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IN LUCE TUA

The LC-MS Convention Ought to Retract A Statement

A NEWS RELEASE FROM the Department of Public Relations of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod announces, "Desire to Resolve Differences Emerges in 1975 LC-MS Convention Workbook." One must admit the possibility that there will be differences of opinion on what the emphases or desires are in a book of over 700 overtures, covering more than 500 pages. But it sounds to this observer as if the headline were a suggestion for an "official" way to look at the Workbook, a way that would not suggest itself merely from reading or studying the book itself.

Let us, however, concur in saying there is a "Desire to Resolve Differences . . ." That desire will have to take focused action; heavy breathing will not suffice. When the desire to resolve differences begins to focus on the differences, the difficulty begins to arise. Where does one start to specify the differences? At the point of the hardship and injury that has been perpetrated? At the point of charges and counter-charges about moral bankruptcy, lovelessness, and deceit? Or shall the beginning be made at the point of the doctrinal differences?

My recommendation for the starting point for the resolution is at the point of the doctrinal aberrations contained in A Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles, adopted at the New Orleans Convention of the Synod in 1973. The starting point for resolving the differences must begin at the point where the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod began to be led officially into erroneous teaching. Repentance must begin at the point where the error became the conscious choice of the Convention majority.

The Cresset published a review essay of A Statement (May 1973 and October 1973) in which, with careful and clear language it was shown that A Statement is " . . . a mis- 'Statement of Scriptural and Confessional Principles.' " The editor submitted this review essay as his documentation for dissent when he followed the steps for entering that dissent. And although the Commission on Theology and Church Relations (prior to the New Orleans Convention) judged A Statement to be in all its parts in accord with the word of God, it absorbed into its report on dissent every major doctrinal criticism registered by the authors of the Review Essay and at the same time repeated its former opinion.

A STATEMENT MUST BE RETRACTED, therefore, because it is not seriously held by those who wrote it and passed it. That attitude will continue to develop nothing other than cynicism about doctrine. Already one hears expressed by some of those most intimately connected with the production and acceptance of A Statement that it has served its purpose and ought to be left alone now as something of the past. What is this: a statement or a doctrine of the week club? The terrible wrath of God to be worked on us for such a view of doctrine will be an increasing contempt for doctrine as people follow leaders. This is neither the way nor the spirit of the Missouri Synod; it is only aping what once was the care of Missouri about God’s doctrine.

A Statement must be retracted, furthermore, because it makes confessional principles plastic and tendentious. Its misuse of Lutheran Confessional materials on the doctrine of original sin, or its misleading treatment of the nature and life and work of the church will lead the churches to hold confession in contempt. Witness even now the per-
verse shift in the use of confession: a person is judged orthodox by what he says about the Bible, not by what he teaches the Bible says about man and God and redemption and the Christian life. Witness even now the contempt for confession: so long as one uses the label "conservative" he may have fellowship at Lausanne, may applaud the Lausanne covenant, drawn up and confessed by people who not only say nothing of Baptismal regeneration, but who, if pressed, would deny it!

Orthodoxy is not determined by what one says about the Bible, but how he preaches, teaches, and confesses what the Bible says about us. The contempt for confession is revealed also in the way confessional discipline is unbuckled from its moorings. Orthodoxies are not javelins to hurl at each other. Orthodox confession is the plumb line for measuring the liturgical life, the preaching and catechesis, the pastoral care and the life of good works. The spirit of chaos and disorder is loose in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod. It is the spirit of antinomian self-will. Its manifestation is the endless new legislation that must be passed for each situation. To repent is to return to the fork in the road, to follow the way that is truth, not the way that leads to error.

A Statement must be retracted because it is an instrument incapable of being used for pastoral care. Is not all dogmatic and confessional theology designed to guard the shepherding of God's holy church? If A Statement were taken seriously and used with devotion in training people for the pastoral office and in the exercise of that office, it would lead to securitas, not faith. That is, A Statement will program people for unfaith, doubt, and finally despair or works-righteousness.

Nothing that has been said above can be taken to suggest or even to hint that doctrinal discipline is a thing of indifference in the church, or that the church is an undisciplined mob. The discipline of the church is aimed to exalt the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ and to keep all of the members of the holy church in faithful trust toward the word of forgiveness of sins through that cross. A Statement is to be retracted because it turns the eyes of its readers to other issues and somehow fails to link those issues with the center.

Neither is what is said to be construed to mean that the church need not be conservative. The treasure of the Gospel and the guarding of the faith that is nourished on sound doctrine and which exercises itself by love, is to be conserved. Paul's instructions to Timothy in chapters one and two of his first letter give clear instructions on how to preserve the treasure. A Statement is to be retracted because it is not conservative; it is a radical departure from that which we have been given to preserve. Evangelical orthodoxy is a precious gift, given at great cost. In the midst of imitations, presently so common on the American scene in the claims of "Evangelical" Protestantism and Christianity, A Statement serves only to obscure and confound the synod in her constitutional charge.

As is the case with all repentance, we have nothing to lose but our sin.

Lutherans are not the least among such special groups with the experience of flight, dislocation, and relocation in their past. Furthermore, Lutheran families and congregations have gained a great deal of experience in the resettlement of refugees in the period of time since World War I. We are pleased that the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service of the Lutheran Council in the USA is joining with the Red Cross and Catholic Conference to furnish support and leadership in this resettlement project.

The Reverend Doctor August Bernthal, Fifth Vice-President of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod and chairman of the committee of the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service says there are about 12,000 refugees to be placed by the three major Lutheran bodies in the United States. Members of the executive committee of the Council estimate that 2,000 congregations will be needed to carry out this project.

There are both political and Christian grounds for supporting this work. Whatever our perceptions about the aims of the Vietcong and whatever our misconceptions about what the United States should have done in Indochina, these refugees fled with dispatch and passion. It is good for us to remember that freedom is fragile, and if some or all of these refugees remind us of the price of freedom or contribute to our own determination for freedom, they will have given as much to us as we gave to them. At the same time, Christians will want to make their contribution to the resettlement of these Indochinese as unsentimental as possible. Christian charity is given without calculations that demean the recipients. In that way, genuine Christian charity is able to release thankfulness in the recipient. If this group of sufferers helps us to understand more clearly how to join with and care for them, we might grow in our determination and skill to help many other sufferers in our land whose case is no less painful because it is less dramatic.
Both the freedom we cherish and the charity we are under obligation to practice can be corrupted if the goal becomes self-righteous exploitation or sentimental salve to ease us in our neglect of others in our country who are in need. Skilful and intelligent service to these refugees may serve to help them and us engage more fruitfully in joining others to locate themselves in the life of belonging, production, and service. 

The Cardinal was one of those tough and stubborn human beings—he may even have been saintly—who in faithfulness to his Lord and in fidelity to his vocation is an embarrassment to most folks. Such a man's enemies have the problem of wanting to kill him, but find that he would have more power to stiffen resistance if he were put to death. His friends want to support such a man, but they have trouble because he will not conform to their larger plans and schemes.

How ready for death the Cardinal must have been: he had practised so long! There was the seven-year jail term, an appetizer for the ultimate loneliness and rejection in death. There were fifteen years in the American Embassy in Budapest where he was cut off from carry ing out his duties, preparation for the time death makes all performance impossible. Since 1971 he lived in exile in Vienna, learning the pain of living in exclusion from “home.” And yet, all these preparations for death are eased if they are made in the company and support of friends. What a blow it is to have been sent on an errand, to suffer great pain in the performance of the duty, and then to be told that those who did the sending have concluded that they no longer want the duty done.

We take note of the Cardinal's implacable opposition to Communism because we think it ought to be remembered. Such remembrance may not be of much service to the one remembered: every man must finally die alone. But the remembrance is of service to those countless thousands who suffer at the hands of others who wish them dead. The remembrance is of value to many other Christians who suffer under the militant displeasure of those who hate their faith. The remembrance is good for us who are so easily deluded into forgetting the depth and nature of that hostility, who think that we must not or will not suffer because such things happen in far away places. Distance does not dismember us from Christ’s body.
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The little narcissus (day lilies, you called them; that name too is ephemeral enough to suit them) were the first to go. Their petals yellowed and parched like newspaper, or like an old photo brittle around the faces. (The same way, as I sometimes fancy, my maiden-face must lie pensively forgotten in my looking glass.)

The columbines that opened to ring their elaborate eloquent silence indoors, were less purple than the outdoor bloomers; but they all alike fell in pieces, in an abrupt puff of pollen, at a touch. I had to remark how, when they thus lost their bowed heads, they did open to heaven their seedy supplicating fingers. (I wasn't sure what conclusions to draw—)

The weeds, anyhow, were more red and more durable. These certainly proved that you picked the lot in an alley, this gang, this riot, even, of four-petalled belligerents, who, though they carelessly discarded a few petals and stamens when I tapped them, did so to unsheathe a flat, green, paddle-shaped, needle-pointed seed case.

You know that the iris are my favorite. They push aside the brown paper of their wrapping deliberately at first, but suddenly full, unfurled, fist-big, in their subtle mottled tissue-velvet, their Trinitarian symmetry, smelling of oranges and licorice, the strip of yellow fur crawling over the crest of the lower petal. They (each) hold their breath for one perfect moment: successively up the stem swell (like the lilies, wanting no seed; like the columbine and the weed, the most of them purple), and expire.

Today two of these flags are left of all your bouquet. One which you said was as close to passionate red as you could find: I say it is the color of dried blood; the other white as an angel is.

And I take these things to be a sign, love.

JOAN LUNDGREN
NEW DIRECTIONS IN SOCIAL WORK

It needs to be said again that social welfare, social services, and social work are not synonymous. There may be groups of skills that are generic to the helping professions. If so, perhaps the inability of some clearly to distinguish social work from other helping professions becomes more understandable.

LYLE E. FRANZEN

Times for New Questions: The Progressive Era and Today

THE MODERN AMERICAN social welfare system, or non-system, functions from a pluralism of approaches to generate the common good— it has no comprehensive perspective. This system is like a patchwork quilt in that its pieces come from a variety of sources. These pieces, or programs, may originate from local, state, or the Federal government, or from an employer, the employee, the union, private insurance, or, finally, from one's own family and individual efforts.

Some of the earliest threads for today’s social welfare fabric were woven in the English Elizabethan Poor Laws. These laws were a response to the economic depressions and the bubonic plague that England suffered between 1590 and 1601. The Poor Laws had three major foci: (1) outdoor relief: money or goods to poor who lived in their own homes; (2) alms house care; and (3) public works for the able-bodied poor— assistance to the poor was seen as a matter of local charity only. Each of these principles is still operating or advocated to some degree in America in the 1970s.

The Jacksonian Era with the leadership of persons like Dorothea Dix, Edward Jarvis, and Isaac Ray, saw something new: the development of state-financed institutions (local charity wasn't enough) for the following kinds of people: (1) the insane; (2) the handicapped; (3) orphan children; (4) the aged, especially war veterans. By 1860 every state in the Union had built at least one asylum for one of the above kinds of persons in trouble. This thrust was originally designed to segregate the sick and the helpless from society and treat them in a proper setting. But by the 1890s, it was clear that the hoped-for treatment had denigrated into caretaker facilities of incarceration, and even punishment, for the helpless.

The poor during the Victorian Era were looked upon as being godless, immoral, lazy, voluntarily unemployed, wasters, diseased, or people tied up with the evils of alcohol and sex, people who enjoyed excessive leisure, and were ignorant. The rich were characterized in opposite terminology. They were Christian, moral, hardworking, thrifty, healthy, virtuous, and educated. Out of this world view came a new response to the obvious urban poverty seen in industrializing communities: The Charity Organization Society (COS). It was essentially a network of "friendly visitors," volunteers who employed the following methodology: (1) investigation of the distressed; (2) co-operation between the private relief resources; and (3) minimal relief to the worthy poor only.

America’s “First War on Poverty” (the Settlement House Movement—the activist branch of the Social Gospel, through the vigorous efforts of people like Jane Addams, Graham Taylor, and Robert Wood) began to reveal new disturbing social determinants. Simultaneously, rapid
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large-scale population growth, urbanization, industrialization, ethnic and racial tensions, an agrarian anti-urban bias, and a challenge to Social Darwinism developed. Within this emerging and fermenting perspective, a new profession was born: Social Work.

The Emerging Social Work profession was caught between two eras: between the small town and the growing urban mass society; the laissez-faire market economy and the complexities of industrialization; a folk mythology that glorified the individual and a growing understanding of one's position in an interdependent society.

During this era the poor were seen differently. They were seen as the exploited: women, children, non-employed, and the aged. They were seen as people who lived in the most difficult of conditions—in the slums. The poor were likely to create broken families. Finally, poverty during this era was seen as a temporary condition. The rich were seen by the social workers as the exploiters, the wealthy few who lived in adequate housing and had strong families.

The new social work profession made no challenge to the entire social economic structure of the United States. It worked within a reformist posture that maintained differences between the wealthy, the middle-class, and those who were poor. Social work's response was to live with the poor, speak to them, and institute reforms on their behalf. Its methodologies were the settlement house, the development of case work, and social action and legislation. In politics, if you didn't win reform on the neighborhood level, you moved up to the next level—the municipal, the state legislature, the state Supreme Court; or you formed a national coalition on the issue.

The early agenda of social work was five-fold and it reflected the two orders that the field of social work stood between and within. The first focus of the social work profession was the children. Children were, after all, the most innocent and least threatening victims of urbanization and industrialization. The second focus of the social work community was on the further development of institutions for the handicapped, with particular emphasis (in Illinois) on the epileptic and those with tuberculosis. The third focus of the social work reformers in this era was women, especially those in industry, those working in difficult conditions. The fact that women were working at all was a threat to the family structure. There was strong support for higher wages for women. The fourth focus was in the area of protective legislation and voluntary structures for the immigrants to the cities. Many legislative efforts were made to deal with the exploitation of newcomers and strangers to American cities. Other social work strategies included something called "Americanization," which was an amalgam of teaching English and helping the unemployed to get a job. The fifth focus of social work in this era was a hesitant, but increasing, commitment to the labor movement, i.e. seeing that the head of the household received a just wage. Charles Henderson's focus on social insurance and Florence Kelley's call for an American variety of socialism were major influences in this area. Social workers had ambivalent feelings toward the labor movement, and the sense of class difference between the middle-class social worker and the lower-class workers was something not easily resolved. However, a coalition of social workers and trade unionists in the Progressive Era was to be the forerunner of the Democratic New Deal liberal wing of the 1930s.

The totality of this agenda, with the exception of the broadening of institutionalization for the handicapped, dealt with threats to the stability of the social order; it also attempted to develop new forms of social justice for those who were poor and helpless.

The contemporary American approach to social welfare has been woven on the same basic loom of social policy since the 1890s. This "environmentalist" loom of social policy attempted to replace a pervasive and ancient attitude toward poverty with a new perspective. Poverty was not caused by lazy, corrupt individuals; poverty was created by structures of social disorder like slum housing, poor nutrition, second-rate schools, racism, and limited employment possibilities.

The fundamental approach that came from the "environmentalist loom" shifted gradually to using the power, potential economic resources and influence of the federal government as the leverage against social disorder. Prayers to save poor people from destitution were replaced by growing programs and bureaucracies. Salvation from poverty was hopefully seen as eventually coming through the incremental growth of the Welfare State.

The fervent agenda of the Progressives provided the social policy framework that was gladly accepted and developed by the New Dealers in the thirties. As private, local, and state attempts to deal with the Great Depression failed, the Federal government became an acceptable and necessary lever upon the forces that create poverty and economic instability. The states began to assume, from local governmental structures, primary responsibility for poor relief. With the establishment of the Social Security Law of 1935 a new "foundation for the common good" was laid. Now, there were some cash payments to individuals to replace loss of income because of old age, invalidism and death, sickness, maternity, work injury, and unemployment. These benefits came from a blend of social insurance, social assistance, and public-service programs.

In the mid-sixties the passage of the Great Society's Medicare and Medicaid legislation, the bare-bones of a national health care policy, signalled the completion of the Progressive/Environmentalist Agenda.
fizzled because it was either vastly underfunded or not dealing with the significant variables that produce poverty.

In 1975, there are still American citizens who are malnourished, live in stinking slum buildings, go to inferior public schools, are still under-employed or unemployed, and still face the brutalities of racial and ethnic discrimination.

Why?

This is the time for social work educators, along with their colleagues within the learning community, to ask new questions about old enduring realities. This will not be easy to do. The momentum of prior social problem definition and social problem solving processes is real. Traditional American resistance to holistic approaches to social change leading to human dignity favors some current version of "rugged individualism." How America deals with the paradox of insidious poverty in the midst of mighty affluence may well signal to the watching people of the Third World where America's true commitments and values are.

LOU JEANNE WALTON

A Description of Group Work and the Black Community

"SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION had its beginnings in a summer training course for charity workers sponsored by the New York Charity Organization Society in 1898. By 1932 a minimum curriculum had been adopted."

Since 1954 the curriculum in undergraduate Social Work at Valparaiso University involves field instruction. Field instruction offers experiences for students to meet real community situations coinciding with classroom instruction. Social Work's traditional methods of service have been casework, community organization, and group work; the latter method and its field instruction will be the subject of this discussion.

Group work students have been placed in social agencies serving Northwest Indiana, Porter County's Y.M.C.A., Opportunity Enterprise (an adult workshop for the exceptional), Immanuel Lutheran School, Boy's Club, Youth Services Bureau, Whispering Pines (senior adults); and Lake County's Gary Neighborhood Services, Emerson Middle School, Y.W.C.A., and the 4-H Club groups. Supervision of students is a joint affair between the voluntary agency supervisor and the classroom instructor. Students apply learning of small group dynamics in Social Work practice to the variety of groups needing service.

The need for service and student assignments is determined by the agency, the community, and the University instructor. Therefore, students experience primarily socialization groups (this group typology suggests a social task continuum for members involved in the "process of becoming human" or acquiring uniquely human attributes from interaction with others) which focus on Social Work's area of preventive services rather than crisis-oriented services of rehabilitation. A student learns the functioning of normal, day-to-day groups and the personality determinants of individuals. The foundation for problem-solving (decision-making) processes in the field with these voluntary groups (members seek membership), the principles, concepts, and ethics of Social Work practice becomes basic for the projected role as a professional worker. Generally, this field experience will acquaint the potential Social Worker with a choice of "group" as one vehicle offering social services.

Since each of us holds group membership in a family, church, work-group, etc., a student begins to realistically grasp the meaning of "group" through this Practicum. Several purposes of the group must be examined; first, definition of group purpose (why do people come?); second, identification of individual interest and group interaction; third, group planning (obtaining purpose); and fourth, termination of the group. Throughout the learning process, a student looks at his role which we professionally refer to as "purposeful use of self." Self-awareness involves a personal confrontation with those values we hold in terms of preference. For example, a student may find it difficult to get the attention of an active after-school group of eleven-year-old boys, based on the student's assumption the "kids never sit still after school." The student worker then must determine the manner in which intervention (the use of self) will facilitate the group's progress. Other aspects of self-awareness have footing in one's religious, cultural, and social orientation as these are value-oriented, necessitating examination by self. This self-knowledge gives one clarification of how one feels, thinks, and acts toward others. By working with an uninhibited child, many workers learn how another may view him; however, this internalized learning experience is made optimum with supervisory faculty
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based on student, agency, and University evaluations.

Today, American society searches for groups seeking intra-psychic comfort through T.A. (transactional analysis), sensitivity, or encounter group sessions. Our course gives students basic group concepts, models, and theories in Social Work which will teach them the "hows and whys" of individual functioning in small groups. This enables transferable learning into other areas of community organization, family, and individual treatment.

Some basic tenents of human services include the individual's rights, opportunity to freedom of choice, and the potential to grow. Accordingly, these tenets can be upheld in the classroom where students (1) select a group field experience, (2) begin to chart the group design, (3) record their observations and actions of intervention in the field, and (4) engage in the classroom learning process. The nature of the group work course summons student involvement and participation.

The classroom, as a group, acquires its own structure, sanction, role expectations, etc. Group, as a conceptual phenomenon, becomes vibrant as the classroom-as-a-laboratory offers observations, occasional role-playing experiments, shares opinions, and renders solutions or alternatives to field problems. When a class log is used, students can evaluate the various interactions in the classroom, instructor included; thus each person has a chance to record observations and gain more insight into the group process. As a trusting relationship among the student peer group develops from the common goal for learning, group cohesion allows both individual growth and professional preparedness. Pincus and Minahan define Social Work practice as focused "on linkages and interactions between people and resources, systems and the problems." The junior year group work student experiences these linkages and interactions in the early stages of personal-professional development. Learning requires personal engagement, the same type of engagement which the student works toward in his field assignment. Student preparation gears his energies nearer the role of an advocate for human services.

IN RECENT YEARS, SERIOUSLY unhealthy "service delivery structures" have been developed by the ever-expanding complexes of the healing professions. As Ivan Illich has observed, a monopoly on the practice of medicine has evolved which has divested the family and the individual of meaningful participation in the healing process. Under the guise of technological professional sophistication, a fragmentation of the healing professions has occurred, with each discipline staking out exclusive turf on which to operate.

As in the medical world, there is a school of thought in the social service field that has fostered a similar dehumanizing and "malignant expansion of institutional health," which renders human beings into controlled, inanimate objects. A case in point within professional social work today is the strong movement in support of the licensure of social workers (and volunteers as well). This effort to secure a monopoly on the dispensation of social services is, however, only indicative of a more fundamental malaise which is embodied in the term "social service delivery system." This delivery system has assumed the maintenance duties which necessarily entail the individual and family. Both self-certification and the fabrication of an elitist "delivery system" have surfaced earlier in the history of the medical profession and other institutions. In a "follow the professional leader game," advocates of a more highly controlled and institutionalized approach to social service delivery aspire to emulate the level of technology which has been able "to put men on the moon." This statement affirms the malfunction which Illich criticizes: the attempt "to solve a crisis by escalation."

The early contributions of social workers involved with community, family, and casework services were solidly based upon humanistic principles ("tenets" still referred to in the profession today). Included among these tenets are the inherent worth of the individual, client self-determination, and freedom from the worker's preconceived goals. Social service agencies, with a finger on the pulse of their respective communities, have been able to make beneficial adaptations in program. Social work "professionalization" has brought definite advantages to people. However, when further professionalization of social services is no longer of positive value to the majority of the community, the term "professional" becomes tainted.

"Technical know-how" in reaching solutions for social problems, in Mr. Given's view, belongs to the trained professional social workers "who know what they are doing." Here, only the social worker is mentioned as the active agent in the healing process. He is the Subject of the verbs: he "asses the situation, deploys appropriate manpower, knows . . . how much of what is needed and has the skill and personal ability to do the job needed." The inevitable result of this process is that the client receives the status of Object. The tendency is to lean

3. Ibid.
back and wait for the service to be delivered.

An interview with a Brazilian peasant recorded by Paulo Freire is well addressed to the “client-as-Object” problem. “The peasant feels inferior to the boss because the boss seems to be the only one who knows things and is able to run things.” The peasant’s complacent despair is shared by the Object of the social service delivery system who is led to ask “What can I do, I’m only a client?”

The aura of self-depreciation surrounding both peasant and client can be dispelled only when they themselves are affirmed as having not only “the know-how,” but also the right to facilitate liberating change. The people’s discovery that they do know something from their relations with the world constitutes a revolutionary step. (This consciousness is the first stage of Freire’s pedagogy.)

“Solidarity” is required, in Freire’s model, to maintain the process of liberating dialogue. Calling for the “conversion” of the oppressors to the people (among the oppressors, no doubt, are many social workers), Freire states that the true test of solidarity between the oppressed and their former oppressors is the development of a profound “confidence in the people’s competence as the doers” or “executors of transformation” marks perhaps the most difficult step of all which the social worker must take.

The social worker revokes his solidarity with the oppressed if he thinks of himself and his fellow self-certifying colleagues as the only actual agents of healing transformation. If a trust in the people’s ability to be Subjects is not present, any talk of “client participation” is contradictory chatter. Social workers not in solidarity with the oppressed fall in with the oppressors, exploiting an activity which is intrinsically the activity of all men. (This is when the “manufacturing of need” begins, when the primary healing agent is said to be outside of one’s self.)

SOCIAL WORK, PROPERLY understood, is catalytic. It must often begin by arousing the consciousness of the oppressed, alerting them to the fact that “they’ve been destroyed,” rendered as objects. It is the immediate goal of a humanized social work “to establish a permanent relationship of dialogue with the oppressed.” Beyond this inceptive stage which invites the oppressed to enter into dialogue, overly distinctive roles (in the worker to client style) tend to be oppressive. Beyond this point, all involved are Subjects... able to know and act independently yet choosing to do so collectively... engaging in common reflection and action.

Freire activates the conception that the people’s own “empirical knowledge of reality” is the primary resource or substance which is capable to uncovering the “causes of reality.” The critical knowledge of the social worker serves simply as an additive nourishing that process. The “study, diagnosis, and treatment model” of social work theory, generally involving the worker as the Subject and the client as the Object, can now be seen in dialogical terms: study, diagnosis, and treatment “for” or “about” them.

Freire formulates new terms (“teacher-student” and “students-teachers”) which embody the interactive mutuality of growth and learning achieved through the dialogical approach to education. In transposing Freire’s “dialogical, problem-posing” model for education to the field of social work, similarly humanized roles emerge. Within the new terms of “worker-client” and “clients-workers” lies the potential to liberate the “objects” of the social service delivery system and their oppressors, the professional, dialogue-discouraging social workers. No longer is the social worker the one-who-works at ameliorating the pathological symptoms exhibited by the client. Meaningful dialogue can now be initiated by the client who is also a working agent in the healing process. While transforming oppressed individuals, the attention of the “clients-workers” may well be first directed at the malaise of the surrounding societal structures which have cultivated disease-invoking domination. In short, the worker-client and clients-workers “become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow.”

Through the working of both participants, the vertical dimension inherent in the social service delivery structure is removed. In a new horizontal relationship, the “clients-workers” no longer have to defy gravity in order to get through to the “worker-client.” Social health is no longer “delivered” but attained through co-operative dialogue.

Freire’s revolutionary approach as applied to social work discourages any rigid maintenance of oppressive worker and client roles. It is a radical call for the relinquishment of any claims of ownership rights on social service delivery, placing human beings in an encounter of dialogue. “Professional” image props are discarded in the new lateral (as opposed to top-down) programming. Social work can thus no longer be twisted into a manipulative process enacted for the oppressed but is affirmed as a process of transformation conducted with them.

5. Ibid., p. 55.
6. Ibid., p. 66
7. Ibid., p. 129.
8. Ibid., p. 67.
THERE IS WITHIN THE VAL-
paraiso University campus com-
munity an open door. It has been
opened by those colleagues and
friends who speak to or about social
issues, social welfare, social ser-
tices, and social work with varying
degrees of clarity.

There is a difference in the knowl-
edge and experience bases of those
who have opened—or sought to
keep open—this door of dialogue.
Those variations, in combination
with the uniqueness of each human
being, have contributed to an expe-
rience or encounter where some of
the dramatis personae and/or the
audience are seemingly being drawn
into a vortex of confusion.

Four major monologues in Act I
set the stage for Act II. First to ap-
pear on stage was Galen Gockel.
His prologue gives focus to the
drama by introducing the themes of
the current dilemma of welfare recipi-
ents—as illustrated in the expe-
rience of one forty-year-old
grandmother—sketches a mini
profile of the historical develop-
ments of the profession of social
work and the social welfare system,
and pays tribute to the social work
of Jane Addams' day: "It gave help
where the problems were the great-
est and the resources the least."8

Next in order of appearance is
Lois Reiner whose soliloquy states:
"someone is slipping up on the job";4
it introduces the theme profession
(of faith, yours), gives rise to hope
(another's), need(s) (another's), de-
mands action (yours); action may
lead to rejection (by your peers and
the community).

Third in order of appearance is
Jack P. Given. His contribution is
no aside; it represents a spirited
attempt to engage colleagues and
friends in direct dialogue within the
framework of his professional pos-
ture and stance. He concludes with
the thesis "... theory and practice
must be put to work on our campus."

The epilogue to Act I is given by
Richard H. Luecke.7 His stiletto-
sharp questions ask for clarification
as to specific social work skills and
knowledge, request collegiality, and
seek further discussion with the de-
partment.

The curtain did come down on
Act I. The actors (a generic use of
the word) gave a fine performance.
A lengthy intermission is now over;
the houselights dim, and Act II is
about to begin. The dramatis per-
sonae in Act II are some faculty
members and students in the depart-
ment of Social Work at curtain time,
spring semester, 1975.

It is apparent that the issues,
questions, and areas raised for dis-
cussion in Act I demand careful
scrutiny and are far too many and
complex to be treated briefly or in
one sitting. Act II is, therefore, only
a bridge to help those who desire
to move into the Third Act.

Act III, hopefully, will be the
longest, most meaningful and pro-
ductive of the encounters, offering
challenging dialogue between inter-
ested scholars at many levels over an
extended period of time, allowing
for the careful articulation of pos-
ture, bringing a broader under-
standing of issues, and, above all,
allowing for an affirmation of the
personhood of each participant, and
those for whom they serve as advoc-
ates.

PERHAPS IT NEEDS TO BE
said again that social welfare, social
services, and social work are not
synonymous.6 The introductory or
survey course in social work deals
with these distinctions. The course
has an open enrollment! The roots
of social welfare may be traced back
through the centuries to Old Testa-
ment times.9 The present welfare
structure in this country is based on
a model created or, more explicitly,
confirmed in Elizabethan England.
The 43rd Elizabeth, or the Great
Poor Law—1601, was the final codi-
fication of law focused on the poor
which began in 1349. Social Work,
as a profession, is somewhat younger.
It emerged on the American scene
about one hundred years ago. It
may not be dysfunctional, Gockel
to the contrary,10 for social work as
a profession to move towards pro-
fessionalization. Greenwood's cri-
teria of a profession are listed by
Witte, along with many others, in
the Encyclopedia of Social Work. In
brief they include:

(1) the basis for a systematic
theory;
(2) authority recognized by cli-
entele of the professional
group;
(3) broader community san-
cction and approval of this au-
thority;

1. Galen Gockel, "Professional Caretakers
of the Poor," The Cresset (February 1973),
pp. 20-21.
2. Ibid., p. 20.
3. Lois Reiner, "An Experience of Seeing
5. Jack P. Given, "Shutting Down the Slip-
7-10.
6. Ibid., p. 10.
and the Work of the Pros." The Cresset (Octo-
ber 1973), pp. 8-10.
8. Elizabeth Ferguson, Social Work, An
Introduction (N.Y.: J. B. Lippincott Co.,
1969), pp. 5-6.
1:17; Exodus 22:22; Deut. 10:18; Job 6:27;
24:9; Psalms 10:14; 68:5; Isaiah 10:2; Hosea
14:3; Eko. 30:15; Deut. 15:11; Psalms 34:6;
49:2; Prov. 30:9; Amos 2:16; and many others.

Clarence Rivers, Jr., MSW and
CAPP Fellow, in addition to teach-
ing duties, is Chairman of the De-
partment of Social Work at Val-
paraiso University.
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It has been suggested by Greenblatt and Katkin that there may be groups of skills that are generic to the helping professions. If Greenblatt and Katkin’s observation is correct, then perhaps the inability of some clearly to distinguish social work from other helping professions becomes more understandable. The differentiation to the confused becomes more subtle and qualitative in nature. Professionals and volunteers in the helping professions are seen as “doing” the same thing; i.e., caseworkers, counselors, and researchers all interview clients. One measurable difference is that the professional, from his or her knowledge base, has a “perception of what the service is doing to the person while doing something for him.” The trained worker has both the theoretical and experiential practicum base to be aware of, sensitive to, and deal with client feelings as well as behavior.

The field of social work education is experiencing growing pains. In 1971 there were 151 Council on Social Work Education approved undergraduate social work programs. In 1975, 215 schools have applied for accreditation of their undergraduate programs. A new design is emerging, a continuum which offers training from the Associate of Arts degree to post-doctoral work. This is a multi-level educational model leading to more precisely defined employment roles and responsibility under a single code of ethics.

Implicit in the design of the educational-employment continuums are levels with unique objectives, mobility to the next level, and content that is either different from or more complex than its preceding segments. The 1975-1977 Valparaiso University Catalog will reflect the efforts of the Department of Social Work to prepare students more effectively for their entry into either the first level of professional practice or graduate education. There is an increasing, or at least a more vocal recognition that various tasks require different levels of education. Recent action by the National Association of Social Workers (1970) opened membership to persons holding the Bachelor’s degree. In 1973 the Council on Social Work Education and its House of Delegates recognized the Bachelor’s degree in Social Work as the first professional degree required for entry into practice.

Present efforts across the country with respect to the licensing of social workers reflect the recognition of the profession for internal governance and external sanction by local, i.e., state, jurisdiction. Presently fourteen jurisdictions have licensing acts; of this number only four have single level licensure. Luecke to the contrary, responsible legislation is needed to protect consumers from the inept, the un-/or under-educated, or the unqualified practitioner. This cuts both ways. On the other hand, with sound legislation each practitioner’s role and responsibilities will be more clearly defined and protected.

Perhaps the facile minded Dr. Luecke will approve of the foregoing rhetoric, but say it is all too academic. The question is, how will certified educational facilities and licensed practitioners benefit the hungry, the thirsty, the stranger, the naked, the sick, or those in prison?

TO STUDY SOCIAL WORK at Valparaiso University is to look at the needs of the total man (again a generic use of the word), as well as man’s total capacities for service. There is not a human being this side of heaven who is not housed in a body which has physical needs. Each person has an intellect—perhaps more, perhaps less than what he/she thinks God gave to him/her. We are beings with a wide range of potentially strong, maybe overpowering emotions. We are all social beings, so created by our gracious Father in Heaven. And we are all spiritual beings. If we do not intervene in each or all of the facets of personhood as that human being has need then we do not serve the total man. Valparaiso University, while not being alone in the sense of being the only school to help a person come to know himself or herself, is only one of a few schools where freedom exists to study, train for, and experience an encounter with the total person.

The diversity of Valparaiso University’s student body allows for some encounter with peers of differing backgrounds. The field practicum component of the department of social work engages students in supervised practice in thirty (30) different agencies in fourteen (14) communities in a triangle from Mishawaka-South Bend to Rensselaer to Chicago. Students may be assigned to clients of many different age groups, ethnic backgrounds, and socio-economic backgrounds—all of which possibly differ from their own.

The educational-employment purpose behind such assignments is to make students sensitive to the variety of value systems within the human family. Another purpose is to give the student some skills with which he or she can actively engage in the intervention process. Yet another purpose would be to help the student become sensitive to the situation where direct intervention on behalf of client or client-group...
is not possible at all, or until the worker is accepted and invited into the life of the client or client-group.

Undergraduate students are exposed to the social work methods of casework, group work, and community organization. The theory of individual development, group dynamics, or community process should be somewhat of a contrast. The needs of the individual client or client-community may dictate a vastly different method or technique of intervention. This may be true also for the same client or client system as he or it faces different stress situations.

MISS BETTY

No basement to her house
Built it tall on a concrete slab
She was so afraid of spiders
And creepy-crawly things
There were no depths to plummet
No musty corners to sniff
She gloried in her lightness
All radiant and serene
Miss Betty foiled the terror
Of specks that float in blackness
And fasten themselves so quickly
To whatever stops to wait
She tripped along a jaunty line
Never quavered in her quest
Nor soiled her virgin skirt
Lovers mold beneath their slabs
Spiders on the swollen tongues
But not Miss Betty
She chose a giant yellow kite
With an endless coil of heavy twine
And a day when the wind raged
Swept up and out like thunder
Toward the hovering sun.

WILLIAM M. WHITE

Now it's curtain time for Act III. Reader, colleagues, take your cue; raise the curtain; play your role.

To paraphrase: "Come now, let us dialogue together."17

17. Isaiah, 1:18.
You Meant It For Evil

Do you remember the story of Joseph and his brothers? It's a fascinating story. It has villains and a hero. It has tragedy and irony. And it has a happy ending. Good is victorious over evil. It's the kind of story we like! We can identify with Joseph’s plight. We can sympathize with his suffering at the hands of others, and we can delight in his final victory over evil.

But unlike our modern “heroes” Joseph doesn’t get even. There is no sweet revenge. The closest Joseph comes to condemning his brothers is the rather factual statement, “You meant it for evil!” Instead of leaving a trail of broken bodies and bloody bullet holes like our avenging executioner-heroes, Joseph responds with kindness and forgiveness. And not just in words! He gives them food and aid.

We are more familiar in our own experience with returning evil for evil. That’s simple justice — right? The bad guys get what they deserve. Joseph returns good for evil. We can only shake our heads. Up to that point it was a pretty good story. We see it every night on TV.

You Meant It For Good

What if we’re not so quick to identify with the innocent victimized hero? Our lives are less heroic. Let’s try another ending. How about identifying with the bad guys, the guilty victimizers? Then instead of sharing Joseph’s innocence and triumph (even if we don’t ex-
actly like his turn the other cheek approach) we would be properly chastised. The story becomes a morality tale and the moral is that we ought to be more like Joseph and less like his evil brothers.

But that doesn't quite work either. Instead of meaning it for evil and being rewarded with goodness, we usually mean well but get bad results! We say, "I really meant well. I didn't mean any harm." And it's true! We are not generally malevolent people, but in spite of that our lives get messed up.

So let's leave the battle between heroic goodness and absolute evil aside for the moment. Our battles are never as clear cut as that. Our experience is more ambiguous. We just kind of muddle around in the middle somewhere. It's less dramatic, but let's look at that fuzzy middle ground we inhabit. What if we are at the same time both innocent victims like Joseph, and guilty victimizers like his brothers? What if this discrepancy between our good intentions and our bad results has something to do with the meaning of the word sin? Then we find ourselves in a difficult situation. Even when we think we're giving, we're taking! Even when we think we're making responsible choices we're looking out for "number one."

Things now seem pretty bleak. We are both innocent and responsible! We are caught up in a situation where it is our fate to mess things up no matter how good our intentions seem. Try as we might to be heroic and able to separate the white hats from the black ones, we all wind up wearing grey ones!

But wait a minute! Wasn't this supposed to be a story about victory? Where's the happy ending? It's beginning to look more like a tragedy. If there is a happy ending it doesn't seem to lie in our ability to create it by our actions. Real life seems to hold more tragedy than triumph, more defeat than victory. Maybe that's why we sigh when the hero rides off into the sunset and say to ourselves, "If only it were true!"

God Meant It For Good

It's time for a confession. There's another ending to the story. We left out the climax. Oh, Joseph is forgiving all right. He does indeed return good for evil. But his final words hold a surprise for us. "You meant it for evil," he says, "BUT GOD MEANT IT FOR GOOD!" This is the surprise ending. This is the surprise of grace, the surprise of God's goodness! We saved the best for last. It's surprising because, unlike the endings we write ourselves (you remember, the ones that don't work), this one was written for us. This one saves us from our grey world of heroic failure and tragedy.

The surprise of grace is that God offers us the resolution of our dilemma and an alternative to our despair. God is working out his good purposes for us and our world in spite of sin and evil. In fact, he brings victory out of evil, and life out of death. His son died for, and at the hands of, all who "meant it for evil"! The victory is at hand. The Crucified One is the Risen One because God meant it for good.

This is our story too when we trust in the meaning of the cross. It's our story when we stop trying to wrest a happy ending from life by heroic efforts which so often end tragically in despair. It's our story when we trust in the Author of Life and in his goodness and live for us. As much as God is hidden from us in that strange mixture of sin, guilt, and fate we experience in our lives, his love and concern are revealed to us in Jesus. God meant it for good. That's the happy ending we've been waiting for!
The 20th Century Leonardo Visits the Small Campus

Maxine Mitchell

THE WEEKS of preparation are over. Student heads, like overly ripe watermelons, are about to burst, thereby spewing forth juicy Fullerian phrases — comprehensive anticipatory design; kinetic intercomplementarity of finite universe; intertransformative, self-regenerating scenario; ever-changing, omni-circus of celestial events; self-interfering, patterned integrity; dormant, innate synergetic comprehensions; myopically over-emphatic experience inventory; dramatically conceptual and imaginatively feelable.

He is here, on stage, R. Buckminster Fuller. There is standing room only in the auditorium for late-comers. Students squat around him. They come, some of them, from other colleges and universities throughout the Midwest. Two of them wear placards—"Disciples of Fuller." There are rows of college profs, some of whom have a technical understanding of Fuller's work. They know about tetrahedrons and synergy and Einstein's $E=mc^2$. Others have an easy familiarity with the work of other architects who also have built their signatures across the face of the 20th century. One of them speaks to me of Le Corbusier and Eero Saarinen. There are short rows of townspeople, too. Dedicated Fuller-watchers all. Missing and marked "Absent" are those students who are off attending the state high school basketball tournament and the ladies of the Faculty Crafts Group who are off somewhere else involving themselves in Crafty Projects.

There are a few moments of incredulity. This diminutive human — this microcosm of humanity — held all those ponderous concepts, all those creative leaps of the imagination?

"Let's pretend that we fasten a rope to the wall over there." As Fuller pulls on it, a professor's son, just turned nine-years-old, tugs on it with his teeth, then with his entire body. The rest of us become engrossed. We help with the rope, also. And as we tug and listen, we discover that there are no straight lines, no silly old earthian geometry. No silly old earthians, either, for that matter, only astronauts aboard Spaceship Earth. We are, all of us, caught up in Fullerian visions. We are helping him to usher in a new age in which there are no failures; all humanity is successful; no person is being advantaged at the expense of another. There are no longer powers nor principalities, nor angels, either, only "youth and truth."

A student from Kansas sits transfixed. I check on him occasionally throughout the lecture. He never moves. I worry about him. Might he atrophy there? I read recently of a Hindu holy man—a sadhu—who held his right arm outstretched for so long that it became atrophied.

We no longer see fragments, only, of universe, we see whole systems. Celestial spheres are spread out before us. We are at home throughout the entire solar system. Vast ranges of electro-magnetic reality are opened up to us. We have Messianic visions — our prophet leads us on. He assures us that he is just an average human being; there is nothing any more extraordinary about him than there is about us. And then, somehow, we all are capable of doing more with less. Our minds, like the rope, are being pulled taut. Will they stand the strain, unaccustomed as they are to working so intently for such long periods of time?

Then suddenly (suddenly? It's been two hours; but has it really?) the lecture is over and he is gone, this 20th century Leonardo. Nevertheless, an aura remains on stage. The atmosphere is still electric. We say to each other, "He looked directly into my eyes." Such a trip as we've been on, those 500 of us who had crowded together in that small auditorium! We gather up our cramped muscles and in an euphoric trance we stumble out into the dark.

That night, while we slept, visions of floating cities and geodesic domes danced through our heads. But what of the Faculty Crafts Group? Their dreams were for the most part, I suspect, untroubled, except, perhaps, for an occasional fleeting glimpse of plastic flowers and Elmer's glue.

Maxine Mitchell is on the faculty of Midland Lutheran College, Fremont, Nebraska, in the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies. She is also a free lance writer — her stories for children have appeared in various national publications and on national ETV.
R. Buckminster Fuller. Expo '67 geodesic dome, U.S. Pavilion, Montreal, Canada. 250' diameter, 137' high. Night and day views.
Hal Lindsey: Space Theologian Extraordinaire


SATAN IS ALIVE AND WELL ON PLANET EARTH. By Hal Lindsey. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972. Paper, $2.25


A Lutheran has real problems with Hal Lindsey's theology, especially his weak sacramental theology and his inadequate understanding of Scriptural authority. But Lindsey has helped to open up questions I had never taken seriously before. Perhaps he will have gotten us thinking about "bringing apocalyptic theology down-to-earth where the incarnation of the human-minded God takes place."

Theodore Jungkuntz is a member of the Department of Theology at Valparaiso University, and editor of the reviews of religious books for The Cresset.
age rates we feel that a review of them in *The Cresset* could improve its sales fantastically while also giving us an opportunity to provoke an encounter between this genre of space theology and some pretty down-to-earth Lutheran thinking. Hang on, Lutherans; you're in for a ride!

But wait a minute. Lutherans aren't so naive as to get into a space theology capsule without a compass in their pockets (and that only after double checking directions by observing the bark on the trees of their Lutheran fathers). For those of you who haven't checked your compass lately we furnish a model for immediate use along with this essay. Actually, we have two models available—one for children and one for adults. The children's model is shaped like a baseball diamond and works like this:

![Diagram of children's compass model]

- faith alone (Gal. 3:1-9)
- grace alone (Eph. 2:8-9)
- Jesus Christ alone (Hebr. 12:1-2; 1 Cor. 3:11; Jn. 5:39-40)

Note carefully that "home" equals "the pole star"; don't make the old error of confusing "home" and "third." More specific directions as to use will be given once we're en route with Lindsey. Meanwhile, the compass model we especially urge for adult Lutherans is the following:

![Diagram of adult compass model]

- Scripture alone - 3 (2 Tim. 3:14-16; Gal. 1:6-9)
- 1 - grace alone
- home
- Jesus Christ alone (Hebr. 12:1-2; 1 Cor. 3:11; Jn. 5:39-40)

ON MY FIRST ADVENTURE IN ONE OF LINDSEY'S SPACE CAPSULES I was quite lost. It wasn't that I had forgotten or didn't know how to use my compass. The difficulty came in reading the text of his directions while simultaneously keeping one eye on the compass. Biblical prophecy, especially that dealing with eschatological material (as found prominently, for example, in Daniel and Revelation) was not one of the outstanding features of my traditionalist Lutheran seminary training. We spent our time contemplating texts dealing with "the Suffering Messiah" (e.g., Is. 53) rather than those picturing "the Reigning Messiah" (e.g., Is. 9:2-7; 11:1-9). So when Lindsey had me looking at biblical material dealing with what seemed to be, if taken at face value, an earthly Messianic kingdom, the excitement of new possibilities led me to take my eyes off my compass. However, when I finally looked back at the compass, I was surprised to see that I was still essentially on course.

Lindsey certainly does emphasize "Jesus Christ alone" although he struggles with the relationship between "Jesus Christ alone" and "Scripture alone" as is evidenced by his inability to cope in any way with "higher criticism." He does seem to have an understanding of the relationship between "Suffering Messiah" and "Reigning Messiah" which reflects the dialectic contained in the compass based on Luther's oft-cited but less oft-understood "theology of the cross." To reassure myself I turned to the book all good Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod pastors and theologians consult when in doubt, Francis Pieper's *Christian Dogmatics.* To my consternation I discovered that Pieper was himself at this point using a defective compass. His critique of Lindsey-like theological positions was limited to scoring them as "anti-Scriptural" because of their "this-worldly" character.7 Disciples of Pieper will have to determine whether this was merely a "Platonic slip" on the part of the master or more than a happy inconsistency in this Christian theologian.

My second experience in a Lindsey space capsule was not so confusing—not that I had meanwhile become an expert in the interpretation of the apocalyptic portions of Holy Scripture (although I was getting help from books by Carl E. Braaten, Richard S. Hanson, James Kallas, and John F. Walvoord),8 but more ground practice in the use of my compass for adult Lutherans had enabled me to employ it more effectively also while in

---


---

*May, 1975*
space. So I confidently climbed into the spaceship which Lindsey quite inappropriately named *Satan Is Alive and Well on Planet Earth* and discovered a great deal about a supernaturalist world which Christian atheists had celebrated as being dead but of which even theologian-sociologist Berger was hearing rumors.\(^9\)

Berger's argument for "signals of transcendence" fascinated me, since it taught me how to "relativize the relativizers," including Berger's own relativization of the historical Jesus Christ. Briefly his "inductive faith" technique works as follows:

I would suggest that theological thought seek out what might be called signals of transcendence within

the empirically given human situation. And I would

further suggest that there are prototypical human
gestures that may constitute such signals. . . . By

signals of transcendence I mean phenomena that are
to be found within the domain of our "natural" reality

but that appear to point beyond that reality. . . .

By prototypical human gestures I mean certain re­

iterated acts and experiences that appear to express

essential aspects of man's being, of the human animal

as such.\(^11\)

Berger then goes on to illustrate how the transcendence thus signaled vindicates certain of our behavior patterns which otherwise would in all honesty simply have to be abandoned.

Rather than follow Lindsey's deductive and pseudo­historical argument for the reality of a "personal Devil,"\(^12\) I should like to employ a series of arguments based on Berger's technique of discovering signals of transcen­
dence. The "prototypical human gesture" I suggest we investigate is man's reiterated striving for perfec­tion. It is typical of Western behavior to strive for per­fection and this precisely in spite of the constantly re­

newed experience of imperfection. And even where at

the urging of Freud perfection is down-played, the new

no-illusion principle becomes the form perfection takes

and the ideal for which man strives even in the face of

the on-going experience of not achieving the state of

perfect no-illusion. How "justify" such irrational be­
havior, i.e., this striving for the empirically unattain­
able? Perhaps there is a "transcendent perfection" which

man not only projects but which he also reflects. That,

at least, would make sense of man's striving for per­fection.

The form of perfection most desirable to man and

also most illusive is in the area of "personal relations­ships." The existence of a "transcendent perfect personal relationship" (traditionally referred to as fellowship

with "God") is accordingly signaled by man's incessant

striving for the perfection of interpersonal relations­ships in the face of repeated failure to achieve the same. Therefore Berger's relativizing (and consequent imper­fecting) of Jesus Christ: he sees "Christ as historically manifested in Jesus but not historically given."\(^13\) Cor­relatively, Berger's pleading for the presence of a rela­tivized (and necessarily imperfect) Christ "in the empiri­cal reality of communities whose actions can be called redemptive"\(^14\) cannot fill man's repeatedly expressed desire for perfection in the form of personal relations­ships. Neither can Berger thus "justify" man's reiterated striving for perfect personal relationships in the face of repeated failure to attain such.

A corollary to this striving for perfection is found in

the striving against imperfection. Man consumes his life in just such futile striving. Precisely this reiterated behavior can be understood as the signal of a transcen­
dent imperfection. Man's most troublesome imperfection is found in the area of interpersonal relationships. Might it not be that the existence of a personal transcendent imperfection (traditionally referred to as "Satan" or "the Devil") explains the futility experienced in man's striving to rid himself of imperfection through purely imminent means? Is this not why the Apostle Paul says that "though we live in the world we are not carrying on a worldly war, for the weapons of our warfare are not worldly but have divine power to destroy strongholds" (2 Cor. 10:4)? Is this not why he insists that "we are not contending against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, . . . against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6:12)? Our inductions on the basis of Berger's method of investigat­ing signals of transcendence bring us to the same point as do Lindsey's deductions from a verbally in­spired and revealed biblical text, viz., Jesus knew what he was doing when he taught his disciples to pray: "De­liver us from the Evil One."

Is it true that the admission of the reality of Satan necessarily brings with it two heretical consequences: (1) It detracts from the glory of Jesus Christ as sovereign Lord and Savior; (2) it relieves man from assuming re­sponsibility for his behavior by prompting him to hide behind a "the devil made me do it" attitude? No doubt such consequences are possible but they are hardly neces­sary — no more necessary than that similar consequences must be drawn from the recognition of the reality of cer­tain "laws" laid on us by psychology and sociology. Lind­sey, at any rate, is as careful as Scripture and the Luther­an Confessions are to avoid positing an absolute dualism or an absolute bondage of the will.\(^15\) A Lutheran has real problems with Lindsey (e.g., his extremely weak sacramental theology and his inadequate understanding

---

9. Lindsey, *Satan*, pp. 65, 239: "Satan is like a toothless bulldog." Thus Lindsey sees Satan as "alive" but not as altogether "well."
11. Ibid., pp. 52-53.
of the nature of Scriptural authority), but his taking Satan seriously is not his problem. On this point he is in the good company of Jesus, Paul, and Luther.

THE BIGGEST PUT-DOWN OF LINDSEY which I've read to date is that by Roy A. Harrisville, Professor of New Testament at Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. In an essay entitled "Tomorrow with Hal Lindsey," Harrisville briefly (and at times erroneously) sketches Lindsey's futuristic scheme and concludes with some biblical-critical and theological observations regarding his position. He speaks of his "gross and ugly literalism," his "bizarre arguments," his "capricious judgment," his "anti-clericalism," and his "royalties." And then he concludes: "But, make no mistake, whoever you are, clergy or lay—your argument that for good or ill Lindsey 'gets folks into the Bible' is sheer self-deception. Nowhere, nowhere at all is the news that God has embraced the impious and unlovely in Jesus Christ ever heard. To the garbage dump with Lindsey and his tomorrow!" So far Harrisville's contemporary version of the confessional "damnamus.

I appreciate that final quote—not because it is true but because it is substantive. If it is true, Harrisville has me as a new convert. If it is untrue, Harrisville can, thank God, still trust "the news that God has embraced the impious and unlovely in Jesus Christ." But I wonder whether Harrisville's compass includes not only "Jesus Christ alone" and "grace alone" but also "faith alone" and "Scripture alone?" What does Harrisville understand Lindsey to be saying when the latter writes:

...we should make it our aim to trust Christ to work in us a life of true righteousness. We all grow in this, so don't get discouraged or forget that God accepts us as we are."

Or again:

The final "Come" is an invitation from Jesus for the person who is still thirsting in his soul for fulfillment. Jesus offers Himself as the thirst-quenching Water of Life. When a man drinks of this fountain, he never again thirsts in the depths of his soul. If you look very closely at the outstretched hands of the One who asks you to come, you'll notice nailprints there. They were suffered for you, so that every awful judgment you have read about in this book might not come upon you. All you need do is "Come."

And finally:

...God has no hostility toward us. He has always loved man. This is why he became a man, so that as our substitute He could bear the judgment due us and in so doing remove every barrier that our sin had erected between Himself and us.

There are a great many contemporary theologians who throw in the garbage dump any assertion that God's left hand is to be taken seriously and eschatologically. As beautiful as it is that "God has embraced the impious and unlovely in Jesus Christ," it is also an indication of God's loving respect for our humanity that he does not force us into the Body of Christ against our wills. The existence of "hell" is a monument to God's irrevocable respect for our humanity (Augsburg Confession XVII, 1-4). I wonder whether Harrisville's contention with Lindsey is not directed less against his "futuristic theology" than it is against Lindsey's understanding of the Gospel framework for that theology. That, at least, is a good issue and ought to be pursued "with all lowliness and meekness, with patience, forbearing one another in love, eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace... until we all attain to the unity of the faith" (Eph. 4:2-3, 13). Only then will we see what is actually ready for the "garbage dump" and I suspect all of us will have our own share to dump (1 Cor. 3:10-15).

Actually, I am far from being a Lindsey convert but feel he has helped to open up for me questions I had never taken seriously before. Is there room in Lutheran theology for the "Millennium," the "Rapture," and the "Charismatic Movement?" Lindsey's reservations about the last mentioned are not stupid but they are limited in applicability. They are limited because he understands little of sacramental theology and also little of Neo-Pentecostalism, which is to be sharply distinguished from classical Pentecostalism. On this question Lutherans will be better instructed by consulting the half-dozen books authored by ALC pastor Larry Christenson and published by Bethany Fellowship in Minneapolis. On the questions of the Millennium and the Rapture we are still waiting for a serious and responsible treatment by a Lutheran. The article by Kurt Huten gives sober and wide guidelines for such an investigation. He correctly points out that the Augs-
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burg Confession, XVII, 5,27 did not mean the rejection of Chiliasm as such, but merely its perverted forms. This is also the opinion of Edmund Schlink as expressed in his Theology of the Lutheran Confessions,28 As the Charismatic Movement, when at its best, will help the church reintegrate the fulness of the charismatic gifts into its day by day life and worship, so it can also deepen the church’s appreciation for the “this-worldly” dimension of our salvation. Is it not ironic that what so often

27. “Rejected, too, are certain Jewish opinions which are even now making an appearance and which teach that, before the resurrection of the dead, saints and godly men will possess a worldly kingdom and annihilate all the godless.”


WHAT IF?

Missouri Synod’s Political Journal

WHAT WOULD HAVE HAPPENED if this year we were preparing to celebrate the 125th anniversary of a political journal edited and published by The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod for the purpose of influencing the political process in this country? A stupid question? Perhaps. We all know how easily one might speculate on such abstractions.

Yet it is a fact that a great deal of effort was expended by the Synod in its formative years in order to launch such a project. What is even more intriguing is the argumentation given in support of the publication of such a journal and in determination of the type of journal it should be. It is the opinion of this writer that this episode in the history of this Synod sheds much important light on its understanding of the entire dogma of church-state and church-society relationships as it has evolved in its history.

It appears that the project was given birth at the fifth convention of the Synod in 1851. Pastor C.F. Gruber of Perry County, Missouri, who was personally unable to attend the convention, proposed that the Synod establish a monthly or semi-monthly newspaper that would contain both political and religious materials.

Gruber’s proposal struck a responsive chord among the delegates. The Synod felt that the political press in its region, especially that in the hands of German editors, sought to tear down all religion and morality.1 This type of godless journalism, in the eyes of the infant Synod, had to be opposed with all seriousness and with diligent effort.

Yet, significantly, the fathers of the Synod did not approve of Gruber’s idea for a journal combining contemporary religious and political commentary. Instead, they called for the creation of a reine political publication, one that would include no specifically religious materials.

The reasons they advanced for this modification are in themselves significant. It was their judgment that there was a crying need for a political newspaper of the type Gruber envisioned. Yet it was the judgment of the delegates that if religious
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materials were included the journal would be repulsive to a large segment of potential readers. Thus the fathers became pure pragmatists; they didn't want their new journal to bear the handicap of the inclusion of potentially controversial religious material.

The enthusiasm of the delegates to the idea of such a political paper was so strong that they went on to choose an editor. And one of those in attendance, a St. Louis printer, agreed to publish the paper, asking only that the Synod support 400 subscriptions.  

This initial effort was ill-fated, however. The chosen editor, the Rev. F. Hofmann, who had just resigned his pastorate in Schaumburg, Illinois, because of illness, did not accept the assignment. Yet the idea remained in the hearts of many because the conditions that gave rise to the project remained.

It was the judgment of the members of the Synod during the decade of the 1850s that the German press in the United States was in the hands of "Christ-opposing" men whose publications "overflow with hatred and enmity against Christianity and the Word of God."  

As a result a stock company was organized in St. Louis for the sake of publishing a daily paper in a Christian vein. It was to be called St. Louiser Volksblatt. Included among those who pledged financial support for this venture were a number of congregations, including Trinity Lutheran, of which C.F.W. Walther was the pastor.  

But the members of the stock company once again were confronted with the thorny problem of selecting a reliable Christian editor. Efforts to find the right man seemed futile until their attention was drawn to a Lutheran pastor in Rainham, Canada, the Rev. C. Diehlmann. While carrying out his duties as the pastor of a small congregation, Diehlmann evidenced the type of ability desired since he at the same time was editor of the Illustrierte Abendschule.  

When contacted about the position in St. Louis, Diehlmann evidenced reluctance to come to St. Louis. He had just recently moved to his present pastorate and did not feel justified in leaving so quickly. Yet he did imply in a letter to Walther that he might be able to be prised loose should certain conditions be met. These conditions included a personal visit by Walther himself to convince the members of Diehlmann's congregation of the need to have Diehlmann serve elsewhere. Also included was the ability of the Synod to provide Diehlmann's congregation with a replacement who would prove acceptable to the congregation.

Shortly after the arrival of Diehlmann's letter, the members of the stock company held a meeting and it was decided to ask Walther to make the journey with a suitable candidate. Walther's interest in the project of the secular newspaper is further evidenced by the fact that the next day he announced to his students that he would be interrupting his teaching duties at the secondary to leave the very next day, March 4th, for Canada. Quite obviously, Walther regarded time as of the essence.

Walther also asked one of his students, Hugo Hanser, to terminate his final year of seminary studies so he could accompany Walther in the hopes he would prove an acceptable candidate to the congregation as Diehlmann's replacement. And all this in spite of the fact that transcontinental travel in early March was quite hazardous.

Walther's determination to complete the journey as quickly as possible is further demonstrated by his actions upon arrival in Buffalo. An intense blizzard was raging, one that forced the cancellation of further train travel. Undaunted, Walther began to search for a driver and sleigh to complete the remaining sixty miles of the journey—this in spite of the fact that the newspapers were daily reporting on sleigh travelers who either had frozen members or who had lost their lives by venturing out into the storm.

Hanser wanted to turn back. Seasoned sleigh drivers refused to accept the trip, even though Walther was willing to pay a high wage. But Walther persisted and finally found a seventeen-year-old willing to make the effort for the price Walther offered. On the trip the sleigh was overturned, and all members of the party almost lost their lives. With that, both the driver and Hanser wished to turn back. Yet Walther persisted and, finally, after three days of travel through the storm, they managed to complete their trip. All this, rather than to delay the time when a suitable editor for a secular newspaper could be obtained.

While Walther was able to persuade the congregation to accept Hanser as its pastor and to grant Diehlmann a release, this didn't end Diehlmann's qualms about devoting himself fulltime to being the editor of a secular newspaper. Upon his arrival
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in St. Louis he was afflicted with pangs of conscience; had he acted properly in resigning his pastorate in order to undertake a secular vocation?

The Western District of The LC­MS was holding its convention in St. Louis at the time. Walther presented the matter to the delegates, emphasizing that Diehlmann's former congregation was quite small and that he could therefore better serve by editing a journal that would reach a wide circle of readers. In response to Walther's appeal, "the convention resolved unanimously that in this instance it was quite proper that Mr. Diehlmann lay aside his pastoral ministry and that he had a godly call to his new position."9

The convention was informed that the purpose of this newspaper was to enable Christians to be better informed so they could function more effectively as citizens and thereby act to preserve their political freedom. The journal thereby served to counteract the poison of the atheistic press. Moreover, the journal was to be edited "without any Confessional tendencies" other than that it was "to be written in a Christian spirit."10

On December 16th of that year Diehlmann promised to the readers of Der Lutheraner that the journal will be characterized by an intense care and delicacy and that no effort or trouble would be spared to make its appearance most satisfying."11

However, for some unexplained reason, Walther on September 22, 1857 warned the readers of Der Lutheraner that the editorship of the St. Louiser Volksblatt had changed hands and that it was no longer being published in a Christian spirit. Walther added that only time could tell whether this journal would now join the ranks of those that were attacking religion, morality, and the church.12

With this notice, Missouri's venture into the realm of secular political publication seems to have ended. The attention of the nation was already being drawn toward the issues of slavery and union that were to have such a traumatic effect upon the members of the Synod as well as upon the political processes of the nation.

Yet while the venture was brief and abortive, there seem to be a number of extremely significant implications that may be drawn from it which have import for an understanding of the attitude toward church and state prevailing during the formative years of the Synod.

The purpose of this purely political newspaper was to enable Christians to be better-informed citizens and thereby to preserve their political freedom.

First, although the claim is often made that the leaders of the Missouri Synod have been passive and quiescent in political matters, we here observe that C.F.W. Walther was so concerned about political affairs that he interrupted his teaching duties and risked his own life as well as those of two others because of his desire to establish as quickly as possible a newspaper that would be purely secular and political.

Secondly, we note that Walther was willing to at least permit—and most likely actively encouraged—his congregation to use its funds in order to support such a political venture. By 1856, $4,000 had been risked in the effort—a considerable sum considering the value of the dollar and the poverty of members of the Synod at that time. Yet Walther and his contemporaries considered this a legitimate use of such funds as they saw a dire need for a journal that would influence the political process and serve as an organ of political propaganda.

Thirdly, we see that the leaders of the Synod wished this journal to be published in a Christian, but not religious partisanship, spirit. It has often been charged that the founding fathers of the Synod felt that only Lutherans were Christian. Yet here we see how much importance they placed upon the distinction between being Lutheran and being Christian. It was considered vital that the newspaper be edited in a Christian spirit without its being exclusively Lutheran.

Fourthly, the founding fathers considered the position of editing a purely secular newspaper to be a godly calling, one worth resigning the pastoral office to achieve. In other words, they were not obsessed with a clericalism that asserted that only he is an effective servant of Christ who holds the pastoral office.

Finally, the Synod in its formative years placed a high premium on the duty of its members to try to influence the political process. Correspondingly, church funds might legitimately be used in order to train church members for effective political involvement.

I would therefore hope that it should be seen as quite obvious that for Walther and his associates, "separation of church and state" did not involve an attitude that says that the leaders of the church let the state go about its merry way. It was a duty of the church to devote its resources toward the task of preparing and motivating its members toward effective political action. And if this means that a C.F.W. Walther needs to risk his life in order to achieve this goal, so be it. It is a cause worth dying for.

This article began with a fanciful question, one to which the reader can draw such conclusions as he desires. But it would appear that such speculation would not be entirely fruitless. In the very least, it might put an end to some of the erroneous claims about "political indifference" on the part of the founders of this Synod.
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WHY LIBERAL ARTS?

Recently, two hundred men and women whom the Danforth Foundation had tagged for “unique performances in the field of education” let down their hair at a regional conference. For three days, they discussed frustrations with “colleagues, the university, family, and community.” What struck me at the time was the fact that those articulating apathy and fragmentation in the most specific terms represented the liberal arts section. While it seems clear that there is a growing malaise on campuses everywhere, the desire to resist it happening in the liberal arts college forms the basis of this piece.

Traditionally, liberal arts schools existed for an elite constituency that could afford to be drilled in the classics and humanities. Up until the late sixties, the nation’s economy still absorbed the products of such institutions and acknowledged the contribution they could make to society. Then came the seventies with an accelerated emphasis on the technical, professional, and service-oriented. Society simply wasn’t pattering authors, artists, and assorted intellectuals on the back any longer. Nor was it sucking in its stomach to make room for them on the job market. What the nation needed were useful people, those who could be incorporated efficiently into a producer-consumer syndrome. With a surfeit of teachers in the breadline, it became obvious that liberal arts schools were turning out graduates who could no longer be assured of roles or paychecks.

The college-inclined began to do a double-take. Why invest (minimally) $3000 per year for four years when no guarantee of a job was included? Two-year technical programs offered a better chance of success at a fraction of the cost. And so the exodus away from the ivied halls began, leaving the decreasing enrollments as testimony to a non-narbarable education.

As the bursar slides his annual reports across the conference table, everyone’s seeing red. The message translated from the debit side of the ledger is: adapt or else. Adapting to the current trend, however, presents a new dilemma. To go about the old way of creating scholars tuned into Plato and Aristotle will not attract those opting for trades and professions. To present a curriculum that appeals to that same majority without dropping the tuition drastically cannot detour those heading for state schools and downtown office walkups, where they know these same programs are available at one-third the levy.

There is a basic desire to discover one’s own humanity in the educational process, however, and it is that discovery which the liberal arts seeks. Why this desire exists and how the liberal arts can answer it should be the current challenge to educators. It is the young who are still with us, fluctuating between boredom and desperately asking “Why are we here?” whose apathy and search for meaning should form more than a thorn in the side of administrators. Whether or not the financial dilemma can be solved might depend upon a direct relationship to the level of excitement and creativity reinstated. And that has to do with exploring together the reasons the individual in liberal arts is so alienated from society. In a word, we are talking about wholeness and the challenge to academe to investigate ways for introducing personhood to the whole by way of self-insertion into it, corporally. How or if it can all be facilitated remains a matter for the experts.

Because I’ve been on the college campus all my life (with the exception of three years in the city, which should by all rights be considered the campus-supreme) my loyalties to academe are firmly entrenched. Had it not been for those three years, I doubt that I’d be filled with anything but despair in the face of the present malaise. What the city taught me was a distinct respect for marrying the written with the real, and during the past six or seven semesters, I am observing this same respect forming in the minds of those who have gone outside the walls to, consciously or otherwise, experience wholeness.

The aesthetics of the campus are pleasant to ingest, but the sense of elitism and isolated homogeneity construct a stumbling block to really experiencing. The desire to touch and feel real people in real situations is diluted by hard facts, no matter how eloquent the lecturer. But that desire can only be nourished in a shared experience that
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will translate the case history and the philosophical argument into flesh and blood—and nourished it must be if we are still dedicated to spiritual values.

A young philosophy major came over for dinner the other night, bringing along a friend whom I recognized simply as a face that seemed to have been around for a long time. Jim had been in the university's Urban Semester program, and on frequent occasions we had compared notes. Many of the situations and people to whom he'd been exposed had been mine, basically, back in the late sixties. The program's dedication to presenting "both sides" had exposed him to the same voices of heterogeneity for which I shall be forever grateful. A precious sensitivity to the whole which he saw beginning to emerge had created tensions for Jim, as well as had the contradictions between what he had felt and touched and what he was now hearing about. Newly observing the university community, he remarked at one point, "It all seems so unreal."

I finally remembered his friend Steve, from a poetry class I had taken. He had impressed me with his appetite and talent for probing literature. For two years he'd been traveling, living around, working here and there, and taking a look at people—all sorts of people—and their situations, and "reading everything I could get my hands on." A thousand experiences in so many different settings with all manner of people had whetted his appetite for coming back, and I had to know why.

"Because my mother would be disappointed," Steve answered unflinchingly. Getting the degree was still equated with "making it" and he couldn't let her down. "I know I could learn more about making it by testing my own capacity for human responses, but she wouldn't understand."

As impressed as I was with his concern for his mother's feelings, I couldn't overcome the sick feeling of having just been deserted on a sinking ship. Surely this university had not been reduced to operating a diploma mill. It and the men and women I know who are committing themselves care enough about the future of these students in society to go beyond recitation of facts and formula.

Since I'm no educator and have no expertise from which to draw, I can only offer a lay reaction to the situation. When students like Steve and Jim express a need to define their humanity, they are not representing a constituency my generation likes to tag as "ingrates." The fact that they, and many like them, have seen the problem should catapult us all towards willing self-criticism and an eagerness to share their discoveries.

Apathy in the classroom must also be dealt with. A close friend confessed at a small gathering of faculty members the other night, "I'm at my wit's end, for while I know my stuff backwards and forwards, I'm convinced that no one's really listening any more. Get the grade and run! I'm convinced I could lecture on five ways to make coconut cookies and they'd all take it down without batting an eye!" And this is a man with as many awards for professional excellence as degrees behind his name.

If we must neither retrench nor adapt, can we consider moving forward? If so, then we can begin to consider the creation of an educational approach that combines expertise and sensitivity to humaneness with the co-investigation of realities, nose to nose. A mammoth job, granted, and one requiring a pedagogy based on co-experiencing and co-reflecting of the most open-minded sort. Yet, it is the LIFE of the university and of those participating on either side of the lectern we are considering, and if it remains our goal to inject the animating spirit of educational adventure into our present time, then our end should involve discovering not more about what society wants, but what it might be needing in terms of humaneness and response.
THE STAGE IS BEAUTIFULLY lit. There is some mysterious magic in the lighting. Smoke fills the stage. The smoke creates wondrous images as it winds its way without any purpose through darkness into the sphere of the light cones, where it whirls and dances in surprising shapes of no meaning and yet with the eye-filling power of surrealistic beauty.

Smoke and light fill the stage several times, and I greatly enjoyed the play of the smoke clouds in the light, their inter-laced designs, their twisted, twirling forms, the way they coiled and spiralled their busy loops into poetic planes with miraculous figures dissolving the moment they took shape. I could have looked at these images of smoke and light, if the play had not interrupted my pleasure with shots, screams, groans, gibberish talk, squeals, and other happenings of little consequence.

Beverly Emmons is a devilish genius at her light board.

No, there were moments of imaginative beauty, staged pictures, tableaux that could have been painted by Magritte, and then a scenic image that Francis Bacon could have thought of—only he would have been more daring in his scurrilous, frighteningly naked satire. Or a cafe scene. Gray-garbed people sitting, two at a table in an atmosphere of the late twenties, or of today. A vase with one tulip on each table. The people were all made up to look almost alike. The words "Chitter" and "Chatter" were written, geometrically exact, all over the backdrop. And it was an automatic chatter and chatter you heard, probably as a satire on the chitter and chatter of society. Empty phrases, inarticulate words. A shot. One person at a table died while the partner went on speaking as the dead person uncrumpled to live again in order to chatter and chatter. Until more shots were fired, more people died and went on uttering sounds of no meaning. I liked this scene. It reminded me of what we had done in the European literary cabarets in the late twenties and early thirties before the real shots of a real madman were heard and people went on dancing and millions did the real dying.

How does one end such a scene, fraught with the frightening image of a phony world? With more gunfire and the appearance of a dea ex machina in the shape of a charming old lady holding up her arms with a sweet noncommittal smile. We are told that she is a stand-in for Queen Victoria. The few words she has to say all evening long give her Mississippi accent away. We are told that she is Queen Victoria in the unsung opera of Robert Wilson, whose eighty-eight-year-old grandmother, Alma Hamilton, pretends to be Queen Victoria in what is called A Letter For Queen Victoria, only pretending to be an opera or a play or perhaps even a ballet.

Then, is it real make-believe? Yes, but make-believe heightened to the point of total absurdity taking place at the Anta Theatre on Broadway. Two dancers, placed on each side stage front, turn incessantly in a kind of spinning dervish dance, in incredibly slow-motion, with only their hands quivering at times. The overlapping sentences turn into gibberish with one or two words clearly pronounced. No doubt, the leitmotif of the opera which only pretends to be an opera is neither a play nor ballet, although people move and pretend to act while making serious fun of what they are doing.

There is a silly game with sounds and the alphabet in front of microphones. It is enacted by Robert Wilson and a spastic, brain-damaged child of great theatrical power, Christopher Knowles. One says A, the other B as a theme with endless variations telling us without any doubt that he who says A must also say B. During a scenic change Mr. Wilson appears in front of the curtain—apparently the show must go on, and it goes without let-up and mercy trying to mesmerize you to believe in Robert Wilson’s make-believe world. Now he has his great aria, full of sounds only, hissing, cries, squeals while bunches of lettuce are brought on stage. Or is it cabbages as a symbol? It all could have been Chinese, and perhaps it was. But Mr. Wilson has an ear-splitting scream, and he screams until his face is flushed and the whole man is on the verge of bursting.

Some stage pictures, with the people coming and going like puppets or falling to the floor without reason, are sculpturally beautiful. There are many vignettes, such as the Civil War scene with aviators, masked and with something bigger in mind than fighting an enemy, but no one really knew what the fighting and dying and getting up again and shouting something into the ether was all about. But whatever it was, it went on too long. Everything was keyed to repetition and monotony, brightened visually here and there. Is it profound redundancy? The dialogue is playful nonsense, enjoying sound melodies of "okay hat haps," tiring word-plays, suddenly interrupted by throwing at the audience clearly pronounced sentences which, because of their sudden legibility, were placed at strategic points to mystify. Such as: "It doesn’t seem right," "I just don’t want to get lonely," "We may never know what took place here," "You sit on a bench and wait for me."

Robert Wilson, a young American, wrote this opera which is not a play nor an opera but could be a ballet without much dancing, a ballet of Doomsday. He wrote all the screams, squeals, nonsense sounds, and fragmentary sentences, and directed whatever the entire concoction may be called. If he invented all the tableaux—some of which were visually stunning—then he has a wonderful flair for theatrical gimmicks. He can hypnotize, bore with precision, surprise, puzzle, irritate, and annoy you. They have called him a theatrical genius in Paris,
London, and New York. I think he is a skillful theatrical operator who tells his audience to enjoy unhesitatingly the Emperor without his clothes as long as they believe Robert Wilson that the Emperor is wrapped in velvet and purple colors.

On the other hand, it could easily be that Mr. Wilson is as confused as our time, but pretends to have a cure for our aesthetic and artistic ills. His magic prescription is actually simple: Mix some of the proved Dada like Schwitters with a huge portion of surrealism, preferably from Magritte, and shake it well with the repetitive vigor of Gertrude Stein while filtering everything through the grotesque absurdities of our age of anxiety which now can be obtained as a remainder at much reduced prices.

To be quite sure he is understood —I am certain Mr. Wilson cares as much for mankind as for his grandmother and wishes to enlighten and amuse us—his plays or operas or ballets or whatever are of mammoth length. His last work, The Life and Times of Josef Stalin, ran for twelve hours. The first time I heard about his work he had put on a five-hour Life and Times of Sigmund Freud. He seems to have vision that goes too far. The opera I am speaking of lasted only three hours. Length being unavoidable where monotony and repetition are used as dramatic tools has never been anything but proof of an artist’s insecurity. An empty canvas that is big is, of course, more convincing than a small one. Robert Wilson may, without being aware of it, use the theatre for his therapeutic needs. Then it certainly is well used.

A Letter For Queen Victoria is a torturous, visually exciting, aurally devastating experience. I don’t know why it is called by that title. It makes as little sense as the whole opera. It should —with greater justification—be called Robert Wilson’s Primal Screaming. I was happy that from time to time it all went up in smoke.

Strictly Speaking is an entertaining book which enables one to smile even while contemplating the question posed by the subtitle: Will America be the death of English? For those who care about language —and though my parents may be surprised, most of my acquaintances will recognize me in that number—the book provides the company of an author who is both congenial and witty, but whose chief attribute is a keen ear for a linguistic atrocity. His file of these unequal encounters between the language and the barbarians must be large, and his secretary a skillful cataloguer. The book is more compilation than anything else, for it consists of example after example in which the meaning of words is ignored, abused, misused, and even completely misunderstood, as when John Dean in testimony consistently used the word “subsequent” as though it meant “prior.” Mr. Newman makes some general observations on his way through the book, which is divided into chapters on politics, journalism, academe, and business, with excursions into the special areas of sports, travel, and food writing. He delivers a hearty blow to the “social scientists,” but then we need no expert guide to show us what they have done to our mother tongue. Indeed, if we can take Newman’s examples as representative, there are in every field those who are doing to that mother what the expletive currently found in the mouths of carefully brought-up young ladies and gentlemen so emphatically describes.

As the British headlines frequently wail, “Can Nothing Be Done?” Probably not, but you may enjoy reading parts of this book aloud to a kindred spirit as you man the indefensible barricades.

GAIL M. EIFRIG

The Cresset
WHEN JAMES MICHENER, who had served on the presidential commission for the planning of the nation's bicentennial celebration, saw Congress vote down the most exciting and imaginative of the commission's suggestions, he determined to contribute his own birthday present to the bicentennial. The result is his latest literary work, *Centennial*. The author has chosen a parcel of land on the prairie of eastern Colorado—land through which the South Platte River flows and upon which, part way through the work, the fictitious town of Centennial is established as a locale from which to reflect upon the history and pre-history of the United States.

Why has he chosen this unpretentious area marked by a most unpretentious river as a vehicle for transmitting his understanding of the nation? The logical answer is that Colorado is the Centennial State and that Michener himself formerly taught at what is now the University of Northern Colorado in Greeley, only a stone’s throw from “Centennial,” and knows the area well. But there seem to be more telling reasons for his choice. *Centennial* is not intended as a compilation of the things that have made the United States great. It is not a self-congratulatory celebration of how marvellous a nation this is. Michener completely avoids the “great moments of history” approach. There is not a breath of the Revolutionary war and barely a hint of the Civil war. No Washingtons, Jeffersons, Lincolns; no “Give me liberty or give me death.” Neither the east nor the west coast is presented, for the history of these areas leads down paths Michener does not care to follow. He is seeking what is representative of the background of the present United States, not what is best, worst, or even typical. He has chosen an area that provides him a chance to give an honest view of the causes, qualities, and trends of our history without being bound to touch upon those events which are conventionally considered to be its high points. He has also chosen a piece of land (and the land itself is the prime focus of the book) that tests the mettle and adaptability of everyone and everything that attempts to put down roots there.

With the understanding of Michener’s choice of locale in mind, there is another factor that the reader must be aware of in order to approach the work from the proper perspective. In this book, Michener is not a novelist, but a historian. In defiance of the book’s dust jacket which proclaims the work a “Random House Novel” it must be pointed out that Michener deals first and foremost with facts, thousands of them, observed, researched, and studied. The author himself admits in an interview “If I flood the reader with information.” Upon this substantial framework of facts Michener constructs fictitious plot outlines carried forth by fictitious characters. The result is a whole that does not so much “make history live” as make history understandable within a context of individual examples. But it is the factual base presented by the historian that constitutes the heart, and merit, of the book.

In *Centennial* Michener follows a procedure somewhat familiar to his readers, that of providing an initial fictitious rationale for the writing of the work, followed by a series of vignettes—or actually short stories—each one representing a different time period in history and always focusing on the same location. As a historian Michener feels that today cannot be understood if it is divorced from the context of yesterday. Both within the individual episodes of the book and in the work as a whole, Michener reaches back for material to provide the background for understanding the moment with which he is dealing. *Hawaii and The Source* have prepared us somewhat for the author’s propensity to dip far back into history. Even so, it is with either awe or horror that the reader beholds his statement “Three billion, six hundred million years ago” as he introduces the chapter on the land itself.

Having begun with the land and the formation of the earth’s crust, Michener takes us through pre-history by means of the fauna of the area: diplodocus the dinosaur, the horse and its diminutive ancestors, a bison (named Rufous, although how he came by this name is not clear), a beaver, and finally a rattlesnake. Man first makes his appearance in 9268 B.C. as a primitive but artistic fashioner of flint spearheads. But then from 1756 to the present the episodes follow closely one upon the other and are interwoven tenuously by the reappearance of some characters or their offspring in subsequent vignettes. There is Lame Beaver, the Arapahoe brave, Pasquinel, a *coureur de bois*, Levi Zendt, a Mennonite whose journey to the land begins in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. The gradual change of the land from Indian possession to that of the white man is presented, followed by a cattle drive from Texas to Colorado which introduces the era of the supremacy of cattle on the open range, quickly contested by sheep herders and farmers. Dry-land farming and migrant labor lead to the concluding episode which centers on a contemporary, environmentally-aware rancher.

This list of episodes sounds in part like a series of all-too-familiar late-night TV movies. But Michener’s wealth of information provides such depth for each vignette that it is endowed with a validity and dimension that make it truly fascinating. Again, the author has not sought out the spectacular or the heroic, but the representative value of events on a basis of day-to-day existence.

And from all the episodes taken as a whole, there emerge some common denominators, some qualities that are characteristic of the inhabitants who survive on the land. Endurance is one of these qualities,
not a noble perseverance but a dogged, almost ignorant persistence which carries both animal and man on from day to day. Adaptability is another. The land demands it, again, of both man and beast — it is the price of residence. The desire for something better stands out as one of the principal motivating forces of all who appear on the land. At times this desire elicits the best of qualities: ingenuity, co-operation, and compassion; at times the worst: greed, deceit, and prejudice.

The concept of balance is also strong in this work. Where disparate forces coexist, factors great or small can disrupt the delicate balance between man and nature, elements of nature, or man and man. A deeply plowed furrow can bring about the ruin of the topsoil; a horse can change the way of life of an entire Indian tribe, a word pronounced in anger or ignorance can destroy the equilibrium between ethnic groups. The reader comes to respect the precarious balance that characterizes the interrelations that all life depends upon, and begins to understand that the sometimes chance tipping of the scales on one side or another determines the course of history.

The transmission of these pervading characteristics is one of Michener's strong points in this work. His attempt at honest appraisal without judgment, in the major portion of the work, is another. The mastery with which he humanizes history stands forth as one of the most captivating characteristics of his style. The impact of what he writes is great because it is in understandable terms, in the context of people living, striving, and making-do. And then there are the facts, facts large and small. They are at the same time the underlying factor for all the outstanding characteristics of the work, the keystone of authenticity, and are interesting in themselves. Some critics have mocked Michener's penchant for factual tidbits, but it is intriguing to find out things one does not know or have new light shed on old ideas. By his repeated treatment of tidbits, Michener keeps the reader fascinated.

There are also weak points in the book, and these are of lesser magnitude than the strong ones, albeit much more easy to define. The literary device which is the excuse for writing the book, the commissioning of Professor Lewis Vernor by U.S. magazine to provide background research for a major article, is not only uncomfortably contrived but totally unnecessary. The work justifies itself, it does not need a pretext for being written. This unfortunate introduction also spawns the pedantic "Caution to U.S. editors" segments which close each vignette and jar the reader back into contemporary reality with unelicited observations by the work's putative author.

Occasionally Michener's passages of dialogue become stiff and unnatural, mainly as a result of the author's trying to reproduce salty expressions and casual, non-upright, modern speech and achieving precisely the opposite effect.

Two of the episodes are inferior to the rest, the first and the last. The initial chapter on the development of the configuration of the land tries to compress three billion six hundred million years of geology into twenty-one pages, and the result is over-simplified sentences and summaries and a superior tone that leaves the reader confused and frustrated. The last chapter, set in 1973, has as its central figure Paul Garrett, who is so totally aware, concerned, noble in principles, and untainted by materialism, toadyism, and prejudice that he is entirely unbelievable. In this chapter Michener stands too close to the events. He loses the historian's perspective and objectivity that are so vital to the preceding chapters, and instead delivers himself of opinions on an incredible variety of subjects from rivers to football, from chicanos to appaloosa ponies.

However, the reader should not be discouraged by these few deficiencies. Between the earth's crust and 1973 there are a good eight hundred pages of fascinating reading.

If James Michener deplored the loss of a great bicentennial celebration for the United States, he has given it something marvellous to celebrate with on his own.

JUDITH G. PETERS

POLITICAL THEOLOGY.


THIS BOOK'S TITLE MAY awaken false expectations in the mind of the reader. Precisely this misunderstanding dominated a discussion of the volume at a recent meeting of American ethicists. Those present criticized the author for her failure to develop an adequate political ethic, despite the fact that she emphatically states that this is not the function of political theology. Historically informed readers have projected their fears that it intends to revive the ancient Stoic notion of political religion, which gave religious sanction to the existing state. But the stated goal of political theology is to break out of the status quo by a persistent critique of what is. Dr. Soelle acknowledges that it would be more accurate to speak of a "political interpretation of the gospel." But that would be a rather awkward title for a school of thought.

The American reader might find a forerunner in Paul Lehmann's translation of the biblical term "kingdom of God" into "God's political activity to make men more human." That represented an attempt to pack biblical meaning into Aristotle's concept of the man of the polis. The point of political theology is that the Gospel does not have to be related to man's life in society, because the social dimension belongs to its essence. The issue is not an ethical one dealing with the application of
the faith, but a hermeneutical one having to do with the interpretation of the biblical message.

Political theology makes no attempt to set theology over politics as the arbiter of political issues, nor does it imply that theology should be replaced with political science. No attempt is made to develop a concrete political program from the biblical faith. The concern is to correct purely existential and ontological interpretations of the Gospel by uncovering its essentially social character.

A major portion of this book consists of a lecture presented by Dr. Soelle to a gathering of the Old Marburgers, the students of the New Testament scholar Rudolf Bultmann. She affirms Bultmann's use of the historical-critical study of the biblical texts. This method of study, she argues, made no attempt to give a causal explanation of what was uncovered in the text. It was employed in the conviction that this mode of study could expound Scripture in its liberating power. That same mode of critical study, contends Dr. Soelle, must also be applied in an examination of our present situation.

One of the goals of political theology is to discover to what extent the Gospel makes possible a critique of Christian ideology.

Soelle diverges from Bultmann in her emphasis that we must take seriously the concrete figure of the historical Jesus. This is necessary, if we are to guard against formulating "purely" theological statements devoid of political presuppositions, content, or consequences. Jesus' language was "impure" in the sense that it was not a form of religious language reserved for a religious sphere of faith. It cut across all dimensions of human life in an unequivocal concern for liberation, and was always both religious and political.

For Soelle it is most important to keep the language of the gospels, because that language confronts the reader with the full-sized meaning of the faith. Political theology does not sift the New Testament documents to discern the explicit political activity of Jesus, trying to find in him the first pacifist or a social revolutionary. The task is to discern the intention of his words and work, and to realize that intention anew in our world. For Soelle, the Gospel deals with the liberation of all people. The truth of Christ exists always as a concrete realization. The biblical criterion of theological statements is that practice which enables men to enter the human possibilities open in their future.

Despite its obvious Germanic orientation, Soelle's volume offers a needed corrective for American Christians. Although many have repudiated Bultmann's mode of critical study, there has been a clear tendency to contain the Christian faith within the confines of the inner, or private, life. But the corrective offered is no simple activism which seeks to make Christianity relevant by tying it to the coat tails of the latest social fad. The reader is challenged to recognize the essentially social nature of the Gospel and to ask what this means in a world which makes possible a scope of social transformation unknown by the early church.

The weakness of the political theology espoused in this work may lie in its tendency to seek to be more than a corrective. Instead it begins to reduce the biblical faith to its political dimensions, as is most evident in the attempts to redefine sin and forgiveness in purely political terms. This problem and others are highlighted in the volume's brief introduction by John Shelley, the translator of the work.

We can look forward to a more Americanized version of this way of doing theology when Dr. Soelle assumes the chair of systematic theology at Union Theological Seminary in New York City this autumn. But this excellent English translation can whet our appetite for things to come.

DALE G. LASKY

THE JEWS OF THE UNITED STATES.


DESPITE THE RESURGENCE of ethnic consciousness in the last decade, the ignorance of Gentile Americans about their Jewish fellow citizens remains impressive. There has been a flood of Jewish literature and stage works in recent decades but most of us don't know a kehillah from a kabbalah, from a Sephardic Ashkenazim, much less understand the complex ideas and forces that have formed the Jewish community in this country. This volume, one of the titles in the New York Times/Quadrangle Library of Jewish Knowledge, is admirably suited to fill this gap. The material is not original; most of it has been lifted from the Encyclopedia Judaica. But it offers a useful introduction to Jewish history, with a nice bibliography for those who want more.

The Jews of the United States shows that at the heart of the Jewish experience in this country has been the struggle of both the individual and the community to balance their commitment to separate Jewish civilization with their full participation in American life. From one perspective, the very existence of this tension is a sign of the generally happy experience of the Jews here. Compared to the ghettos and harsh discrimination of Europe, America has been a promised land, where they could not only practice their faith without restriction (after the lifting of colonial sanctions) but achieve economic affluence and a measure of political power.

Their rise was swift and dramatic. For a few decades after 1890, the impoverished Russian Jewish masses huddled in immigrant colonies like the Lower East Side of New York, creating the vibrant Yiddish culture...
so memorably portrayed in Ab Cahan’s *The Rise of David Levinsky*. But with their co-operative, often socialist, institutions, their passion for education, and the considerable assistance of the more affluent German Jews, they emerged quickly from their deprived status into the middle class. In the free air of America, the Jews flourished.

Not that anti-Semitism did not show its face. It appeared in the early twentieth century in folk movements like Populism and Coughlinism, in the *Dearborn Independent* of Henry Ford (despite his wealth a perfect embodiment of folk prejudice), and among the Anglo elite, with their Ivy League quotas and restricted covenants in housing and country clubs. (*Pace, General George Scratchley Brown*. Jews were sharply restricted in such establishment enterprises as banking, insurance, and heavy industry, and they own only 50 of the 1800 daily newspapers in the U.S. The General would have been on firmer ground had he said that Jews control the good newspapers—the *Washington Post, New York Times*, and *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.)

Yet the striking fact is how little such anti-Semitism retarded the economic and social advancement of most Jews of the second generation. (The discriminatory 1924 Johnson Act ended further mass immigration, and only a handful of refugees from Nazism were admitted, to the everlasting disgrace of the State Department.) In their successful ambition to enter the American mainstream, many Jews cast aside what they regarded as rather embarrassing traditions. By the 1950s the question was whether Jewish civilization, which had withstood Pharaoh, the Masada, Christian persecutions, forced conversions, and pogroms, could survive the split-level, TV, and Mixed Dating.

The primary solution to this dilemma in the postwar period has come from outside America: in the plight of world Jewry, American Jews have found both a point of personal identification as Jews and a practical collective activity to draw them together and distinguish them from non-Jewish Americans. The Nazis’ murder of millions of Jews, the Soviets’ persecutions of others, and above all, the state of Israel, have reinforced the ancient Jewish feelings of communal loyalty and danger from the outside world. Not all Jews shared equally in this movement, but especially after the 1967 Arab-Israeli War, the revival of Jewish awareness and solidarity has been so strong that fears about the total assimilation of the Jews now seem quaint. Moreover, after certain developments among some blacks and New Leftists, the complacent assumption that anti-Semitism was a thing of the past in America no longer seemed justified to many Jews.

Still, the appearance of revived communal activity and individual Jewish identity has only obscured, not removed, the complex questions of life for Jews in America, touching on matters of social life, employment, neighborhood, marriage, culture, and religious observance. Both Arthur Hertzberg’s introduction to *Jews in the United States* and the concluding chapter remark on this problem and the issues it raises for the future of the Jews. Hertzberg sees a continued “not-quietness” about Jewish life, a perpetual ambivalence and wavering between assimilation and Jewish revival. But the editor is more pessimistic, predicting a growing polarization between those Jews who are moving toward complete identification with Israel and religious revival and those who prefer their drift toward “unwitting assimilation.” If the latter prognosis is correct, the recent fierce controversy in *Commentary* over the *Jewish Catalog*, a major source-book for young, radical Jews who scorn the anemic religious life of their elders, may be only the harbinger of a kind of schism in American Judaism.

MEL PIEHL

THE REAL SATAN FROM BIBLICAL TIMES TO THE PRESENT.


WHEN SOMEONE BROUGHT it to my attention that Kallas had written a book which took Satan seriously, I was surprised. After reading his study on Revelation entitled *God and Satan in the Apocalypse* (Augsburg, 1973), I was not prepared for a book from Kallas’ hand which took Satan with ontological seriousness. Whether he admits it or not, I detect a shift in his position and it is a shift for the better since, as he himself writes: “. . . by neglecting Satan every significant New Testament doctrine had either been distorted or denied” (p. 11).

The title of the book is a bit too pretentious since it would not lead one to expect Kallas to jump from biblical times to the present but rather more in the style of *Soundings in Satanism*, edited by F. J. Sheed (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1972), to trace Satan’s role in theology throughout history. Kallas, however, does a fine job of working through the biblical material including the intertestamental period. He shows dramatically how the catastrophic calamities associated with Antiochus Epiphanes not only reshaped Jewish society and produced the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Essenes but how these calamities also produced a whole new understanding of the nature and role of Satan. Relating the principle of retribution to the calamities under Antiochus, Kallas demonstrates how the understanding of Satan shifted from the Old Testament notion of Satan as God’s servant to the New Testament drama of Satan as God’s enemy. Kallas is careful to observe a development in the seriousness with which Satan is taken even within Jesus’ own self-understanding. The turning point came at Caesarea Philippi when for the first time Jesus connects his victory over Satan with his own death and resurrection.
Previously he had thought Satan could be defeated simply by his own appearance as the Son of man. Now he senses the full extent of Satan’s rule and understands that it can be broken only by battling him to the point of death.

In conclusion Kallas points out that although the resurrection of Jesus was not the end of the war against Satan, it was the turning point of the war. Now that victory only needs to be proclaimed in order for it to become effective. However, Kallas warns that we should not make the mistake of assuming “that Satan is ever the same, always appearing in the same forms” (p. 108). He does not expect Satan to appear so much in the form of the possessed girl in William Peter Blatty’s The Exorcist as he discerns his influence behind drugs, Watergate, Southeast Asia, starvation in Ethiopia, undenying conflict in the Middle East (and he might have added in the LCMS). He too simplistically states that “it is only when we are into it, only when we are enslaved by it, only after the fact, never in advance, that we see the ugly, destructive, devastating side of Satan. From the outside, evil is attractive, luring, enticing, promising much” (p. 110). Earlier he had associated sickness, hunger, and death with Satan. Even when viewed from a distance these are not particularly “attractive, luring, enticing, promising much.”

Although Kallas has done a commendable job of letting the biblical teaching regarding Satan be heard in the full clarity of the Gospel’s light, he has still fallen short of the pastoral insight of the New Testament which puts the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God (Eph. 5:17), into the believer’s hand to be used in personal assault against Satan (1 Pet. 5:8-9; James 4:7; cp. Matt. 4:10). This is more than proclamation about Satan’s defeat; it is hurling this proclamation by faith into Satan’s teeth (or fangs, or smiling face, as the case may be). But Kallas has shown himself capable of important theological growth and I recommend the book highly, both as a complement to but also to be complemented by Hal Lindsey’s best-seller, Satan is Alive and Well on Planet Earth.

THEODORE JUNGKUNTZ

DIARY OF DAILY PRAYER

By J. Barrie Shepherd. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975. $2.95.

FEW OF US OVER FIVE YEARS old can pray without a sense of irony. It is spiritually impossible for us to pray without inspecting ourselves and our prayers at the same time. And whether we admire our prayers or despair of them, that part of us which admires or despairs is that part of us which is not praying. The saints tell us that every effort to transcend that part of the self which inspects the self at prayer infinitely regresses, and I think they tell us true.

Graciously, Christian prayer does not require that infinite regression or the obliteration of the self. The Spirit intercedes with our spirits for those sighs which lie too deep for words, and that part of us which ironically watches even our most gathered and centered acts of self at prayer is also hidden with Christ in God.

Of course, men at prayer not only cannot “unthink” of themselves at prayer, but they also cannot think of God apart from themselves. Even our Lord’s high priestly prayer speaks more of his “I” than the “Thou,” and that is comfort for all of us who cannot pray without a sense of the irony between who we are and what we pray, and between our watching selves and our God.

A Diary of Daily Prayer is sixty prayers by a man fully aware of the irony of praying man. That irony is expressed well in one of his own prayers which begins “I am aware that I have far too much to say and far too little to listen for”—and then proceeds through thirty lines asking God to shut him up. Anyone who has ever done some serious praying identifies immediately with the plight of the prayer who must continue speaking to achieve silence, and who must go on speaking God’s promises with one part of himself to another part of himself silently trying to listen.

The prayers in the Diary range widely in their petitions. That range is represented by two of the best prayers in the book: one for a richer awareness of our bodies and another for a deeper appreciation of our dreams. Like the New Testament writers, Christians are not noted for their appreciation of bodily grace and beauty or the riches of the subconscious mind, and these prayers, among others in the book, should help all of us whose man—and hence God—may be too small.

The prayers are arranged in the manner of John Billie’s devotional classic, A Diary of Private Prayer, including a blank page opposite the morning and evening prayer of each day. Well aware that no man can do another’s praying for him, the author modestly intends his prayers as “launching points” for those prayers which the reader will write into his dairy to make it his own. Those blank pages also forestall any criticism, for any deficiencies in the printed prayers are apparently to be made up with the reader’s own, better prayers. This reader was happy to say his “Amen” to every prayer in the book.

The author’s piety is what William James called “healthy-minded,” and his world seems to be comfortably white and middle class. Those whose spiritual struggles take them through darker nights of the soul or whose minority lot in life is less affluent will have much to add to those blank pages in this otherwise commendable and recommendable book.

RICHARD LEE

May, 1975
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