higher education. The concept of "entitlement" is an important gain, the matching funds for increases in state student aid programs is important, and the institutional supplements accompanying students with financial aid may be important. The effect will be very uneven, depending perhaps more on the aggressiveness of financial aid officers in the past than on the proportion of low-income students attending.

2. State financial aid programs will grow more rapidly than institutional support, but they will still represent a relatively small proportion of the state's investment in higher education. Currently about 30 states have financial aid programs but most of these represent less than 3% of state appropriations, and in no case as much as 15%. There are three types of state student aid of which I am aware: 1) general scholarships and grants available to students on the basis of need, attending either public or private institutions, variable on

"To the extent that education requires subsidy, major emphasis should be placed on the subsidy of students... The most rational and efficient way to achieve our national objectives in education "would be the subsidy of individuals on the basis of need..."

the basis of costs; 2) tuition equalization programs, generally providing the difference between public and private tuition up to a given figure (e.g. $1000 but not more than need); and 3) a fixed grant to students attending private colleges without reference to need. This is found only in the state of Georgia where the amount is $400 per year.

3. There will be considerable expansion of grants to institutions on some basis, such as the per graduate grants (N. Y., Maryland) or grants to the institution through the student (Washington) or through the use of the concept of contract for services rendered (Minnesota, Oregon, New Jersey), or as a supplement for the institution accompanying the grant to a student (Illinois, New Jersey). New York's so-called "Bundy grants" of $400 for each baccalaureate degree illustrate the hazard involved in assigning to administrators the decision as to when colleges are or are not "nonsectarian." Originally 21 colleges were declared ineligible and these have had to prove their "innocence" in the face of such administrative assumptions of "guilt." For instance,
Wagner College, has just this year become eligible for a program that was established in 1968. Washington's $100 per resident student must be collected from the student. Oregon private colleges receive $250 per 45 credit hours taught to Oregon students, exclusive of religion courses. Minnesota colleges receive $500 for each additional Minnesota student above the 1970 fall enrollment and $500 with each grant recipient attending a private college. This brought just over a half million dollars to Minnesota's private colleges last year and is expected to bring several times that amount to them during the present year.

New Jersey has adopted the most far-reaching contract program, covering additional students, students with $1000 of financial need, and a range of special and professional programs. The declared intention of the program, for which $7 million is appropriated for this year, is to increase by 15,000 the enrollment in New Jersey private colleges.

4. Some definite efforts are being made to substitute some sort of variable tuition at public institutions for a fixed, across-the-board tuition rate. New York and Illinois have had rather full-blown programs of this kind developed. The Illinois Board of Higher Education's special commission on the matter, recommended a sliding scale from nothing for families with incomes below $6000 to $2325 for families of over $15,000. In addition the low-income families would receive awards up to $825 for indirect educational expenses plus free housing. The New York proposal would cover total tuition charges for families with less than $9000. Tuition for other students would be scaled according to the ability to pay and related to level of study, with the tuition at the highest end of the scale raised significantly above present levels. New York has a built-in technique for accomplishing this through the scholar incentive awards which are already in effect, and which are variable according to need. Tuition rates have now been established at $650 for lower division, $800 for upper division, and $1,200 for graduate and professional students. Scholar incentive awards are then granted on the basis of need for an effective tuition rate that depends on ability to pay.

Minnesota has had a committee working with the Higher Education Coordinating Commission during the past year which has reviewed this matter quite seriously. There are many people in public higher education, particularly those with backgrounds in economics, who are fully convinced of the need for change, but it must be expected that public postures will place great virtue in the no-cost or low-cost tuition policy. In fact, however, tuition is not the only cost of receiving an education and the attempt to keep tuitions low through large institutional subsidies is increasingly of interest to the student without need and increasingly irrelevant to the student with great need. Let me illustrate what I mean. A student from a family with $4000 family income, with 3 children, 1 in college, earning $350 in the summer and living away from home will need $1500 to attend a state junior college, $1550 to attend a state college, $2000 to attend the University of Minnesota, $3,100 to attend a private college, and $1,100 to attend an Area Vocational Technical Institute. If he paid no tuition at all he would still need about $1100 to attend a State Junior College, or a State College, about $1400 to attend the University of Minnesota, and $1100 to attend an Area Vocational Technical Institute. This student obviously has to have financial aid in order to attend any kind of institution, including an AVTI which is tuition free. It is not until you get to salaries of about $12,000 that students can really attend any kind of institution without some form of financial aid. Thus, up to that level, any shift of funds from institutional subsidies to consumer subsidies can only benefit the student. It is the student from the $16,000 and above family-income levels who will be most directly affected by tuition changes.

Direct public concern has been concentrated largely on what happens to the low-income student when tuition is raised $100 at the public institution, and hardly at all on the much larger and more serious question of what happens to the low-income student when financial aid is not available. For the student who cannot raise the dollars needed to take advantage of low tuition, it doesn't matter much whether tuition is kept low or not.

The Higher Education Coordinating Committee staff has been experimenting with a proposal which would combine a higher tuition level with a flexible grant based on need. Several models have been developed and none has cleared the Commission so far. For instance, if tuition levels were set at $800 for AVTI and State Junior College, $850 for State College and $950 for the University of Minnesota, it would make available an additional $9,995,506 for financial aid.

The HECC staff has also been trying to develop a state loan program with some income-contingent features. The term "income-contingent" is applied to loan programs in which repayment is linked to future earnings. It was originally proposed in the Johnson administration by the Zacharias committee which called it the "educational opportunity bank." Yale has in operation a "deferred tuition" plan which operates on this principle. Harvard put a revised version into effect this fall. The Ford Foundation has put a good deal of time and effort into it but found that it could not interest enough private capital in the proposal to have confidence in its workability. There does not appear to be any good reason why it could not work with public funds if it were done on a national basis. That probability may exist in the future but perhaps not now.

On a state basis, only a modified plan could be implemented since it would not be possible to use the taxing machinery of a state to recover the loan from people who disperse across the country after incurring the debt. What is being proposed here is a state loan fund, using federal loan resources and guarantees, along with private funds,
with pay-offs limited to a percentage of income and effective only when income was at a determined level with delinquencies added to the end of the ten year loan and cancellable after fifteen years.

I would make this closing observation. There are enough public support programs in operation somewhere for the benefit of private colleges so that, if they could be replicated in each of the states, the future viability of the kind of colleges which we have been speaking of would be assured. We have gotten much farther in providing supplementary forms of support from public sources for private colleges than we have in coming to grips with the two-price system. While the kinds of support I have described will help hold down tuition in the private sector, possibly even reduce it, the adjustment on the other side of the price system (increases in public charges and a shift from subsidies without regard to need to subsidy of need) will come very slowly, and not without some pain. I would like to think that the

"The price of worthwhile survival (for private higher education) will be vigilance and active participation. We cannot assume that public policies will be changed without input from the private sector as a responsible component in the total program of higher education."

the shift which has long since taken place in health, welfare, and most other fields, could be accomplished with dispatch in higher education, but I think that would not take into account the extent of the adjustment to be made or the weight of the system which must be moved.

We may not assume that the development of public resources for private higher education will come easily or that it will involve no risks. The price of worthwhile survival will be vigilance and active participation. We cannot assume that public policies will be changed without input from the private sector as a responsible component in the total program of higher education. □

THE CITY — GALEN GOCKEL AND JOHN KREITZMANN

URBAN STUDIES IN CHICAGO

In this issue of The Cresset, questions are put to a member of the University's Department of Education to come clean with respect to pedagogical intents. We devote the city page to the Urban Studies Program, a seminar in town for selected midwestern college students, which often seems controversial or mystifying to people on campus. The writers reply that disciplines are reformed by attention to the city — as the city must be reformed by the exercise of disciplines. — RHL

The city has by now found its way into the college catalogue. Students may study its history, its geography, its economics and politics, even its art and literature. And all for college credits.

Yet an urban dweller, at least one who knows and delights in his city, may well feel a curious sense of incompleteness as he scans the catalogue listings of urban this-or-that. For isn't there something about a city which is more than the sum of its parts? As for the parts themselves, are the standard academic departments the only way or even the most adequate way to subdivide the city? Is not the city, at one level, the nexus at which the various disciplines, along with their practical applications, come together? And might it not be possible, finally, to design a course of study which treated the city as a whole or at least as an extended set of overlapping and interdependent parts?

It was with these questions of content and subject-matter in mind that an experimental urban studies program was launched some three and a half years ago — a joint venture of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest and Valparaiso University. Little did the freshly-hired staff (a hybrid collection of academic urbanists and urban activists) realize what an exciting and challenging pedagogical experience lay ahead of them.

Urban studies programs at the college level, with a very few exceptions, fall into two categories. The first, based on the Antioch work-study model and typified by the Great Lakes College Association program in Philadelphia, is basically a work internship. Students come to the city, are assigned to a public agency as fulltime staff, and perhaps produce a research paper on that agency. Such programs provide valuable on-the-job, pre-professional experience for the student, and acquaint him both with his own agency and with that agency's view of the city as a whole.

Is the city merely the sum of its parts? Can the study of the city be subdivided into sections conforming to various academic disciplines? Is it possible to devise a course of study which treats the city as the nexus of the various academic disciplines?

The second major category into which most urban studies programs fall involves very simply a collection of classroom based courses on urban topics. Such a course sequence, even when offered at a city-based campus, is often no different from that required for any other major or minor concentration.

Given these alternative patterns, the ACM-Valparaiso Urban Studies Program found itself without a model. Students were to live in the city of Chicago for a semester but they were not to have fulltime jobs. They were to study the city at first hand; they were not to depend entirely upon the digested interpretations, either in lecture or in written form, or urban "experts." The staff

Galen Gockel is Director, and John Kretzmann a Staff Member, of the Urban Studies Program, Associated Colleges of the Midwest.
was charged simply, with creating a meaningful and coherent educational experience which featured the city as both content and context.

What has emerged? It is only after three full years of experience with the urban studies program (six full semesters, 400-plus students), that the staff has been able, still tentatively, to begin to delineate both its goals and its pedagogic practice.

The basic goal of the program is to provide students with an introduction to the way power is distributed in the city, using a pedagogy which is at the same time experiential and inductive.

The emphasis on the distribution of power and resources is consistent with the mandate under which the program operated — a mandate approved by the twelve faculties which comprise the Association.

Decisions and subsequent urban directions depend on who holds power, the way in which it was acquired and the constraints under which it is executed. Questions such as this lead inevitably to broader discussions of the country’s political economy and the extent to which it determines the distribution of resources and privilege.

In some of the program’s components, the question of power is directly treated. One of the elective seminars is titled “Power and Politics” and utilizes first-hand observations of the local political system at work, discussions and appropriate readings from the literature of urban politics. The core course, which all students take, devotes a month to “The Powerful and the Powerless” or “The Visible and Invisible Chicago.”

Should a particular system of the city be under consideration, it is viewed through lenses provided by e.g., speakers who represent power (the chief trust officer of First National Bank), a steel worker from Cicero, and a welfare mother from the poor West Side.

The key aspect of this basic goal, however, is the pedagogical method which the staff has been forced to develop as a result of the milieu in which the teaching takes place.

The program is essentially nondisciplinary. That is, it is impossible to begin with the theories and empirical generalizations which characterize, say, sociology, political science or the other academic compartments. It is impossible because these categories and abstractions would be ignored by the student early in the program at the worst, or at the best, he would openly challenge them. Then, too, the staff recognizes that the data of the city are not intrinsically sociology or political science or anthropology, but are to be understood by whatever conceptual scheme most appropriately ties them together.

Rather than beginning with the traditional lecture, the staff’s main responsibility is to use “the city as teacher.” To bring the people and places of the city to the student, and to encourage and suggest his explorations into the neighborhoods, institutions and groups which dominate or are dominated by the city, is a main staff task.

"The basic goal of the program is to provide students with an introduction to the way power is distributed in the city, using a pedagogy which is at the same time experiential and inductive."

In addition to the staff’s role as a signpost, directing the student and the city to each other, each member of the staff must be attuned to the moment when reflection and analysis would be most productive. Attempts to plan and structure these opportunities for reflection and comprehension have not been notably successful. Instead, the small, spontaneous groupings, or “precept” meetings provide the most productive settings for the attempts at finding how all the raw data fit together.

(A precept is a group of about fifteen students who live in apartments which are in geographical proximity, and who are entrusted to the care of a “preceptor” or younger staff member who can meet with the group regularly two evenings per week and at other times, as needed.)

Much of the experience to be reflected upon and merged with other information comes through the work assignment. Students are required to work as volunteers in an urban institution at least twelve hours per week. Some help tenants organize; others counsel young women with unwanted pregnancies. Some tutor 10-year-olds; others serve in a legal aid office. Some conduct Naer-type research; others work in an alderman’s office. Thus the work assignment tests the possibilities for action.

The learning continues when the features of a city must be mastered for later action. As the aphorism puts it, “That which I hear, I forget. That which I see, I remember. That which I do, I understand.” The student learns not only from the city; each student learns from the other. The program pedagogy stresses cooperative group learning rather than competitive individualistic learning. Each is freed from the impulse to hoard information and insights, because the grading is on a pass/fail basis. Sharing his information with others will not jeopardize his chances of getting a better grade than his peers.

The experiential/inductive mode is largely determined by the environment in which the program is located. Chicago is a centrifuge. History is being made in the courts, theaters, or streets of the city. The students are pulled in many directions; resources are scattered over a hundred square miles. The student is stripped of the comfort and predictability of family and campus.

At the college from which he has just come, life is more predictable. The cafeteria is a moment’s walk from the dormitory. The latter is visible from the library and classroom, where his learning takes place. The data of the city literally are not available and the student must make do with others’ descriptions and interpretations. The city permits that which the campus prohibits, and the reverse is true. No one pedagogy can serve both environments.

But the program attempts more than an introduction to the power distribution of the city. The student is encouraged to develop a personal position toward that which he has seen and digested. More than simply deciding whether existing arrangements are “good” or “bad” he is encouraged to consider alternative ways of deciding this question, and
to weigh existing social relationships against alternative ones.

For example, one may define society as a system of necessary, permanent inequalities or agree that too much democracy inhibits leaders' ability to reach and implement decisions, and therefore be content with the inequalities he or she sees. More typically, encountering instances of the arbitrary use of power and the long-term effects of powerlessness on people, the student concludes that the public good requires some reallocation of resources.

However, understanding and evaluating the city is not enough. The program adopts, as its final goal, the students considering themselves as potential actors within this urban society. Shortly after the program opened, it became apparent that their future roles were very much on the students' minds and that they were using the program to clarify a wide variety of issues pertaining to their personal vocations.

One aspect of this program goal is its ability to avoid the "isolation" in which students plan their immediate post-collegiate future - an isolation highlighted in the recent Report on Higher Education:

The longer students remain in the academic atmosphere, the more some become dependent upon it, because it is the only life they know. With the exception of summer jobs, most young people in college have no first-hand knowledge of any occupation save that of being a student... Many, perhaps most, students lack the experience and sense of adult roles that would help them see how courses could be relevant.

The final goal is actually a specific example of a more general process - that of students using the program to make the transition from adolescence to adulthood. Not only does the program give them direct access to a variety of urban occupations, but encourages and requires greater independence in virtually every aspect of life. This, finally, may be the most profound contribution academic institutions can make to their students' futures.

---

**MARGINAL NOTES**

**AT THE**

**OPENING SEASON**

We do not yet know what kind of a season it will be. But we do know that the plays are slow in coming in; as a matter of fact, a couple of successful off- and off-off-Broadway plays from last season are moving into Broadway houses. Ten years ago - I do not dare think of the fifties - we usually had at the end of September already a thriving Broadway business of many plays and musicals, some surprisingly good, some flops. There can be no doubt about it that the Broadway business is making room for a decentralized and off-Broadway theater fare. On second thought, in about ten years New York City will no longer have the cultural and theatrical hegemony it has enjoyed so far. The social, racial, and cultural changes which are now visibly in progress will make a drastic turn of events inevitable.

Available theater needs playwrights who can write for or with a certain theater or group in mind. The greatest playwrights were actors writing for their companies. Our established dramatists can no longer afford to write for a possible and rather doubtful Broadway production. Only the small off-Broadway groups can take risks. So far they have not yet discovered another Arthur Miller or Tennessee Williams. Even the West End theaters in London are no longer quite what they were. Their producers cannot realistically hope to bring their plays to lucrative Broadway. Most of the plays making a successful journey across the ocean are those of the National Theatre and the Royal Shakespeare Company, both nationally subsidized institutions. We do not have and never will have an equivalent of such great theaters. Still the richest nation, we are too poor for an investment in our culture. We are used to hanging our accomplishments on trees without roots.

* Alvin Ailey - famed Negro choreographer who had done quite some work in the theater as an actor - staged a short one-act play without words in the open-air Delacorte Theatre in Central Park. Clive Barnes rightly referred to it as a theater piece rather than a ballet, even though two dancers, Bonnie Mathis and Dennis Wayne, were featured in what Ailey called Shaken Angels. It was a most sordid picture of our time emerging from the love-hate relationship of a man and woman. He was lost to dope. While she expressed her horror and despair, we saw him engrossed in the ritual of applying the needle in a repellingly realistic manner. He then pursued her...
in the apparent desire of forcing her to join him. She resisted. She tried to escape through all exits of the theater. He finally dragged her back to the stage where he pushed the needle into her arm. A short pas de deux of frightful agony ensued. She died — no doubt of an overdose and shock — in his arms.

It was magnificently acted and danced. But some people booed. They could not take the naked stare of reality. That night, according to police reports, a burglar broke into the apartment where the two dancers slept, a man who desperately needed money for the stuff that kept him going. The dancers woke up and struggled with the intruder. Bonnie Mathis was stabbed in the arm. Dennis Wayne, wrestling with him, was stabbed six times. Bleeding, he dragged himself into the adjoining room where he had hid a gun. He could still reach for it. Two shots felled the face in front of me, her painful expression and the wild screams of the siren.

Curtain.

When I read it, I looked up to the imaginary gallery, anxiously, desperately waiting to hear thundering boos. Only the neighbor’s radio blared forgotten tunes of an old operetta. A car hooted impatiently to get nowhere fast. I wanted to shout down that this is exactly where the world is going. But I was stunned, staring at the paper, seeing Bonnie Mathis’ face in front of me, her painful expression when Dennis Wayne pushed the needle into her arm — or was it when the burglar stabbed her? I wanted to say something: I love you . . . I loved you in . . . ! What roles she played, how magnificently she moved, what drama in her expression!

*  

The dramatic imagination of life makes the writer and choreographer superfluous. This frustration creates a lust for sensation. I read some-

where this summer that a German stage director imprisoned his audience for twenty-four hours to convey a feeling of “real” reality. I wasn’t there, but I believe it. Such fascinating theatrical ideas are now rampant everywhere. The Belgian Theater Laboratoire Vicinal believes only in mechanical, physical happenings, in nothing but action of props involving seeming actors trying to solve problems of no consequence within a given space. There are no characters, there is no plot. The stage is part gymnasium, part laboratory. The actors push props, relate to them, props relate to props.

Tramp is one of their plays that was also performed at La Mama. The reference is to a tramp steamer. If the program wouldn’t say so, we wouldn’t know. Actors are pushing props, changing the shape of a scaffold as children would do on their playgrounds. Wheels are removed, shapes changed. Well, I said that before, but that’s what happens. Other props are brought onto the stage. The actors get childishly involved in them. I’m sorry, I said that before, but that’s what happens. A few words of no consequence are spoken. Naturally, since the play is about props and sounds. At the end the props are formed into a ladder on which the actors escape. Ha, what a profound idea!

Mel Gussow from The New York Times thought that now “the ship is wrecked and these are castaways — or men reborn.” He also said that this is “innovative . . . extending the possibilities of theatrical experience.” But he admits that “others may think that the play is pointless — exercise without resolution.” I am one of the others. I am desperately looking for the next emergency exit — not trusting the actors’ ladder. Who was that British philosopher who gave this title to one of his shows — oh, many many years ago: “Stop the World! — I want to get off!”?

Movies For People Who Don’t Like Movies

Movies For People Who Don’t Like Movies are largely the archives of other arts. The camera copies more than it creates. The editor is more cunning than cutter. The director may mount other arts like butterflies on pins, but he does not call up the lively arts of his own medium to make a real movie.

Recent film fare abounds with MFPWDLRM. No purist need scorn them — often enough they can be enjoyed for what they are as present entertainments and the photograph and phonograph albums of passing Americana.

Butterflies Are Free, for example, nicely cans the play, sealing it in celluloid right off the stage. All its credits and debits are clerically recorded for anybody who wants to audit theater on film. I don’t mind if I do.

The credits are stellar stage acting and a winsome story — can a high-
spirited, if kinky, girl come to love a sensitive, if understandably unsel­
confident, blind boy? The debits are visual stasis, wordiness, and a little slippage into "frank" soap opera sentimentality. Well, would you want your child to marry one?

*Butterflies* sells well, for it has something for everybody. An obli­
gatory title song, Parental Guidance nudity, poignance, wit (although jokes on blindness pale fast), and an upbeat ending. I'd judge it is aimed for the TV movie market in about three years. Now, the film goes down best when one is up for a matinee and far from Broadway; it may even be better taken blind, like an old Lux Radio Theater program. As one of the finest MFPWDLM around there is really little cinematic in it to see.

MFPWDLM are not always bright museums for theater although their conventions are always more theat­
rical than cinematic. Some pick events of the day from newspapers and novels, make theater of them, and then do their fall canning. Both *The Man* and *The Candidate* are fair MFPWDLM and ride in on the coat­
tails of the election and our national habit of taking politics as something seasonal, like the Great Pumpkin Festival.

In *The Man* a black senator suc­
ceds to the Presidency after the cataclysmic deaths of his predecessor and many others in the line of suc­
cession before him. After the film trips blithely over the gaping im­
probability, some minor problematicas of a black Presidency unfold plausibly enough. Pressures mount on at least two sides — white moderates who would make him an Uncle Tom care­
taker President and black militants who would also use him for their own ends. "The Man," however, rises above both tacky factions and makes those manfully moral choices which few real Presidents make if they wish a second term. *The Man* is good melodrama but not great melodrama.

The film ends with "The Man" entering his party convention to seek its nomination to run on his own. Each in the audience can take away his own conclusion. Realists know he will be trounced and have their reward. Those more faithful to the American Dream can hope he meets a constituency of morality sufficient to create a new reality — in which such a man can be elected President.

*The Man* is cinematically blah, but it's worth a social comment.

(Item: I except one happy sequence from the blahs. As the reluctant Presi­
dent enters the Oval Office for the first time, camera work alone wordlessly tells his story. First, from aloft, the camera shows him circling the desk, as if he were an old dog pac­ing his den warily before lying down. Second, a medium shot shows him sinking into the swivel chair and turning slowly around. Finally, a third, deeper circle is drawn. Subjectively [as if we were seeing with his eyes] the camera pans the walls, stopping briefly on the por­traits of several of his predecessors. In this sequence *The Man* nears a real movie. The camera moves, takes a point of view, even narrates and plays a part in the movie. Here is the new black President now in the circles and very seat of power, awed and humbled by his new office, with a white President­
inal history surrounding him and looking down on him.)

*The Man* is obviously for white fantasies, either the nightmare that a black might attain the Presidency or the daydream that he could. It is therefore harmless, if not very socially refreshing, escapism. It does not restore us to waking life, glimpse­
ing any actual possibilities. In a real world where most whites wouldn't call, say, a black pastor, a fantasy about a black President doesn't matter very much.

Meanwhile blacks are jamming *Super Fly* and *Slaughter* and other sons of *Shaft* and *Sweet Sweetback*. I hope "rebuilding the black male self­
image" needs few more of these sterile — if violently sturdy — thrillers. But that may be my racism speak­
ing, for it holds blacks to higher standards than whites maintain.

(Item: There is an oddly effective "B"-movie, *Skin Game*, making the sec­
ond billing whenever double features are still shown. It's a race comedy of a wiley white and savvy black who collude in a con game on the eve of the Civil War. The white auctions the black as a slave and then the black escapes to rejoin the white for half the boot and the next sale. *Skin Game* achieves an honest-to-humanity bite on its low budget and is an allegory worth showing through the next Broth­
erhood Week in every church, lodge, and union hall up and down the land.)

*The Candidate* tells the selling of a vaguely leftist senatorial candidate by those machinations which shift his "image" toward the putative­
ly "vital" center of the electorate. "The Candidate," however, stands for so little of political importance that all the vaunted gulling of the voters to elect him hardly seems worth the guile.

Some footage is shot with jerking, hand-held camera to stimulate docu­
mentary immediacy, and TV screen inserts try to suggest the timeliness of the evening news. But these are cliches en route to becoming archetypes, and it is ironic that a film about the shrewd crafting of arousing mass media "images" is itself so cinematically tired. Also, its theme — the American political system is merely a game of the blind following the blind — is a tired and uninvigorating pot of message.

True, the tag line of *The Candidate* puts the theme more earthily, "Politics is bull- - -!" I, however, find the film part and pile of the same tripe it airs. It panders to the cynical, purv­
eying the righteous evasion of re­
ponsibility, which is their escapism. Certainly it flatters the audience by avoiding any mention of their complicity in anything so vile as sales pol­
itics. (A more honest film would also probe the moral fub of the electorate and its consumercitizenship.) In sum, *The Candidate* is as safely packaged for the box office as "The Candidate" is packaged for the ballot box.

These MFPWDLM need a real movie for contrast, and I finger that flawed gem, *Slaughterhouse Five*. (Item: Marjoe is an honest failure, falling between MFPWDLM and a real movie. It is a documentary of Marjoe's childhood and youth in the business of revivalism and his decision to give up the easy money and put away childish things. The movie is doubtless an important public con­
fession for him, but it is cinematically weakest when it rests on his penitential narration. There are, however, redeem­
ing moments — especially the cinema)
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verite studies of his pathetic customers "getting religion" — and Marjoe's story is worth seeing as well as hearing. Perhaps the movie will strike you with the similarity between Movies For People Who Don't Like Movies and religion for people who don't like life.

*Slaughterhouse* enjoys the running start of Kurt Vonnegut Jr.'s suggestively cinematic novel, but the movie does not return the compliment and simply paraphrases it. Happily, much of the alluring pop surrealism of the novel is resisted in order to make a better movie than the novel suggests.

The tag line of this dark comedy — "I have come unstuck in time" — also sums up the fluidity of its movie construction. Moving surely back and forth in future, past, and present, with often brilliant bridges of sight and sound, *Slaughterhouse* is the life of Billy roving psyche and the terrifying exteriors of his bodily life. Billy survives his earthly pilgrimage through his devouring parents, glutinous wife, sulky son, the fire bombing of Dresden, and finally suburbia itself. Possibly he even survives his own murder at the hands of a nut, for (in cinematically weaker sequences) his pilgrimage continues on another planet.

Billy is a symbol of the modern pilgrim, upon whom life just happens in all its absurdity. His natural grace is his endurance and resiliency. It isn't easy to make a movie about a visually passive hero without losing him, and *Slaughterhouse* earns cheers for the focus it maintains against the odds. The movie isn't as fearful or funny as dark comedy can be, but there are enough winces of laughter to go around while Billy lifts the weight of our world.

As you leave the theater you may need a few minutes to get your bearings. You have just seen a human self shored up against the slickening brutality of our times. Parts of your own self may be returning which you may lose in waking life and almost never get back at MFPWDLM. But that's the risk you run when you see Movies For People Who Don't Like Movies. □
Tenure procedures must be thoroughly examined, since the vitality of an institution is at stake.

Summary fashion. Teaching can (and already has been) effectively evaluated by students.

What qualities should a Teacher possess?

Eble emphasizes generosity, dramatization, variety of presentation, enthusiasm, and intellectual honesty. The student must be given a real chance to succeed; this may well lead to more success. Why cannot a failing grade be set aside and replaced with an incomplete (a la Malcolm X College)? If we are to interact effectively with our students, we must give assignments which increase our chance of being able to give them honest praise. We must work to keep learning pleasurable to the learner. Drama is necessary in the classroom. Teacher presentations should be exciting performances. Indeed, they must be if learning is to be set in motion during the class period and continue afterward.

Variety also is central to effective teaching. The typical 50-minute period must be broken up into smaller segments. There must be a variety in the mood and emphasis of the teacher. New contexts, and teaching of new subjects are needed to keep the teacher and his presentations fresh and alive. The use of examples and illustrations is crucial. There is a radical need for translating what is to be learned into something that the learner can both do and experience. This translation can be accomplished via careful use of assignments and a selective use of visual aids.

Other essential ingredients are enthusiasm, which comes with confidence, which, in turn, comes with experience. Confidence can come with good organization and clarity; i.e. getting down to the basics of the subject. Intellectual honesty is not a luxury. This involves focusing on careful preparation, admission of error, and compassion and concern for the right. Thus an honest teacher could not do research that had no real value in order to make money. Teaching should be alive and active, getting students to start learning and doing themselves. Effective teachers are open to, and willing to learn from, students as well as from each other.

Classroom visitation is essential for good evaluation.

Both writers stress that classroom visitation is a must. The individual teacher must come to terms with how others, fellow teachers as well as students, take him. Senior colleagues should be the ones to conduct visitation. The teacher involved should be consulted ahead of time, so that he can make clear what he is trying to accomplish on the day of visitation. The visiting person should consult with his colleague afterward, giving him a detailed verbal feedback of his impression of the class period. Full written reports of the presentation should be sent by the visitor not only to department chairmen and or deans, but also to the faculty person. His administrator should be careful to take into consideration the basic assumptions of the observer.

Teaching materials also can be taken into consideration as a measure of teaching effectiveness. Each term, a report should be made by the faculty members to their superior. This should include for every course a course outline, a list of reading assignments and copies of exams given during the term.

Other aspects of faculty performance.

Miller discusses the category of publishing. There is need for an honest and open statement of what the institution's emphasis is on research and publication. Quality of work is crucial. Yet it is essential to consider the context of an article (i.e. its value and the value, professionally, of the journal or periodical in which it appears). Consideration must be given to the type of article in question, whether the writing is in the form of a book, monograph, special report, an article in a book or a periodical. Categories of publishing must also be taken into account. Is the research in question basic scientific investigation, a study of education-oriented problems, a classroom experiment, a field test, or application of educational material?

Tenure procedures must be thoroughly reexamined, since the vitality of an institution is at stake. Shoddy, anti-intellectual procedures often underlie seemingly fair tenure policies. Evidence taken into account by one's colleagues is of a third-hand, gossip or hearsay nature. Colleagues have considerable power, but the basis for judgment often is not clear. Classroom performance may be considered, but there is often really no hard information considered in making tenure judgments. Hearsay and impressions of a subjective nature tend to prevail. The alternative? There is need for a clear, explicit job contract, in which the responsibilities of a faculty person are clearly spelled out.
Evaluation should be made of faculty performance in terms of this contract. Only then will there be an appropriate and fair judgment. There should be a mandatory review of all tenure judgments by the faculty tenure committee of all the material submitted to the department chairman. Both Miller and Eble express the hope that such procedure would break away from the secretive and often high-handed approach typical of many institutions of higher education.

What are the bases for evaluating faculty performance?

For Miller, the bases for evaluating faculty performance, both for tenure, salary increases, and promotion, would be teaching, advising, faculty service, administration, performing arts, status in the profession of his discipline, publications, public service, and research. Eble would evaluate teaching by considering command of the subject, extent to which presentations are well-organized, ability to explain and clarify, ability to arouse and hold interest in the subject, openness to ideas besides one's own, and ability to establish rapport both with the class and individual students. Eble particularly emphasizes that there can be no assumptions about students being motivated to learn. The teacher cannot assume his world view is the same as theirs. His task is to assist the students to see how learning applies both to their world view and to the world in which they live. An administration must seek not only to insure improvement in new faculty, but also to encourage and require it in permanent faculty of both middle and mature years.

What could be done to improve the training of teachers in higher education? Graduate school administrations should concern themselves with the potential teacher's desire to work with students, the extent of his curiosity, ability to synthesize and clarify, command of verbal skills, and whether he has breadth as well as depth in a subject. A rigorous application of non-appropriate criteria excludes many potentially gifted teachers. A teaching doctorate could be established to emphasize teaching as a graduate specialization. The dissertation requirement could be broadened or altered to include preparation of courses and development of pedagogical method. There could be an ongoing, frequent evaluation of the candidates as they move on in the graduate program. As of this time, there seems relatively little interest in the development of such a program.

How could college teaching be improved?

Improved teaching could come from continuing education opportunities. New faculty can be helped to develop their potential, as opposed to the present "up-or-out" policy. Teachers well into their careers could be offered different courses at their own institution, and the chance to participate in teacher exchanges. Those approaching retirement could be similarly inspired to use their remaining time and resources.

Eble's book offers us a live, flexible approach centering on the need for teaching development and upgrading. Much attention is placed on the need to make graduate training more appropriate, and to develop effective programs for in-service teacher training. Miller attempts to pinpoint this concern via his proposal for specific categories, which he offers us, printed up, in definite evaluation forms. There is in both books an emphasis on faculty improvement and development as opposed to judgment. Miller offers more helpful insight than Eble as to the extremely subjective nature of tenure-and promotion-granting procedure. Both suggest the need for fair, appropriate and open alternatives, and include much greater consideration of both student evaluation as well as the use of a committee reviewing the decision of the department chairman.

Summary

These authors assume fair, honest and competent faculty evaluation. This is ideal. The question of personality and personal factors are always present. How can we attempt to offset the differential influence of departmental members on departmental chairman and dean when tenure is sought? In an era when deans are increasingly overburdened with work, will adequate review procedure of departmental tenure decisions be adhered to? What procedure is there open for an individual who feels he has been treated unfairly? No mention is made, for example, of the ombudsman concept. Nor is there any consideration given to alternative strengths and weaknesses of various bargaining agents, such as the AAUP, NEA, and AFT.
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I do not see an adequate provision for due process included here. There is possibly also the problem of logrolling. Is there not a tendency on committees reviewing tenure decision for members tending to go along with the wishes of those in other departments, with the understanding that such favors will be returned at a later date? There is also the matter of values. Will faculty trained in the competitive atmosphere of the graduate school tend to shift their value perspective toward emphasis on quality teaching and due process? Yet Miller, in particular, points us in the direction of competent, concerned, self-respecting faculties, growing in skill, wisdom, and humane concern with the years. Certainly, in an age of specialization, there is crying need for trained teacher specialists, people who receive recognition and appropriate rewards.

How might institutions of higher learning initiate improvement in faculty? Faculties could decide to put into operation the evaluation forms and procedures used by Miller and Eble. Faculty briefing sessions, emphasizing the qualities desired in teachers, can be begun and put into use both at the beginning of and throughout the school year. Student evaluation and visitation can be made mandatory. Promotion and tenure policies could be based on these procedures. Mandatory review of departmental decisions concerning tenure could be made mandatory. The authors open the curtain on much fairer, more scientific evaluation.

TEACHING TEACHERS

Bernhard Hillila

A member of the Department of Education expresses his views on Valparaiso University's goals in educating educators

The following article grew out of some questions which the Editor put to the author. The question-and-answer format is retained, because the logic of the article is that of dialog.

Korby: I hope The Cresset can promote dialog about what Valparaiso University is attempting to do as a Lutheran university. Since the University prepares so many teachers, the Department of Education seems to be a good place to begin. Just how do you go about educating educators?

Hillila: I realize I'm not coining a new phrase, but I'd like to make one thing perfectly clear: the whole institution, not just the Department of Education, is engaged in teacher preparation. Since almost one-third of the graduates of the College of Arts and Sciences are in education, teacher preparation is one of the major concerns of the University.

Valparaiso University has acknowledged its institution-wide accountability in this matter by lodging responsibility for teacher education policies with the Committee on Teacher Education, which is a committee, not of the Department of Education, but of the entire faculty, with broad representation from the various departments.

Other agencies also consider teacher preparation a function of the entire institution. When the state sets requirements for teacher certification, it specifies courses in many fields, not only in education. When the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education evaluates a program of teacher education, it investigates the entire institution, not just the Department of Education.
Students, too, are well aware of the fact that a minor fraction of their preparation for teaching is in education—about one fourth for those in elementary education, only about one-sixth for those in secondary education. The student preparing to teach in the elementary grades majors in education; the student preparing to teach in the secondary schools minors in education and completes a major in his subject area—music, French, or whatever his field may be.

Having noted the institution-wide engagement of the University in teacher preparation, we must, on the other hand, acknowledge the special responsibilities of the Department of Education in this venture. The Department provides the sequence of professional courses: the foundations of education, methods of teaching, practice in teaching. The Department has a key role in development of resources and personnel in this area.

**Does the University—and specifically the Department of Education—do something distinctive in teacher education?**

As you know, there have been many attempts to articulate the aims and emphases of Valparaiso University. In 1969 an in-depth review of the purposes of the University produced a broadly representative task force report, “Design for the Seventies.” The report speaks of objectives which guide the University in educating all its students.

The University requires a common core of learning of all its students. The objects of this core are: 1) to develop those basic intellectual and personal **skills** which will permit the student to participate effectively in community, to pursue a life-long interest in learning, and to conceptualize his experience; 2) to commend to him **values** which will enable him to participate responsibly in the academic and intellectual enterprise; 3) to provide him with relevant **knowledge** so that he can bring some degree of expertise to his participation in his immediate community and in the broader environment; 4) to broaden his **horizons** beyond the boundaries of his own field so that he may see its place within the large context of all of man’s learning and experience; 5) to introduce him to a **style of life** which has been shaped by the demands of the moral law and the freedom of the Christian Gospel.

These aims are also aims of our teacher education program.

O. P. Kretzmann speaks more poetically of our distinctive emphases. In addressing new students through *The Torch* this fall, the Chancellor said:

> Depending upon the bias of the observer, the University may be a community of scholars, an institution devoted to study and research and teaching, a collection of books and buildings... It must be something higher and deeper and greater. A University is first and last a spirit... With all its weaknesses and shortcomings the University is a spirit, especially the University under the Cross.

I agree that our “Valpo-ness” doesn’t lie in our architecture, our bibliographies, or our academic processes—it’s found rather in the commitment of our persons.

In May, 1971, the Department of Education adopted a statement of the teacher’s role, prepared by Dr. Allen E. Tuttle, then chairman of the Faculty’s Committee on Teacher Education. The following is an excerpt from that statement.

> Emerson once observed that it is not what you say, but what you are, that teaches. The truth underlying this Emersonian exaggeration suggests that the most effective teaching involves the whole self and that the teacher, whatever store of specialized knowledge he has accumulated, should himself be an educated person in the broadest possible sense. If this concept of the teacher embraces the whole man, the teaching role expands beyond the mere imparting of “subject matter” to a complex interrelationship with learners involving intellectual, emotional, and spiritual qualities...

The teacher, of course, consciously and deliberately sets out to teach something—and there is no substitute for competence in this aspect of his role—but he teaches in the context of human and social complexities, in an age of rapid changes and tremendously expanding knowledge. A static pedagogical role will not do. Aware of the diverse possibilities of human and social development, he seeks to aid his students in their process of self-development, knowing that current knowledge and skills may not be sufficient for future demands. The continuously learning teacher seeks to convey the ideal of continuous learning to his students. This means that the development of the inquiring spirit and the critical methods appropriate to it should take precedence over the mere storing of knowledge.

Finally, as the teacher seeks to stimulate in his students the spirit of inquiry, he encourages them to derive values from his learning and make sophisticated discriminations among them. It is hoped that the prospective teacher who has chosen Valparaiso University for his educational preparation has developed a sense of the sanctity of the individual as a creature of God and will bring to his role a scrupulous aversion to violating this sanctity and a consciousness that he is working with values which transcend the expediencies of the here and now.

I’ll teach to that!

**Do the teachers you prepare serve in some unique way?**
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Some of our graduates will do their teaching in church-related vocations as parochial school teachers, parish pastors, instructors in church colleges. Receiving many students from its supporting church body, the University trains and returns some of those persons to positions of service and leadership in the Church. It should be noted that the Valparaiso program of preparation also for such service is the University's program of open inquiry rather than a catechetical program of indoctrination.

The great majority of our students, however—85 to 90 per cent—plan to teach in the public schools.

Do Valparaiso-trained public school teachers carry with them any differentness because of our program?

We're not in the business of turning out wallpaper—imprinting an identical pattern thousands of times. The impact Valpo makes varies with the background and values of each student, the quality of our teaching, plus a host of other influences. In fact, the final result for someone may be negative—he may decide to reject what we value most. Both Christ and Vida Blue show students to the teacher education program, and we don't check the senior's theological orthodoxy before graduating him. Assuming that some student leaves our program as an atheist, we would expect that he at least knows well what he doesn't believe, what leap of faith he has made in rejecting Christian faith, and what option of grace is available. And we would expect that he has come to his stand not with easy arrogance but with anguish after confronting alternatives. In fact, while shaking our heads at his decision, we may have gently and for forcing us to clarify our concepts.

We don't use a sieve of religious doctrine in admitting students to the teacher education program, and we don't check the senior's theological orthodoxy before graduating him. Assuming that some student leaves our program as an atheist, we would expect that he at least knows well what he doesn't believe, what leap of faith he has made in rejecting Christian faith, and what option of grace is available. And we would expect that he has come to his stand not with easy arrogance but with anguish after confronting alternatives. In fact, while shaking our heads at his decision, we may have gently and for forcing us to clarify our concepts.

Assuming that a particular teacher prepared at Valparaiso University has a commitment to the Christian faith and life which has been reinforced by the University, can he in any way express that commitment in the secular public school?

There are, of course, some things which he must not do in the public school situation. He must not use his teaching position to promote sectarian views, or to proselyte. He must not begin class with prayer.

However, there are things which he can do, some things which he must do, as a Christian.

In the reference quoted earlier, Emerson indicates that we should be concerned with what the teacher is rather than with what he says. I hate to put "being" and "saying" at war with each other like that. We ought to be concerned about what a teacher is and also about what he says. There are, of course, times when the teacher's actions speak so loudly that students can't hear the words. Thus the teacher who glowingly praises democracy in an autocratic classroom setting is likely to teach authoritarianism. When statements don't jibe with example, the words tend to be forgotten. I suppose that explains why teachers, for the most part, teach as they have been taught, rather than as they have been instructed to teach! Nevertheless, even though being and saying are sometimes at odds, generally they reinforce each other.

I would, then, expect the Christian teacher to teach some important things by being a Christian—not in a painful "Look, Ma, no vices!" approach, with a self-conscious, saint-on-display bearing, but as a child of God caught in life's ambiguities, simul justus et pecator.

The public school teacher need not feel that his Christian commitment should be a well-kept secret between God and himself. The American ideal even for public servants is not a homogeneous neutrality regarding religion but a pluralism of views, the coexistence of persons with varying commitments of faith. It would be a mockery of religion to make a public school teacher feel that, in order to be acceptable to the PTA, he should rid himself of all except the least common denominator of religion—something acceptable even to the least common denomination. In fact, such belief would be a giant step toward heresy, toward a non-Christian civic religion.

Granting that the teacher has personal freedom for the exercise of religion, isn't that freedom curtailed in the classroom? Hadn't he better hang up his ardent Lutheranism with his hat and coat in the teachers' lounge?

You're quite right: the teacher can't teach Lutheranism in a public school classroom. Just as he is not to promote partisan politics, he is not to advance sectarian religion.

There is, nevertheless, a legitimate inclusion of religion even in public school classrooms. Teaching religion is forbidden; teaching about religion is inescapable. To omit explanation of religious references in literature would be deadly; to avoid mention of religious institutions in social studies would be miseducation; to cut out the influence of religion in the development of civilization would be a drastic history-ectomy indeed. The Supreme Court has been quite clear on this matter. Although the Court has found Bible reading and prayer to be unconstitutional when part of a religious exercise in public schools, there is no sympathy for a thoroughgoing exclusion of religious content from curricula. Writing for the majority in the June 17, 1963 decision regarding Pennsylvania and Maryland cases (Abingdon Township v. Schempp and Murray v. Curlett), Mr. Justice Clark stated:

... It might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of
civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the First Amendment.

I consider the Bible to be more than literature or history, but unless a person knows Bible history and Bible literature, he is grossly miseducated. Hopefully, Valpo graduates will not contribute to the growing religious illiteracy of our nation. Perhaps they can even help our communities to realize that Christmas hasn't been declared unconstitutional. Maybe they can educate a generation which will again know the origins of "doubting Thomas" and the "patience of Job."

According to current legal interpretations of the Constitution of the United States, it is forbidden to prefer one religion over others or to prefer religion over a non-religious point of view. I submit that it is just as wrong to prefer irreligion over religion, to favor atheism over Christianity, or to establish secularism.

What about the mood of students today? Do you find a readiness to reject old values and rebel against established standards?

I don't believe that is the prevailing mood. I have high regard for the current student generation. To be sure, some individuals want to discard established codes of conduct. It's especially disappointing to see such rejection at times without testing, searching—simply on the criteria of oldness or relation to the establishment. How can a person gain perspective for life, to say nothing of appreciation for art and wine, if he is bent on discarding everything that's old?

It's disillusioning also to note that new moralisms, current legalistic strictures, may develop to replace the ancient ones and may be enunciated just as negatively; Thou shalt not have more than two children. Thou shalt not use phosphate detergents. Thou shalt not sign a contract with Dow Chemical Co. (A laboratory caught in the act will be stoned.)

Even though the "now" generation has sometimes wanted to resign from the human race, I'm afraid it's stuck with being part of our humanity, which has its continuing needs, its abiding alienations. For each generation the Lutheran understanding of Law and Gospel can correct and liberate. I have hope for both younger and older generations.

In education itself there is so much ferment these days. Is the wisdom of the ages being replaced by the relevance of the contemporary?

There is a cult of contemporaneity these days. Realizing that many mistakenly identify the relevant with the current, we ought to make clear the persistent relevance of the past.

However, let's admit that we've often been irrelevant. We've sometimes been content to pass on the form of knowledge without its meaning. Dr. T. A. Kantonen of Hamma School of Theology used to speak of the good Lutheran who was asked, "What is the nature of man?" "I am a sinner," he answered—not humbly because he was sinful, but proudly because he knew the right answer.

The lasting values we believe in can't very well be passed on through rote learning. Authoritative pronouncements of Truth seem to be more in character for the Pharisees than for the Teacher who "set a child in the midst of them."

If the role of the teacher is not that of knowledge transmitter, what is it?

The teacher should be a catalyst to make learning happen. It seems to me that there has been a healthy shift from "How do I teach?" to "How do I help someone learn?" That good idea comes to a sad end in the thought of Ivan Illich, who proposes the de-schooling of society and asks that all initiative for education come from the learner! That's unrealistic: we need schools, structured learning. However, the teacher's task is important, not because he is a prestigious personage, but because learning is crucial. I wish teachers would take their work more seriously and themselves less seriously.
Resurrection is from Death

John 11:17-44

EDGAR P. SENNE

In the week of the seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost, according to the Standard Pericope Series Revision as proposed by the Lectionary Committee of the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship (John 11:17-14), we were celebrating a kind of Easter festival in the Chapel of the Resurrection. At Morning Prayer on Monday of that week something happened in the liturgical action of the people that issued the note of exuberant joy, unmitigated happiness and victory. Hymns and responses all seemed to signal that victory and confidence. The brief meditation which follows was delivered on the following day and very much with the Monday experience in view. We reproduce it here, as nearly as possible, in its spoken style and context.

The Peace of the risen Christ be yours, you shouters of loud Alleluias.

Please look with me at the service folder in your hand. Look what it says right after your last response. It says, “Homily: To Believe is . . .” and then it lists my name. Obviously, I am being assigned the task of finishing that statement, and out of that I am to offer you some five minutes of edifying speech. Now look at it again, “To Believe is . . .” I wonder how you would like to finish it if you were given my assignment today. If I am to judge by your exuberance in shouting your praises and loud Alleluias; if I am to judge by your brash claims of faith and our utter certainty in believing, as I heard those claims pouring forth in this place yesterday and again this morning; if I am to judge by this, which my ears have heard, I shall speculate that you might finish that sentence in something of the following manner:

To believe is . . . sheer happiness.
To believe is . . . to have certainty in the midst of all the challenges of friends, professors, and textbooks.
To believe is . . . not feeling sad or depressed in chapel when everyone else is shouting like crazy.
To believe is . . . to be always singing, “Jesus loves me, this I know, For the Bible tells me so.”

As I look through the eleventh chapter of the Gospel of St. John, I think I begin to see something else, some important clues for finishing that statement, “To believe is . . .” I see two sisters burying a beloved brother, Lazarus, who was too young to die, but died anyway. I see friends of the family gathering about these sisters, doing their very best to console them in this heavy hour. I see Martha running out to meet Jesus, full of grief and just a bit accusing in her manner toward Jesus, who had come too late to save her brother’s life. I see here a woman who believes in resurrection on the last day, but still she grieves. I see a Martha who believes in Jesus, but really seems pretty confused about all the implications of such believing.

As I look, I see another sister, Mary. She is running out to meet Jesus. Her face is flooded with tears of sorrow and anger. I hear her saying to Jesus, “If only you had come sooner my brother would not have died.” I see Mary almost collapsing on Jesus in her sorrow. I see tears in Jesus’ eyes. He is not cool and detached; he is weighed down with sorrow. I see him standing there weeping without shame—weeping in pain and grief—I think it is because he loved Lazarus and loved...
those sisters like his own. I see a grave, a cave, a hole in the rock, where it was the custom to lay the cold remains of the beloved dead. In that grave was the corpse of Lazarus. Fortunately, I did not have to see the corpse itself, for it was wrapped in grave clothes and was out of sight. Fortunately, I say, for it is the fourth day after Lazarus has died.

I see Jesus looking up toward the heavens. I hear him muttering his prayer; something about the glory of God; something about "that they may believe that Thou didst send me." And then I saw him look at the grave and call in a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth." We waited a moment, and he did—Lazarus came out, grave clothes and all. Then Jesus said to those who stood around in amazement, "Unbind him and let him go."

Now let us go back to that statement we are trying to finish, "To believe is..." What has been added to the answers we were giving before? I think I see the clues. I think I know how I want to complete that statement.

To believe is... to have just been dead and then to come forth when Jesus says, "Come forth."

To believe is... still to have tears in your eyes and a choke in your voice as you follow your loved one's coffin down the aisle, meanwhile trying to sing, "For all the saints who from their labors rest."

To believe is... to have a broken heart and a broken dream and a broken love—to feel crushed and still to look to Jesus, with clouded eye and faltering voice, and say, "Yes, Lord, I still must trust you. Yes, Lord, I believe that all this suffering, failure, and death must give place to you. You must give me life again, as you promised—that I may live and love and hope and dream again."

To believe is... to be standing beside my beloved, who lies incurable, and to watch the process of death take over; to look at this squarely and yet to confess, "Jesus is Lord! Death's power is broken," and then to weep in that strange combination of grief and joy.

To believe is... still to be smarting from the shame of that oft-repeated sin, that sin which I have so often promised to God and to my neighbor and to myself that I would never do it again; to be smarting from the shame, to be accusing and condemning myself almost to the point of despair; and then to hear a voice saying, "In the name and in the stead of my Lord Jesus Christ, I forgive you all your sin, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"—to hear this and to say, "Yes, Lord, that is my Easter! that is my resurrection."

To believe is... to know that you are all bound up in the grave clothes of your daily anxieties; bound by your fears of today and tomorrow; bound by your fears of yourself and your fears of others; bound by your doubts, your doubts about yourself and your doubts about God; to be bound by all that and more, and then to hear Jesus cry out to you in your death and say, "Unbind him and let him go." To hear that and to look up and to know that he says it about you, "Unbind him. Unbind her." My God, I am unbound!

My dear sisters and brothers, if Jesus is, as we have been confessing with St. Paul, "the first-fruits of those who sleep," that is, the first to sprout forth out of the ground; then let it be remembered that he had to die and to be buried before he could burst the bonds of the grave. Resurrection promises did not prevent Jesus from the death struggle of Gethsemane, nor from the coldness of the ninth hour on the cross, nor from the dampness of the tomb. It is not because he escaped from that, but because he has overcome it that we say to him, "My Lord and my God."

Then let us shout our "Alleluia," and let us sing our happy songs of praise. But while we sing and while we shout let us be aware that we cannot thereby go around any of the deaths which it is our lot to die. We must die our deaths if we are to know a resurrection from death. Sickness, trouble, accident, disaster, depression, deterioration of old age, fears of every kind, nagging guilt, the anxiety of not always knowing what is good and right and true—all these deaths we will die. Not only these, but yet one more; the death we learn to know as we, one by one, lower our parents, our brothers and sisters, and our friends into the bosom of the earth. That death too is ours to die, and by our Easter shouts we dare not pretend that we will somehow escape it.

The rich and deep joy of the Easter Gospel is that none of these deaths has the power to destroy us, for "our life is hid with Christ in God," and neither life nor death can separate us from His love. In all our deaths, we die with Christ; a death begun already in the waters of our baptism. In all our victories over these deaths, we share the resurrected life of Christ. His is the power to raise up the fallen, whether that be from the pits of despair or from the cold earth of the local cemetery. He is "the Resurrection and the Life." He is the one who calls out to us and says, "Come forth!" and then commands the powers of death, "Unbind him and let him go."

To believe is... to go to death with Jesus—not alone, but with Jesus—and to know that he gives new life today, tomorrow, and forever.

In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.
NATURALISM IN ARCHITECTURAL ORNAMENTATION

Selections from a portfolio of photographs by George Strimbu
made in Chicago from 1961-65.

The high-contrast black and white photographic images reproduced in this issue of The Cresset are the achievements of George Strimbu, part-time instructor of photography at Valparaiso University. The theme was developed by George while working towards an advanced degree in photography at the Institute of Design of Illinois Institute of Technology, where at various times, he was taught by such outstanding photographers as Aaron Siskind, Harry Callahan, and Art Sinsabaugh.

Highly stylized or lavishly literal depictions of organic nature can be found in the ornamentation of especially 19th century buildings. The Chicago architect Louis Sullivan, for instance, set the pace with his endlessly varied profusions of foliage, seed pods, and vine-like interlacings, reminding the beholder that the geometries of the building's structure and the activities of the building's users are part of a universal creative energy. Such ornamentation rarely occurs in today's buildings which instead, rely on the inherent character of the building's material and the details of the building's structure to take the place of small scale ornamental depictions. Besides being beautiful images in their own right, George's photographs can also help us to pay attention to the ornamentation on the remaining buildings of the past.
Night against my house . . .
Wild animal
attacking . . .
Roaring autumn wind.

Beyond the glass walls . . .
Crystal rain this
autumn night . . .
Liquid gems unseen.

Stick-y trees like brooms . . .
Turned up toward
the dusty sky . . .
Snow sweeps over them.

Cardinal flashed by . . .
On this windy
autum day . . .
Or was it a leaf?

Jack A. Hiller
GIVE THE CRESSET
A distinguished, unique and thoughtful gift, for anniversaries, graduations, confirmations, and the like.

**Gift and Subscription Blank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE SEND THE CRESSET FOR:</th>
<th>Send The Cresset, along with a card and my name to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ) 1 year (student rate) $1.00</td>
<td>Name .............................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) 1 year, regular, $3.00</td>
<td>Address ...........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) 2 years, regular, $5.50</td>
<td>City ................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR ME ( ) ; AS A GIFT ( )</td>
<td>State ............................................. Zip code</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My name ..........................................................
Address ..........................................................
City ..............................................................
State ........................................ Zip code

( ) Enclosed is a check or money order for $ .....
( ) Bill me.
(Five or more subscriptions from one donor, $2.00 per subscription per year)
( ) Check or money enclosed for $ .....
( ) Bill me
(Because our staff is small and the budget limited, it is helpful if you send payment with the order).

Name ..........................................................
Address ..........................................................
City ..............................................................
State ........................................ Zip code

November, 1972
THE CRESSET

REPRINTS

Use these fine articles for your own reading, for discussion groups, and for passing on to friends.

Now available as one handsome reprint:

Walter Keller  "A Scrutiny of the Statement," June, 1972


The above three articles can be purchased as one document at the following rates:

1 to 49 copies, ea. 15¢
50 to 99 copies, ea. 12¢
In groups of 100, ea. 8¢

Complete copies of the October and November issues of The Cresset (1972) are available at the following rates: 1 to 9 copies, ea. 35¢; in multiples of 10, ea. 20¢.
Some months ago, in the crucible of the college classroom and the departmental administrator's chair, two related questions were thrust at me. They were questions which professors in small liberal arts colleges will confront with increasing frequency. First, from the liberal (or, radical) thinking of some of our staff came the proposition for eliminating much of traditional educational structure; e.g., classes, course requirements, grades, etc. Why not? Second, from the frustration of graduating seniors, who three to four years prior to this time had asked the same question, came the query, "What can I do (for a career) with my sociology major?" In the face of such questions, I raised some of my own. Did the thinking of staff toward the abolition of traditional forms represent a course of action that our students would approve? Are students hell-bent on following a traditional pattern because it represents a proven pattern toward future opportunities in careers? In this respect, how do students perceive their reasons for being at the university and what are their expected rewards? There were no grand allusions about fabulous, astounding discoveries; but to discover and to share was the purpose. So, in the following paragraphs is the record of what was done, what was discovered, and summary comments.

The Questionnaire and Study Population

A forced choice index of 24 attitude items (with a Likert type response continuum, i.e., strongly agree to strongly disagree) was developed for the purpose of observing attitudes in three broad areas of student concerns: academic, college social life, and future career expectations. Also included were two open ended questions seeking the students' specific reasons for being at this college and major expectations from this experience. Usual background questions (e.g., socioeconomic, class year, sex, etc.) were attached. Students were given the questionnaire in classes on randomly selected days (around mid-term) during the Winter, 1972, and were requested to respond immediately.

The study population consists of 60 percent (N=212) of the ten Winter term sociology classes at a small mid-western university. Table 1 shows certain characteristics of the study population in comparison to the actual class enrollments. Seniors and Juniors are slightly under represented while Freshmen are over represented, thereby skewing the study toward an under-classmen bias. Although males and females are representative, another bias is reflected in the greater percentage of introductory level students. Introduction to sociology courses were two-thirds Freshmen; however, upper-level courses were 95 percent Sophomores, Juniors and Seniors. The data in Table 1 also indicate that on the given days in Winter term 40 percent of the sociology classes were not in attendance.

Completed questionnaires were collected by the professors, a code was developed, responses were punched into IBM cards in accord with the code, and tabulations were made by computer. Responses to the index items were analyzed separately and were divided into three levels reflecting the intensity of student differences; e.g., if as many as 75 percent of the study population had the same response patterns on an item this was assumed a weak differentiation and the respondents were classified as basically in unison; if the pattern of response was the same in 60 to 75 percent of the cases this was classified as a moderate differentiation; and if the responses were the same in only 40 to 50 percent of the cases this pattern was classified as a strong differentiation.

The general assumptions of this study were that students in this small, basically conservative Lutheran sponsored university would be strongly homogeneous. This homogeneity was expected in socioeconomic backgrounds, in views of the academic setting of their involvement, and in attitudes toward college social relationships. However, concerning career orientation, it was assumed that persons who perceived their education in terms of specific career commitments and plans would indicate a more traditional concern for the educational process than would those not oriented toward career preparation.

Findings

As expected, students in the study are homogeneous in social background; e.g., fathers' occupations are 80 percent white-collar. The slight socioeconomic difference did not account for differences in attitudes toward education, nor in expectations from the college experience.

A general summation of student attitudes is developed along the scheme of weak, moderate and strong differentiation (see above). Overall the attitude index shows homogeneous qualities for the students in sociology. First, in the area of academic concern, the students favored the continuance of a 36 course requirement for graduation as opposed to a possible plan that would allow one to receive a degree by passing
a comprehensive examination at any point in a four year undergraduate program. Students indicated satisfaction with the present number of courses (usually ten) required for completion of a departmental major. Respondents had negative feelings toward tests as intellectual measuring devices. They refused to identify their professors as authoritarian and unconcerned for students.

Second, concerning social life, the students did not see themselves as socially ostracized by others, and they had positive views toward college life in general. Third, reflecting upon attitudes toward work and achievement for the future, the students disdained the achievement of wealth in favor of service to humanity.

In the same three areas (academic, social, and career), there are indicators of moderate differences for the study population. First, academically, they agreed slightly that college was intellectually stimulating, and that institutional requirements are too numerous; on the other hand, there was slight disagreement with labeling the student as "nigger," for spending two or three hours per class hour in private study preparation, and with compulsory class attendance as a valuable academic tool. In feelings about communication with faculty, there was agreement that communication was easy.

Moderate agreement about social life at college included the conviction that it is basically a "fun" experience, and that there is a commonality among students of campus. Reflecting on the practical aspects of education, the respondents only moderately agreed that students of this campus want to be involved in the correction of social ills (this in spite of a strong indication that they desire to serve humanity).

Strong patterns of differentiation appeared only in the academic area. The study population was equally divided in views that indicated required courses as boring, in keeping institutional requirements, in abolishing examinations, in the assignment of grades and in a sense of intellectual inferiority toward professors.

Having observed both moderate and strong differences in attitudes, a number of control variables were cross-tabulated with attitude responses to determine if any of the variables were attributing to the observed differences. On the attitude index there were no significant differences due to these variables (i.e., sex, socioeconomic status, class year, departmental major, etc.), meaning that the factor(s) accounting for attitude differences cannot be determined with data in this study.

Although differences could not be analyzed for attitudes, significant differences did appear in the analysis of responses to the open ended questions: Why are you at this university, and what do you expect to be your most significant gain from four years of college? These differences were between males and females; e.g., males responded more often than did females that they were here for career goals (however, only one-fourth so responded), and general educational goals (see Table 2); on the other hand, females indicated a much stronger response toward social reasons. Concerning expected gains from the experience at college, males and females were both quite strong in expecting to gain social and personal qualities for life more than that of the attainment of knowledge or the attainment of career training. Females tended to expect to gain slightly more personal quality than males, while males were two to one more anticipatory toward gaining general knowledge. Both categories were equal in career expectations.4

Comments

Several things of importance should be brought into focus. First, one would generally expect homogeneous attitudes, especially from middle class students; however, even the 20 percent working class descendents have joined the ranks. Although responses to a few items concerning academic involvement (e.g., boring courses, institutional requirements, examinations, grades, etc.) indicate strong differences, the variable(s) accounting for such differences has (have) not been tapped. The writer suggests that quality of academic work could well be an important missing variable (e.g., grade point average, time given to study, etc. were not included).

Second, it seems that length of time in the college environment does not account for different attitudes toward academia, college social life, or future work goals; however, one thing that has changed is participation in sociology classes by attendance. This fact has a two-fold dimension: 1) There is a regression in class attendance from Freshman to Senior year. 2) There is a regression in class attendance from introduction courses to upper-level courses (partly a function of number one above since there are more freshmen enrolled in the introduction courses).

Third, approximately one-third of the sociology students indicate that they are at this university due to some career interest; also, one-third are here for the purpose of gaining knowledge (in the true liberal arts perspective), and the remaining one-third are at this particular institution because of some special quality; e.g., a pretty campus, small classes, etc. In spite of an advertised liberal arts focus, an equal number of students are here for career and quality reasons.

Fourth, what do the sociology students expect to gain here? One-fifth expect preparation for a career, one-fifth expect a significant gain in general knowledge, and three-fifths expect the qualities of their social and personal lives to be enriched in some approving manner. There seems to be a discrepancy between why the students say they are here and what they expect to gain. Career and learning expectations decline in responses concerning gains while responses about en-
The professionals are unsure of the purpose of liberal arts colleges. Adding student opinions, what do we have? It seems that students no more want liberal arts than they want career preparation. However, in the context of academic life, both academic and career interests seem to give way to personal and social qualities (e.g., relating to others, understanding self, satisfaction, etc.). It seems unreasonable to argue that acquirement of the above qualities constitutes liberal education; such ought to be subjugated to the rigor of getting knowledge.

Finally, what of the original questions? The subjects of this study are hardly favorable toward radical structural change in the academic community. Concerning whether or not this sociology department in this college should have an academic or a practical orientation, students could care less. The question about what to do with sociology seems harder to deal with now than before. If students have no career goals or expectations, what can an adviser say? In academic naivete, perhaps we are guilty of not teaching that the methods and resources of sociology (and the same must be true of other disciplines) can be used by the liberal arts student for discovering even the practical uses of his acquired knowledge.

FOOTNOTES

1. Student majors for the population in this study are as follows: Humanities, 11.3 percent; Sciences, 14.2 percent; Social Sciences, 62.7 percent; and undecided, 11.8 percent. The study population seems unrepresentative of the humanities and sciences. Generalizations refer primarily to social science majors. Note: During the Winter term, 1972, this university gave 45 percent of its course credits to students in the areas traditionally recognized as social studies.

2. Although this statistic is truly reflective of relaxed attendance patterns, it must be taken with some caution since some of the upper-level students are engaged in independent study, and some class programs include the choice of individual and group work which do not require daily class attendance.

3. Among white-collar families 47.6 percent of the mothers worked outside of the home. However, among the blue-collar, 75 percent of the mothers worked outside of the home.

4. When the three categories of orientation toward college (i.e., career, general education, and quality of living) were compared by attitude responses, they were significantly different only on one item, i.e., I feel intellectually inferior to my professors. Career oriented persons felt inferior three to one more than those who expected general knowledge and personal qualities as primary goals. Those expecting to gain general knowledge were likely to fear inferiority to professors least.

TABLE 1. Comparison of Sociology Study Population with Actual Enrollment, Winter, 1972, in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Level</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2. Responses of Male and Female Sociology Students to Questions of Why They Are at the University and Expected Gains from College Experience in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question, and</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you at this University?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Career Goals</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Education Goals</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of quality or type school</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you expect to gain from four years of college experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career preparation</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General knowledge</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualities for life</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dr. Andrew Schulze is, in our judgment, an authentic latter-day Christian hero. If one yields to the temptation to substitute the word “martyr” for “hero,” the designation would be equally apt. For if Andrew Schulze’s neck has been spared the feel of the headsman’s axe, it is only because we live in an age and in a land whose sensitivities have become sufficiently refined to recoil at such indelicate methods of dealing with those who have dared to flout the status quo. And make no mistake about it — Andrew Schulze has been flouting it — outrageously, gloriously — for almost half a century. In other times, other places, equally good men and true have lost their heads for less. We are grateful that Andrew Schulze has kept his — both corporeally and theologically.

Theologically, yes — for theology is what this book is all about. Fire From The Throne is far and away the best statement on the theology of race relations that we have seen. It should remain a standard text in this field for a long time to come.

Dr. Schulze’s theological approach is evangelical, conservative, Biblical. To those who have long regarded the author as a wild extremist, it will come as a surprise that his approach in Fire From The Throne is moderate, irenic, constructive. The tone is calm, the rhetoric is cool, the argumentation is lucid.

Not that Andrew Schulze, the longtime Lutheran race relations pioneer, has become a Melanchthonian Leisetreter. He is about as much of a pussyfooter as John the Baptist. And, like his prophetic prototype, he lays the axe to the root of the trees. But the arm that wields the axe is firm and well-controlled.

And there are trees a-plenty that need to be felled. One is the popular but discredited shibboleth of “separate but equal.” Ostensibly, the purpose of the Supreme Court’s Plessy vs. Ferguson decision of 1896 was to sanctify the practice of segregation under the guise of even-handed treatment of all citizens, black and white alike. Actually, as everyone knows, “separate but equal” turned out to mean that whites were “more equal” than blacks. It has been only under the impact of the massive civil rights movement of the past two decades that this iniquitous legalism has been declared void — officially, at least.

Unfortunately, the enactment of anti-discrimination statutes has not expunged the virus of racism from the body politic, or from the human heart, but has only served to mitigate its more virulent aspects. Dr. Schulze is realistic enough to concede that morality — in this case, the morality of racial equity — cannot be legislated. But he does make the cogent and irrefutable point that appropriate legislation can at least remove the legal barriers to racial justice, and it can help to create the kind of social climate in which, please God, the noxious weeds of racism will in the course of time wither and die.

Another tree that is felled with the Schulzean axe is the specious and sanctimonious dictum that, in view of the alleged curse of Noah upon Ham and his descendants, the Negro race — with whom the Hamite post-race — with whom the Hamite posterity is arbitrarily identified — is forever doomed to a status of inferiority and servitude. It was on the basis of such dubious exegesis that the Church for centuries justified the infamous institution of Negro slavery. We hope that Schulze’s book will abolish, for once and for all, this mischievous distortion of Scripture that has done so much damage, for so long, among so many.

The question of interracial marriage is another tree to feel the impact of the axe in Schulze’s hand. Clearly, patiently, dispassionately, he shows that there can be no objection to interracial marriage on either theological or biological grounds. But the author’s more rabid critics will no doubt be surprised — and perhaps charged with — that he did not, in effect, take his three sons by the ear and tell them, “Come on, Paul, Herb, Ray — here are three nice black girls. Go ahead and marry them — or else!”

On the contrary, he realizes that in this imperfect world there are certain social impediments that beset intermarriage between blacks and whites — impediments that place an almost intolerable burden upon all but the strongest of those who enter such a union. The fact that they suffer unjustly, the author declares, “is a plain sociological phenomenon that cannot be denied.” For this reason, in Dr. Schulze’s own appraisal of intermarriage, “The writer bespeaks its validity but is not an advocate of it.”

Dr. Schulze, like his predecessor in another wilderness, keeps on wielding his axe. Another tree that he topples is the practice of racial segregation in the Church. With studied restraint that scarcely conceals his withering scorn, he exposes the pride, the hypocrisy, the con-
descension of the all-white congregation that "votes" on whether or not to admit Negro members — and then preens itself on its "love" and "tolerance" when the majority votes in the affirmative. Why not vote on whether to admit members who have red hair, or blue eyes? It would make just as much sense. What ever happened to the Pauline dictum, "You are all one in Christ Jesus"? 

By the same token, the very concept "Negro church" — whether on the congregational or denominational level — is a contradiction in terms. Incidentally, the section on the doctrine of the Church is one of the best discussions of ecclesiology that we have read. If every churchman would read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest this doctrine there would simply not be a "race problem" in the Church.

In this connection, the author trains his sights on the lamentable results of the Church's long-standing program of segregation in ministerial training. "Separate but equal," indeed! The brutal fact is that for generations the kind of theological training offered in the Lutheran Church's segregated Negro seminary and preparatory academy was miserably inadequate and far below the standard of the comparable "white" institutions.

And yet, when Dr. Schulze and his associates in the Lutheran Human Relations Association sought to bring about the closure of these schools and the integration of the black students into the existing institutions of the Church, they had to settle for half a loaf. While the Negro seminary was closed, the Negro academy — situated in the heart of the "black belt" — was not only kept open, but the Church convention, in its wisdom, voted to spend over a million dollars on the campus for the construction of new facilities — thus insuring the perpetuation of "separate but equal" (?) pre-ministerial and teacher training on that campus for the next several generations. In the words of a current ditty, "When will they ever learn?"

Having said this, however, it is only fair to add that the swinging of the pendulum back in the direction of segregation is in no small measure due to the efforts and desires of many of the black churchmen themselves. Andrew Schulze devoted his whole career, single-handedly and fervently, to the task of breaking down the barriers between the races, of eliminating the scandal of racial segregation. It is supremely ironical, then, that just as the threshold of success, the black leadership within the Lutheran Church should itself, in effect, repudiate this approach and reconstitute the same kind of all-black clergy association that Schulze had fought so long and valiantly to eliminate when it was an integral part of the old "Negro Missions" of the former Lutheran Synodical Conference.

We realize, of course, that there is a fundamental difference between enforced segregation and voluntary segregation on the part of our Negro brethren. We also have heard the argument — which even Andrew Schulze, swallowing hard, has apparently accepted — that the new black policy of self-chosen segregation is only a temporary expedient, until all the present tensions are dissolved and genuine, complete equality is finally reached. But does this policy not rather exacerbate those tensions and alienate those whites who have sincerely striven for racial integration and the effective leveling of all artificial barriers — in the church, school, and society? Is this not actually racism in reverse?

When it comes to presenting Luther's doctrine of the "two kingdoms," Schulze is just plain good. One could not ask for a better, more concise, more persuasive presentation of this basic theological concept. The author draws a clear line of distinction between "temporal" and "supratemporal" authority. In the implementation of this distinction, of course, problems arise which require the application of sanctified common sense. An example would be the question of participation in a peaceful demonstration. If one is guided by the principles that the author sets forth, he will likely not go wrong.

For all of its excellences, the book is not without its minor flaws. Dr. Schulze is too sanguine, we think, about the role of the United Nations as a peace-keeping mechanism (p.19). The charge that the Republican Party is, or is becoming, a "white racist" party (p. 56) should not be left unchallenged. After all, to what party do George Wallace, Lester Maddox, and Senator James Eastland belong? Does the author seriously contend that the "white backlash" is confined to Republicans? It seems to this observer that the guilt of racism is pretty evenly distributed among Republicans and Democrats alike.

The author, moreover, repeats with approval the popular but fatuous cliche that "Communism is a Christian heresy" (p. 191). The rationalization that he offers in defense of this notion ("it is a criticism of the failure of the Christian churches to carry out an essential part of their task") is totally irrelevant. A heresy is a divisive movement arising within and subverting — a given institution or body of thought. Thus, Arianism, Monothelitism, Socinianism, Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinar­ianism, yes. Communism, no. (It is not ab initio an anti-Christian force?)

Finally, the reader may wonder about the book's rather esoteric title. The author derives it from Jesus' words in St. Luke 12:49, "I came to cast fire upon the earth." Dr. Schulze sees in the fire a symbol of God's judgment upon a perversive, guilt-ridden world. But "it is not all judgment." Fire also spreads light and warmth — the light of God's truth and the warmth of His mercy.

Dr. Schulze is a living reflection of the light and warmth that come from the Spirit of God. In Fire From The Throne he has left to the Church an enduring legacy — a legacy which at the same time will remain a fitting monument to a good and heroic man.

THOMAS COATES
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LARGE IMPLICATIONS OF A SHORT LIST

The Dean of the Chapel and I are moderating a seminar this semester on “Contemporary Christian Humanists.” The members of the seminar are reading and discussing Gerard Manley Hopkins, George MacDonald, Hilaire Belloc, G. K. Chesterton, Charles Williams, T. S. Eliot, C. S. Lewis, C. E. M. Joad, J. R. R. Tolkien, Dorothy Sayers, Graham Greene, and W. H. Auden. A formidable list, but we think we have students capable of handling it.

During the first three weeks of the seminar, the Dean and I tried in a series of lectures to provide background and context for understanding what these men and Miss Sayers were up to in their writings. The Dean did several lectures on humanism and I did three on the Victorian Era (of which I may be the last living specimen) and then we asked the students to chime in on an hour’s discussion of “The Temper of the Modern Mind.”

Each student was asked to suggest three or four words which he thought expressed some essential characteristic or attitude of the modern mind. It was not necessary that the word he proposed apply to his own thought, although it soon became apparent that practically all of the members of the seminar felt that they were very much products of their age and that whatever they might say about the thought of their contemporaries would apply pretty well to their own thought. So it is perhaps not unfair to read the resulting list as a kind of diagnosis of the mind-sets of the students themselves.

The list would hold few if any surprises for anyone who has been close to young people in recent years. Surely not accidentally, the first word suggested was “alienation,” which was then elaborated on with such words as “inwardness” and “solitariness,” over against which were set such antidotal words as “friendship” and “faith.” One of the members of the seminar insisted that these words themselves were meaningless; as a confessing behaviorist, he saw us all as mere reactors and was content to leave it there.

At least as significant as the words that were suggested were some that didn’t get on the list. “Love,” for instance, didn’t make it, although when its absence was pointed out several members of the seminar said that it was more or less assumed. One student suggested that “friendship,” which had appeared prominently on several lists, seems to many people today a “bigger” word than “love,” which has been so bastardized by loose usage as to have practically no meaning left. Another word that didn’t make it was “hope,” and one gathers that its omission was not accidental, not because there was another word considered more capable of expressing the concept of what we have traditionally called hope, but the concept itself seems alien to contemporary man.

To one whose own mind-set is Victorian, the tone of the list that eventually appeared on the board recalled Tennyson’s image from In Memoriam: “Infants crying in the night, infants crying for the light, and with no language but a cry.” Indeed, some critics of the younger generation have dimly grasped the essential nature of young people’s thought; hearing the cry, they sneer at the “cry-baby” and thus further embitter the alienation between the generations.

But those of us who are privileged to work daily with young people are impressed by the fact that the crying, of which admittedly there sometimes seems to be a superfluity, is surprisingly seldom a bewailing of one’s own lot. A part of the unrest which students at our middle-class, middle-American, middle-Lutheran university experience is the result of guilt feelings over having things so good when most of the human race, including large numbers of people in our own country, have such a wretched time of it. They are not content, in a day when practically everything seems to be technologically possible, to absolve themselves with generalizations about the inevitability of suffering and the general nastiness of the real world.

Perhaps one reason why they do not put “hope” on a list of key words for contemporary man is that they sense that the great capital crime of our day has been the betrayal of hope. We have left undone those hopeful things that we ought to have done and we have done those hope-destroying things that we ought not to have done, and just for those reasons there is no health in us.

And is not that perhaps precisely the context for understanding what the great Christian humanists of our time have been trying to do for us? “What a piece of work is a man!” Who, outside the Christian community today, dares to shout such a thing with joy and utter conviction? Who really believes today, as Lewis did, that man—that is, individual men who are now living—will still be there to see the extinction of the remotest sun? Who has a word for our day? Who will make the case for faith, hope, and love?
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