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Controversies, like offenses, must come. The Scriptures teach us that “. . . there must be factions ("heresies" according to the King James Version) among you in order that those who are genuine among you may be recognized” (1 Cor. 11:19).

When the terms of a controversy are poorly defined and improperly set, the church continues to be tormented with bad solutions. Power, not authority, becomes the means of operation. And many of the church's children feel like children in a family where divorce is underway. They are forced to choose between two, both of whom they love; or they must go on their own. However, when the terms of a controversy are clearly defined and properly set, and when the church is willing to suffer patiently for the Gospel of our Lord Christ, then great blessings come to the church.

Reflect on the Te Deum, the great Creeds and hymns, the great prayers, and the enriched understanding of the Lord's work and the Lord's Supper. These have come to us through patiently enduring, to their conclusion, the controversies in the early centuries and the sixteenth century.

In the early years of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, the burning questions about the church were only partially answered. Our forefathers had learned anew that papalism does not guarantee the apostolicity of the church. Rather, the church is constituted by preaching the Gospel purely and administering the Sacraments according to Christ's institution. However, along with this precious insight, won afresh, our fathers in the faith made heavy use of the terms "visible" and "invisible" in the controversial talk about the church. The words "visible" and "invisible" were not merely new terms added to the list of predicates from the Nicene Creed ("one, holy, catholic, and apostolic"); these words "visible" and "invisible" became a kind of filter or lens by which all other words about the church were seen in a different way.

Constant and persistent use of the words "visible" and "invisible" as filtering predicates of the church tend to destroy the unity of the church. That is, the unity of the church comes to have very little to do with the congregations' life and treatment of each other. Witness the shameless way people transfer from congregation to congregation with nothing but likes and preferences as the real grounds of transfer. Similarly, consider what is revealed about the unity of the church when people are told blithely to go somewhere else and leave us alone, or where others make facile plans for the formation of new groups, all as if the unity of the church would go on undisturbed.

Such practices show how easy it is for generations of users of these two words "visible" and "invisible" to begin to think in terms of "two" churches, although the Creed confesses, along with Scriptures, only one. Or, if the one church is insisted on, that "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic" church is abstracted into such an unreal ideal that it has no organic connection with those members in our congregations.

One cause for this drift to thinking of "two" churches is the shift in sensoria that comes when people consider the Word of God by which the church is constituted. The church is a "mouth-house" not a "quill-house." The Scriptures urge us to hear and to speak. The terms "visible" and "invisible" urge us to look. Faith, say the Scriptures, comes by hearing. The words "visible" and "invisible" teach us to try to see. Looking is the sensorium of proof (popular in a scientific age); proof is the enemy of faith. Until the Parousia, we live by faith, not by sight.
Which Way to Apostolic Purity?

From its beginning, the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod has been struggling with and giving answers to questions about the church. The recent convention of the LC-MS in Anaheim, California, has brought that Synod back home to its original questions. After their crisis over “Bishop” Stephan, the Saxon immigrants were tormented with questions about the church. They had left Germany without a commissioning, without an external call. They went into exile. Who certified or authorized them? How is the true doctrine, the unity of the church, authorized? How is the true doctrine, the unity of the church, authorized? Questions about purity of doctrine, the unity of the church, and the organization of the church’s life and work were their questions. Anaheim has taken us home again to these questions.

One must carry the burden of the past if there is to be a future. This return to the primary questions is a signal of the good that will come from evil. The past can be carried under the relentless demand of God’s Law where there is no rest, no vacation. In this way of carrying the burden of our past, the attempts to purify the church by the works of the Law will be endless, without rest. In such attempts, the Word of God’s Law is muffled by excessive attention to bylaws and rules. Those who muzzle the Law fail to do justice, to seek truth, and to come to repentance. Repentance is replaced by harshness or sentimentality: the one in pride; the other in nostalgia.

The convention theme at Anaheim suggests a different way to carry the burden of the past. “Jesus Christ is Lord,” said that theme. As big as one’s Gospel is, so big is one’s use of God’s Law. Those who labor and are heavy laden with the Law’s burden of the past are invited to come to that meek and lowly Lord. Yoked to Him, their burden is easy, their yoke is light. The way of His cross is the way righteousness, truth, and repentance are done.

The Anaheim convention has shifted the question in the present controversy away from the “historical-critical method” (which was not really a controversy of the church) to the question about the church. How do you tend the apostolicity of the church? How do you “continue in the apostles’ doctrine”? One thing is certain: the apostolicity of the church, both “continuing in the apostles’ doctrine” and living in the “sentness” (mission), is not accomplished by papalism. Not what is enshrined in the hearts of leaders or conventions but what is taught in the plain text of Holy Scriptures is the normative word. It is not what people say about the Bible that insures the apostolicity of the church; rather, it is using the written apostolic word to govern the preaching to and the life of the church. Surely the history of the papacy and our own history as a synod should instruct us in these times. Anaheim has brought us home to the original question: are we the church?

Standing the Church on Her Head

This past we must carry, with its shift in sensornia about the Word of God and the consequences of that shift for thinking about the church. But such a shift makes it easy to be misled into thinking that the “synod” equals “church.” The actions of the Anaheim convention clearly displays such a misunderstanding. Thus it comes about that Synod equals church: the districts of Synod are the arms of the church; the congregations are the hands and fingers of the church. Truly, that is to stand the church on her head.

In reality, the Synod is an aphasismon, an invention of man to do the work of the church. Contrary to the repeated argument that churches give up some of their autonomy when they join the Synod, it must be asserted that the churches have given up their autonomy to the Lord Christ. The Synod is a construction of the churches to aid the congregations in doing the work of the Messiah who is present among them as they gather to hear His voice. When the Lord Christ, working through the Holy Spirit, calls them together, gathers, hallows, and keeps them in faith, He is building His church on the rock that confesses His Name. That local, living organism of rescuing divine love is the place and the instrument for Christ’s calling pastors to shepherd those people in faith and holiness. His authority in calling them is the authority for their ordination.

By taking us back home to these questions, the Anaheim Convention has shifted the subject and the arena of the controversy. Indeed we must contend for the apostolicity of the church, both continuing in the apostles’ doctrine and going about our sentness. Indeed we must genuinely engage each other in the discipline of discipleship. In that these concerns agitated the Anaheim convention, that convention was right. But the Anaheim convention was impatient, not by virtue of the speed of its action, but because in its acts it could not wait on the Word of God. It did not lawfully use God’s Law and it did not purely use God’s Gospel, both governed by the clear text of Scriptures. Anaheim was impatient because of its mistrust of the Word of God to guard the apostolicity of the church. It took things into its own hands.

We must not become impatient but must use the clear texts of Scripture to help each other to repentance and faith in holiness in life and work. The struggle has now become a controversy of the church, not merely one in the Synod. It is there, in that local gathering of the “one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church” that we must engage each other. That flock, including the pastor whom Christ has given them by the Holy Spirit, is the keeper of the keys of the Kingdom. It is not without good reason that the shepherd’s crook is the symbol of the pastoral office. The shepherd’s crook is an instrument for rescuing the lost and entangled. It is also an instrument for warding off those who worm their way into the flock from the
NOTES FROM THE EDITOR’S NOTEBOOK

George Meany has had my respect more often than he has had my applause. Admittedly, I do not know enough about the workings of a labor union to judge his policies and actions. Such lack of knowledge has not kept me from feeling irritated sometimes at his behavior and statements. But it has always seemed to me that labor unions ought to be the people most interested in striving for quality of workmanship. About this matter I have heard very little from Mr. Meany.

But for one thing I applaud him loudly: the members of his union are not going to load the ships for sending wheat (and corn and soybeans) to Russia until the terms of the deal are more clear. I am glad some one blew the whistle in a way that it can be heard. Granted, in the ultimate sense, our grain supply is a gift to us. In the penultimate sense it is also the work of the hands of our countrymen. And in the ultimate sense we are the stewards of what has been given to us. The use we make of it ought to conform to our intentions and not the intentions or schemes of somebody else. The food will feed the hungry, not only hungry Russians. In the business of international bartering, our government officials are charged with the care of the interests of our country and our citizens. Let them use the materials of the barter to feed hungry people in conformity with these interests. And if the labor union members put their kind of pressure on the officials to come clean in the deal, hurrah for them.

In this issue, The Cresset continues its series, “What’s New in the Discipline?” It is a happy convergence that our tribute to Walter E. Bauer has been given to us. The use we make of it ought to conform to our intentions and not the intentions or schemes of somebody else. The food will feed the hungry, not only hungry Russians. In the business of international bartering, our government officials are charged with the care of the interests of our country and our citizens. Let them use the materials of the barter to feed hungry people in conformity with these interests. And if the labor union members put their kind of pressure on the officials to come clean in the deal, hurrah for them.

KENNETH F. KORBY

September, 1975

Readers of The Cresset will not be surprised by a “Letter from Abroad.” Walter Sorell has consistently and over a period of time contributed such a letter. But readers may wonder about a second “Letter from Abroad.” We are pleased to introduce this new feature with the report from New Guinea. In future issues there will be reports from Africa, India, South Korea, Hong Kong, and Japan. We feel fortunate to have such a distinguished array of willing “letter writers” at work in these various countries.

These correspondents have been asked to review the developments in their respective countries, to comment on political and economic development, the situations in education and letters, changes in family and social life, and to note also the health and activity of the churches. Ways for them to comment on the relationships between our country (or parts of it) and the life in theirs will be open to them. In this way we hope to give our readers firsthand information about other parts of our world and give the correspondents a larger arena for their observations.

During the Fall semester the editor will be on leave of absence. Arvid F. Sponberg, a member of the Department of English, will serve as acting editor. Dr. Sponberg brings good qualities of mind and spirit, as well as genuine interest, to the position. While he is setting the course for the editorial work, Ruth Pullmann will “execute” whatever needs “executing” around the office. The Cresset is in good hands. We wish them well.
Walter E. Bauer: A Tribute

The Best in the Academic Tradition

Dr. Walter E. Bauer is one of those exceptional individuals whose life and work embodies the best in the academic tradition. Broadly educated in the liberal arts and theology, he has been a pastor, teacher, and administrator. He served as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Valparaiso University and as Dean of the Faculty during some of the University's most formative years under Lutheran auspices. He has left his mark on the University in the development of its faculty and in its striving for excellence.

But Dr. Bauer's particular interest was always in the classroom. He taught history at Valparaiso for nearly half a century and inspired many generations of undergraduate and graduate students with a respect for their heritage and an understanding of the fascinating events which contributed to their civilization.

In books and articles Dr. Bauer revealed his conviction that the hand of God is in the historical affairs of man. Even though he is now a Distinguished Professor Emeritus, his inquisitive mind continues unabated in its quest for meaning. As he says, quoting Socrates: "The unexamined life is not worth living." And he cannot help adding the words of Jesus: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

We rejoice in dedicating this number of The Cresset to a respected colleague and delightful companion in the academic venture. His work is not yet done, for a host of alumni and friends are stimulated by his example to explore the fullest reaches of the mind and spirit.

A. G. HUEGLI, President

Richard H. Bauer

ON THE TEACHING OF HISTORY: REMINISCENCES AND REFLECTIONS

Dr. Richard H. Bauer is Professor Emeritus of History at the University of Maryland, College Park. Aside from his own publications and his reputation as a master teacher, he has served as an editor of The Historian and as book review editor of The Social Studies. Most recently, he inspired and guided the founding of a unique new historical journal, The Maryland Historian. He is the brother of Walter E. Bauer.

When the editor of The Cresset invited me to contribute an article to this issue, I was very grateful for the opportunity to do so. For one thing, his invitation served to bring back cherished memories of my brief teaching experience at Valparaiso University during the early thirties when I substituted for my older brother Walter while he completed his graduate studies at Cornell University. Even more important, its acceptance would give me the opportunity, together with others, to pay tribute to Walter, whose example and wise counsel have been a constant source of inspiration to me.

Indeed, Walter's enthusiasm for history exerted a considerable influence on my decision to major in this field. To be sure, there were other influences to explain my decision, such as the encouragement I received from various teachers in high school and college, my four years of high school Latin which introduced me to the civilizations of ancient Greece and Rome, several
courses in biblical history which enriched my knowledge of the ancient Near East, and the impact of contemporary world events, particularly World War I and its aftermath. In assessing Walter's influence, I recall that, while I was still in high school, he repeatedly called my attention to standard texts and references in history. As a bibliophile, he was an ardent collector of books, both old and new, for his library, to which I had ready access. I also recall that he often discussed some significant historical topics and themes with me. I must admit that, in several of these discussions which at times led to differences in interpretation, he usually had the last word.

Our early preference for history did not exclude a lasting interest in other subjects, ranging from languages and literature to religion and science. As I look back, each of these subjects, in varying degrees, had something to contribute to our general knowledge of history. Some of them, as in the case of languages, facilitated our later research in European history. In the sense that all fields of knowledge have had their own historical development, with many achievements on their record, they definitely merit consideration by historians in their writings. In the words of George M. Trevelyan, the noted English historian, history "is rather the house in which they all dwell. It is the cement that holds together all the studies relating to the nature and achievements of man."1

Walter's teaching career and mine, with some minor differences, have had much in common. Each of us has taught for almost five decades. Whereas Walter taught almost exclusively at one institution, my teaching took place at five different ones of varying size and background, culminating at a large state university. Moreover, we had a similar interest in European history. Within this large area we were called upon to offer a variety of courses in the ancient, medieval, and modern periods. In retrospect, the offering of several courses, rather than the concentration on one or two, gave us the unusual opportunity to widen and deepen our historical perspectives and to make interesting comparisons between different periods of history. While realizing the importance and value of research, Walter and I were primarily interested in teaching. Indeed, teaching became a way of life for us, in which concern for the student was paramount. We regarded research, as well as the extensive reading of historical literature with the aim of keeping abreast of recent findings and interpretations, as contributing to the enrichment of our lectures and class discussions. Walter was well aware that the presentation of history as the living past required careful preparation, familiarity with the subject matter and the literature of the period, the ability to communicate effectively with students, the judicious use of visual aids, and, above all, the ability to put meaning into the facts and events of history.

Walter, I am sure, will agree with me that the conscientious teacher of history, in addition to giving his students a clear, balanced, interesting and thoughtful presentation of the past, will seek to provide them with a better understanding of the nature and scope of history, the work of the historian, the problems of interpretation, and the more lasting values of history. Hopefully, he aims to instill in them a greater appreciation of history.

AS FOR THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF HISTORY, about which much has been written, it is important for the student to know how history has been variously defined by leading historians. When Walter and I were first introduced to history before World War I, it was still commonly defined, in the oft-quoted words of Edward S. Freeman, the English historian, as "past politics," with emphasis on the political development of mankind. Since then historians, in their definitions, have enlarged the scope of history to embrace man's economic, social, cultural, intellectual, as well as political, activities. For example, James Harvey Robinson, in his The New History (1927), stated that history "in its amplest meaning includes every trace and vestige of everything that man has done and thought on the earth."2 That is quite an order! The tendency to make history more inclusive is reflected in the definitions of

Carl Becker, Charles A. Beard, James T. Shotwell, and others. While these definitions might vary in emphasis and particulars, they still retain much in common.

Should history be classified as a social science or as one of the humanities? In the past this question has often aroused considerable controversy among historians. Impressed by the advance of the physical sciences during the nineteenth century, several influential English historians, led by J. B. Bury of Cambridge University, attempted to classify history as "a science, no more and no less." They maintained that the work of the historian was just as scientific as that of the chemist or physicist. They tried to counteract the prevailing view in England that the writing of history, in the tradition of Froude, Macaulay, and Carlyle, was a branch of literature, and hence should be regarded as an art. According to this view, the eminent historians are often remembered as much for their literary skill as for their interpretations. As a result of this controversy, which has largely subsided, many American historians continue to regard history either as a social science or as one of the humanities. Whether regarded as one or the other, it is well to emphasize that all fields of learning, in one way or another, are interrelated. Walter and I have preferred to associate history with the humanities.

Introducing students, especially the history majors, to the varied activities of the historian is another important aspect of teaching undergraduates. In attempting to achieve this goal, many departments of history offer a special course, or proseminar, which requires the writing of a research paper of each student—one that follows the usual historical procedure from the selection of the topic to its completion. In conducting this course, the professor discusses the many problems that confront the historian in his craft, such as the choosing of a topic for research, the gathering of information on it in libraries and archives, the use of primary and secondary sources, the problems of authenticity (external criticism) and the credibility (internal criticism) of documents, the use of related disciplines (archaeology, chronology, diplomacy, heraldry, philology, genealogy, and others), the techniques of writing, and the theory and philosophy of history.

The foregoing steps are preliminary to the most important and challenging activity of the historian—namely, that of putting meaning into his findings. To merely list facts, or to arrange them in chronological order, is a simple matter. But to discover what they mean in relation to one another requires a thorough knowledge of the period under consideration, creative imagination, and sustained reflection. The distinction which a historian achieves as a scholar depends, to a large extent, on his ability to give fresh insights into events and movements.

It is noteworthy that the same facts are often subject to various interpretations. Historians will find different meanings in them, depending on their training, outlook, and interests. For example, historians who are primarily interested in economic developments are prone to discover economic motives. The Marxian historian is quick to detect economic influences, and almost invariably sees evidence of the class struggle. The political historian, the social historian, the historian of ideas might analyze the same facts from different perspectives, with the result that their interpretations will often vary, if only slightly. These interpretations, however, are likely to have a good deal in common. Indeed, when considered together, they will give a fuller and deeper understanding of a period or movement.

Interesting, too, is the fact that older interpretations, once widely accepted, are subject to modifications. Each succeeding generation of historians, often on the basis of new sources and in the light of new perspectives, reinterprets the past. To cite only a few examples, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the French and American Revolutions, the American Civil War have been subject—and still are—to numerous interpretations.

**BESIDES ACQUAINING HIS STUDENTS WITH THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF HISTORY, THE WORK OF THE HISTORIAN, THE PROBLEMS OF INTERPRETATION, THE ALERT TEACHER WILL TRY TO DEVELOP IN THEM A GREATER APPRECIATION OF THE LASTING VALUES OF HISTORY.** For those who already like it—and there are many—no justification for its study is really necessary. But for those who, for one reason or another, might have misconceptions or distorted views concerning its goals, the following reasons for its justification, among others, may be helpful. 1. History will give a better understanding of modern civilization by explaining how our institutions—political, social, economic, religious—came into existence and what historical forces are at work in modifying them. 2. It helps to interpret current events by providing the necessary background for them. It often furnishes the why for their occurrence. 3. It gives one perspective, or the long view, so important for the understanding of events, both past and present. 4. It provides an excellent background for other courses and fields, such as those in literature, art, government, law, and journalism. 5. It sharpens one's critical faculties by providing opportunities to make historical comparisons and to sift and weigh historical evidence. 6. It often develops a sense of sympathy and toleration for other classes, races, and nations. Prejudices and ill feeling, often rooted in ignorance, are more likely to disappear with a knowledge of the historical background of these groups. 7. It enriches travel experiences. Obviously, the traveler will derive greater pleasure and satisfaction from his itineraries if he knows something about the history of the places and countries he plans to visit. 8. By acquainting the student with his cultural heritage, it introduces him to man's achievements in art, literature, and science.

Walter, I know, would add still other reasons for the study of history. But more, in his lectures he would take
the opportunity to consider other matters concerning the study and teaching of history with his students, such as the complexity of the historical process, historical causation, the biographical and psychological approaches to history, the impact of modern secular ideologies (nationalism, communism, fascism, for example) on history and historical scholarship, and the theory and philosophy of history. For further elaboration on these and related topics, he is much better prepared than I.

With these few reminiscences and reflections, I wish to pay tribute to my brother as a teacher and a scholar. For the years ahead, I hope that new horizons and vistas will open up before him in his quest for fresh insights into history. Above all, I wish him and Della, together with his family, God's richest blessings.

A CHRONOLOGY

1897 - Born on July 22 in Chicago, Illinois, the son of Theresa Ann (Schwotzer) and Anton Ernst Bauer.
1915 - Completed four years of high school at Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Indiana.
1917 - Completed two more years of study at Fort Wayne and enrolled in the Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis.
1918 - Served as Vicar at Trinity Lutheran Church, Petit Jean Mountain, Arkansas.
1919 - Studied during the summer at the University of Chicago.
1921 - Received a diploma from the Seminary and begun study for the Master's degree at Columbia University.
1922 - Received Master's and accepted a teaching fellowship to Harvard University and served as instructor in German. For his work, he received the Certificate of Merit and a lifetime offer of a teaching position at Harvard.
1923 - Was ordained and accepted a call to be Pastor at Trinity Lutheran Church, Scarsdale, New York.
1924 - Became a part-time instructor at Concordia College, Bronxville, New York.
1925 - Married Clara (Brauer) Bauer.
1926 - Accepted appointment as instructor of History at Valparaiso University.
1932 - Completed the Ph.D. at Cornell University.
1936 - Named Director of Valparaiso University's Lutheran University Hour on radio station WIND in Gary, Indiana.
1942 - The Lutheran University Hour moved to station WCFL in Chicago and Professor Bauer continued as the program's director.
1946 - Became Head of the Department of History, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Dean of the Faculty; member, Social Ethics Seminar in the University.
1956 - Clara Bauer died.
1957 - Resigned as Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; married Della Maria Krentz.
1962 - Became Dean Emeritus of the Faculty.
1966 - Was named as Distinguished Service Professor and received Honorary Alumni Award.
1967 - Resigned as Head of the Department of History; became Exchange Professor of History at California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks.
1968 - Named as Director of the International Studies Program, Reutlingen, Germany.
1973 - Named Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus; the Department of History established the Walter E. Bauer Award for student research in history.
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A PERSPECTIVE ON HISTORIANS
IN TWENTIETH CENTURY AMERICA

The purpose of this essay is to provide a framework that will help one to understand the men and women who have engaged in the craft of history in this country during this century and to offer a particular focus on those who practice it today. Two basic questions will be pursued. First, what has been the general line of development followed by historians? Second, how can their present status be described?

AT FIRST GLANCE THE DEVELOPMENT OF American historians during the last hundred years appears to have been a quarrelsome and disjointed experience. Despite the knowledge expansion of our century, there has yet to appear, and probably will not appear, a clear theoretical consensus among historians regarding the nature of their discipline. As Roland Stromberg has reflected, "historians are not usually comfortable when theorizing about their work; they prefer to do it, plunging in with energy, determination, and a rough-and-ready empiricism." When they have reflected on the nature of their work, and they are increasingly engaging in such commentary, they have by no means spoken in one voice. No doubt this is related to the difficulty commonly associated with defining the term "history."

That history lacks universal definition should surprise no one. To the contrary, it would be surprising if any area of knowledge as expansive as history's domain would give itself to precise definition. To do so would rob a highly personal subject of its individuality; it would dull history's creative edge. More to the point, aside from tentative, functional, and partial definitions, the essence of history lies not in abstract definition. History is what the historians make it. It changes as historians themselves change, it moves and develops. Understanding history is, then, first of all a matter of understanding historians. The purpose of this essay is to provide a framework that will help one to understand the men and women who have engaged in the craft of history in this country during this century and to offer a particular focus on those who practice it today. Two basic questions will be pursued. First, what has been the general line of development followed by historians? Second, how can their present status be described?

The first question takes us back to that "Golden Age of History," the nineteenth century, to a time when the art of history mirrored the broader themes that moved through the age. History then was frequently cast in a romantic or nationalistic mold, or in some other way that reflected the times. Written by men who were in many instances as much philosophers as they were historians, it seldom failed to be of interest. History, created by writers like Francis Parkman or George Bancroft, was exciting, moving, compelling. Of the romantic strain that permeates writing such as theirs, C. V. Wedgewood comments that it could lead to a "picturesque idealization and poetization of history" and could lend itself to "follies and excesses." Of course, as Wedgewood also suggests, the romantic historians contributed to a fuller

1. Unless otherwise specified, all references in this essay are to American historians or to European historians who have had a following in this country.

James D. Starit is Professor of History at Valparaiso University. He received the BA (1957), the MA (1961), and the PhD (1965) from the University of Maryland.

* The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance he received in writing this essay from his colleagues Willis Boyd and Dean Kohlhoff.
understanding of the past. The essential point is that historians in the nineteenth century were different in many ways from those in the twentieth. They were more subjective, more distinctly amateurs, more forceful, and more outwardly individualistic. In our century historians have striven for objectivity and have become decidedly more professional.

In fact, the growth of professionalism is the most striking development that characterizes historians in the last hundred years. Since the time of Herodotus there have been historians, and by the nineteenth century history had become one of the most vigorous forms of writing and an accepted subject in schools and in liberal arts colleges. Nevertheless, little attention was given to it in universities and until the final decades of the last century there was little sense of professionalism among historians comparable to that enjoyed by theologians, doctors, and lawyers. At that time the distinction began to appear between the amateur and the full-time professional in many fields. The growth of universities, graduate schools, libraries, and archives provided the institutional facilities necessary for the emergence of historians as a professional group. Professionalism also came as a result of a new sense of purpose that historians themselves acquired.

When one considers the approximately fifteen thousand professional historians who today teach and write history as their prime work in life, it is difficult to imagine that small group of forty-one men who gathered at Saratoga, New York, in 1884 to form the American Historical Association. Led by Herbert Baxter Adams of Johns Hopkins University, they represented a nucleus that grew and gave direction to the increasing number of historians in this country. Original research, a critical attitude, and a scientific intent rather than theoretical schemes and broad interpretations of history marked their work. They wished to discover the true past and to impart that truth. Thoroughly scholarly, they thought of themselves as performing a duty to society. Their writing, firmly anchored in original resources, tended to be more narrow and exhaustive, more monographic in nature than those sweeping epics that patrician-historians before them had written. For the most part, the new professionals came from the Northeast and they felt a certain kinship to their counterparts in Western Europe. They were especially under the influence of the famous nineteenth-century German historian, Leopold von Ranke.

Ranke, who was elected in 1884 as the first honorary

4. Boyd Shafer, Michel Francois, Wolfgang Mommsen, and A. Taylor Milne, Historical Study in the West (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968), p. 189. This figure does not include the more than 60,000 teachers who conduct high school classes in history, or those who teach history at the college level under a title other than history. It includes neither graduate students who may have handled a limited number of history courses nor librarians and archivists.


Some historians demanded a revision of history, a "New History." This "New History," a term coined by James Harvey Robinson, aimed to broaden the base of historical inquiry and make it deliberately "present minded." member of the American Historical Association, is an example of the right man at the right time. Nineteenth century Europe inherited a strong scientific tradition from the Enlightenment and Ranke was literally a workhorse in adapting the scientific spirit to history. He trained his students to penetrate to the sources of history, to be critical and precise. The seminar came to be indicative of his methodological pursuit of the real past. He had his forerunners, to be sure (the names Barthold Georg Niebuhr and Giambattista Vico cross one's mind), but it was Ranke who popularized the new scientific history by attacking the weaknesses of history as it was written in his day. In the process he helped to establish history as an academic discipline in many places including the United States where he influenced an entire generation of new professionals. By the end of the century the Rankean method had become the standard. When J. B. Bury succeeded Lord Acton as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge in 1902, he could announce in his Inaugural Lecture that "though she may supply material for literary art or philosophical speculation, she (history) is herself simply a science, no less, no more."5

Thus begun and shaped, the professional identity of historians grew over the ensuing decades. The training of historians was regularized. In the 1880s the Ph.D. in history was first introduced; by the mid-twentieth century it became the accepted requirement for an academic position. Standards for historical scholarship were set mainly by graduate facilities. History came to play a large role in graduate as well as undergraduate program, and the American Historical Association gained recognition as the "official representative of historians in the United States." This association, for instance, represents historians in the American Council of Learned Societies as well as in other national and international associations. It is consulted by the government when the "voice of historians" is needed.6 In time, other regional or specialized historical associations appeared to augment the organization of historians according to their special interests. A similar expansion occurred with the appearance of new professional journals, though almost from the first, The American Historical Review (founded
After the second World War American historians began to take a greater interest in European history and showed a particular awareness of America as a part of the Western community. They extended their interest in the study of Africa, the Middle East, and the Far East.

in 1895) has remained the most important and most prestigious historical publication in this country.

BY 1910 A SECOND GENERATION OF PROFESSIONAL historians began to appear, and they differed from their predecessors. Mostly trained in American graduate schools rather than abroad (especially in Germany), they were more interested in popular movements and social-economic conflicts than writing about the past politics of ruling elites. Many of the newcomers were products of the Middle West and reflected the influence of the Progressive Movement. With leaders such as Frederick Jackson Turner and Charles A. Beard, they became more sensitive to protest and reform than the professionals who preceded them. Some of these historians demanded a revision of history, a "New History." This "New History," a term coined by James Harvey Robinson, aimed to broaden the base of historical inquiry and make it deliberately "present minded." Historians of the school wanted history to be "relevant" and to that end they were attracted to economic and intellectual trends. But in their own way they thought of themselves as scientific as their predecessors and shared their doubts about literature and philosophy.

In the 1930s, however, "New History" lost its vogue. But at that very time one aspect of the "New History," its concern with values, gained ascendancy. "Long before the relativistic implications of the New History touched other historians," writes John Higham, "they were troubling the agile mind of Carl Becker." This son of a "rock-ribbed Iowa Methodist" farmer has to be one of the most interesting figures among American historians. A student of both Turner and Beard, he learned from the New Historians but moved beyond them. He accepted their relativistic present-mindedness but questioned their scientific pretensions. To Becker historical facts became "mental images" shaped by the present. Although Becker began his rejection of scientific history as early as 1910, not until the post-war twenties and thirties did his ideas gain significant acceptance among his colleagues. Becker, who was himself a fine stylist, also gave history a push back towards literature and philosophy. Meanwhile, in the thirties historical scholars were beginning to show a greater interest in the field of intellectual history.

During the time that the second generation of professionals held the stage, history appeared, as Arthur Marwick observes, to be moving toward either the "economic imperative" or "the idea." Both trends can be understood as results of the time. The interest in economic history came out of the nineteenth century and was underscored by events and issues that permeated the twentieth century; and the thrust into intellectual history, in no small way, reflected the profound sense of doubt that was so widespread in the West during the early decades of this century. Although many historians would question that historical truth lay with either the economic reality or the "idea" and would claim that it existed between both extremes perhaps touching each, the fact remains that historians of the Robinson, Beard, and Becker variety searched for a meaningful past. They pushed out the frontiers of their discipline in the hope that their efforts would serve society.

A THIRD GENERATION OF HISTORIANS CAN be discerned after the Second World War. On the surface, the changes are easy enough to detect. These historians showed a greater interest in the narrative element in their work than did the men of the pre-war period and, perhaps as the result of a growing attention paid to European historians and philosophers, E. H. Carr and R. G. Collingwood especially, they became more speculative. Without losing its scientific moorings, history's ties with the humanities were strengthened. Moreover, the interest range of historians expanded, no doubt as a result of contacts with the world beyond America made during the war and because of the reality of the shrinking world. Although the serious expansion of the scope of American historians' work dates from the First World War era, it became much more pronounced at this time. American historians began to take a greater interest in European history and showed a particular awareness of America as a part of the Western community. They extended their interest in the study of Africa, the Middle East, and the Far East. Meanwhile, in American history they explored new aspects of old subject areas and pushed out into some underdeveloped fields such as Black history, immigration history, and urban history.

Of equal significance, the posture of history was changing again. Increasingly, historians reacted against the old tendency to subordinate history to the social sciences. This reaction was, in part, a rejection of the old idea of subordinating the past to the present; in part, it resulted from the feeling that science could not explain all things. Whatever its basis, the reaction reflected a growing sense of maturity among historians themselves.


In 1948 Roy Nichols published an important article that pointed the way to an independent future. History, he said, was neither science nor art. It was independent of either with elements of both. "During the 1950's," John Higham observes, "the attitudes vaguely prefigured in Nicholl's essay in 1948 became the dominant outlook in the American historical profession." Historians, to be sure, continued to grapple with the old issues, but they were enslaved to none. Art, science, and relativism can be detected in their work, but now they were integrated as elements of a new posture. The average historian today, the "Straight-Line Professional," as Arthur Marwick calls him, operates "with a vague mixture of Rankean 'scientific' history lightened by a few dabs of relativism."  

The post World War II years became one of the most fruitful periods experienced by historians in this country. A growing interest in history found its counterpart in an increasing sense of confidence among historians. As historians discovered their audience expanding, both in the nation at large and on the college campus, they reached a new level of productivity in their writings and activity. Symbolic of the new popularity, the American Historical Association tripled its membership between 1953 and 1965. History became the largest field among the humanistic disciplines. Such growth and security, however, failed to survive the decade of the sixties.  

During the second half of that decade, tensions mounted within the profession as the historians' audience declined in size. Like other disciplines, history was plagued by the general culture malaise that permeated those years, and by the effects that our involvement in Vietnam had on American society at large, and on the academic community in particular. The climate of opinion shaped by the sixties contained elements of thought and feeling that were disconcerting to historians. As the clamor for "relevance" intensified, history acquired an "irrelevant" image in the minds of many people. Some existentialist writers, along with a larger group that developed into a present-minded cult, criticized history and even spoke of the burden of the past. Such critics symbolized the drift away from history. It was this drift that C. Vann Woodward had in mind when he placed the phenomenon in its proper perspective by reflecting: "The fortunes and vitalities of learned disciplines, history as well as the others, vary considerably from period to period. Decades of confidence are followed by eras of hesitation and marking time."

Although it is too early to appreciate the full nature of the drift and to say how far it will go, this much is clear at the present. If there are signs of dismay for history, as there are for the humanities in general, there are counterbalancing signs of encouragement. There are already indications, for instance, that the attractiveness of relevancy as a feeling that shapes interest has begun to wane. In regard to the idea that history is a burden, several contravening persuasions exist. The first is that the idea of history as burden relates more to the past as a present force than it does to history. Second, the idea logically finds its counterpart in its opposite. If we can speak of the burden of the past, we can also speak of the burden of being ignorant of the past. Surely in our own century examples of suffering caused in part by ignorance of the past or by knowledge of a distorted past would be easy enough to find. As "custodians of the past" historians discharge a responsibility that serves society in the broadest sense, and there is every indication that they intend to continue in that service and that a large number of people on campus communities and beyond recognize that such an effort must be made. Speaking to this point, and to my knowledge the contention has never been stated better, C. Vann Woodward recently said of history: "There is no other branch of learning better qualified to mediate between man's daydream of the future and his nightmare of the past, or, for that matter, between his nightmare of the future and his daydream of the past. So long as man remains recognizably human, he will remain a creature with both a past and a future." Regardless, or perhaps because of, the cultural shock occasioned by two world wars, Nazi excesses, the atom bomb, plus a number of trends that Walter Lippmann once labeled "the acids of modernity," historians in general join C. Vann Woodward in believing that man "is not a creature who can safely turn away from history."

BEYOND THAT, HISTORIANS FIND REASSURANCE in a number of recent internal developments within the profession. There has been a new emphasis on the teaching of history, an old concern often broached before. Today the tendency among historians is to approach the teaching of the discipline as continuum of, rather than an activity apart from, their other professional interests. Expansion of the profession continues. The point is underscored not only by the current inter-
As "custodians of the past" historians discharge a responsibility that serves society in the broadest sense, and there is every indication that they intend to continue in that service.

The history of the radical tradition in America is a case shown in new fields such as urban and Black history but also in methodological trends.

Indicative of these trends is the interest now taken in comparative studies, quantification, and radical history. Recent attention to comparative history is the natural outgrowth of several things. It represents an attempt to correct a tendency toward over-specialization and it is part of the endeavor to place our own historical experience in a wider setting. Quantification is not altogether new to historians who have "counted" for a long time. Nevertheless, it has been their custom to use impressionistic terms such as "few," "some," "most," "many," and "normal." Quantification, facilitated in some cases by the computer, which can hasten an otherwise long and tiresome process, is a tool for historians to use. It can replace imprecision with precision. Furthermore, it is of service when one confronts the problem of content analysis. The historian, for instance, will find quantification techniques useful in probing group identities, and they can sharpen a profile that encompasses attitudes or patterns of thought. Radical, or "New Left," history can mean several things. To some it means delving into ignored areas of our "hidden heritage." The history of the radical tradition in America is a case in point. To others it can mean searching the past as a background for involvement in social action in the present. The radicals are concerned about the neutrality that is so valued by historians; they represent a rebellion against a consensus view of the past, popular in recent American historical writing. Consensus historians, they claim, underestimate the element of struggle in history.

There are limitations to all three of these trends. Comparative history can be reckless and can lead to forced analogies. In regard to quantitative history, Lester Stephens offers this sound advice: "It may be well to remind ourselves that history is still basically a humanistic study, and quantification is useful to historical research only insofar as it helps us to understand human beings in the past. The lure of certainty and exactness inherent in quantified studies may draw the historian into a cave of deception if he does not remain alert to its limitations." Radical history is vulnerable on at least two points. David H. Fischer and others chide the radicals for being "methodologically reactionary," and claim their history is "impressionistic, technically unsophisticated, and conceptually unoriginal." Probable the most common criticism of the New Left, however, concerns its obvious present-mindedness. As Irwin Unger reflects, "it suggests a contempt for pure history, history that is not enlisted in the good fight." Comparative, quantitative, and radical history, flaws notwithstanding, are indications of history's present vitality. As trends, they are easy to overstate but too important to overlook.

**HISTORY TODAY, THEN, IS A STRONG, VIGOROUS discipline, broadly designed to accommodate a wide variety of interests as well as methodological approaches. It is the result of a tradition that stretches back to the nineteenth century and beyond. The tradition itself grew in an enveloping manner. Each generation of historians had its pioneers who challenged and advanced the frontier of historical knowledge, but the efforts of these pioneers usually rested on breakthroughs made at an earlier date. Regardless, each generation had a character of its own. More important is the tradition that one can detect. Rooted in the past, it continues to expand in the present. It evolved through the generations, gradually gained strength and acquired a sense of autonomy.

This tradition provides historians with a point of common departure. They know that others before them have grappled with questions about the past very much as they do. And, they know that today they are a part of a large group of professionals with whom they share mutual interests and concerns. This brings us to the second basic question of the essay: what is the present status of historians?

Admittedly, this is a nebulous matter to describe, but the idea of autonomy of history provides us with a starting point. It furnishes a focus on how we see ourselves in relation to other disciplines and it leads us to ask what, if any, are the common assumptions shared by historians as a group. The claim to autonomy that historians make is an outgrowth of their conviction that they look at the past in a particular way. Since many other disciplinarians study the past for their own purpose, it might be asked just what is unique about the historians' approach? Geoffrey Elton claims: "The answer lies in three habits peculiar to history: its concern with events, its concern with change and its concern with the particular." Historians are indeed concerned with explaining events; and, as Pardon Tillinghast reminds

---

At various times in the past, history was treated, to a large extent, as a branch of theology or philosophy. Nevertheless, the common base that at one time drew them together is now a matter of past experience. A glance at the basic direction that Western historiography has followed helps to explain how this happened. History owes the debt of its origin to the ancient Near East as well as to the Greece of antiquity. "Just as the combination of Greek and Hebraic elements formed Western Civilization in general," explains Roland Stromberg, "the combination of the two elements produced the Western sense of history: in origin, the meaningfulness of time was Judaic-Christian; the self-determination of man, Hellenic." 21 It was in ancient Greece that history gained its synthesis of expression, and in our own time historians still pay homage to Herodotus as "The Father of History." Once established, the historical tradition was passed on to the Romans and, later yet, it became a major cultural concern in the Byzantine world. In the medieval West, however, notwithstanding some exceptions of note, the tradition declined sharply. "The scholastic method as it developed in the Middle Ages was an utterly unhistorical, if not anti-historical method," E. H. Harbison has observed. "History had little if any real interest for the profoundest thinkers of the age." 22 Modern history owes a great deal to the classical and Christian traditions, but its modern status is largely the result of the post-medieval world and represents a movement away from the assumptions upon which much of medieval scholarship was premised. In the modern world the role once performed by medieval scholmen was transferred to systematists of a different sort. Philosophers of history searched the past, like their medieval predecessors, for the "meaning of history." The "unity underneath" the surface of events is what interested them; they tried to discover the powerful force that "has woven the great web of History." Systematic historians, Jacques Barzun and Henry F. Graff observe, "in short are committed to the doctrine of the Single Cause." 23 These systematists had a wide following as late as the nineteenth century. After that, the appeal of their concepts waned.

Philosophers themselves are concerned with historical matters, but they approach them in a different way. They ask questions of their own about "the truth," the "how," and the "why" of an event and are more interested than orthodox historians in the relationship between facts and concepts. The historian approaches an event in a more practical manner and traditionally has shown little interest in the philosophers' contentions. The reverse is true for philosophers. One contemporary philosopher, Haskell Fain, opens his engaging book Between Philosophy and History with the comment: "History has been either unfairly treated or ignored by most philosophers in the Anglo-American tradition." Later in that volume he becomes even more specific when he writes that "it is not unfair to characterize most Anglo-American philosophy from the eighteenth century on as profoundly ahistorical in temperament." 24

Of the relationship between theologians and historians in our century Pardon Tillinghast writes: "Although most working historians have not developed great excitement over philosophical discussions, their animosity to the efforts of the theologians has become rather acute." Just why this is so is not altogether clear, but there are a few clues that help one to understand the basic nature of their differences. Theologians argue that man's past taken by itself has no meaning; consequently, they approach history with metaphysical assumptions—that at least with certain accepted principles already in mind. Assuming that Christianity is true while other religions are false, they reveal their faith when exploring the past. Theologians are concerned with knowing the ultimate meaning of the human experience and arrive at judgments that encompass "the total human-divine pattern which is their primary concern." 25 Historians, more concerned with the meaning of events rather than conceptualization of events, are more skeptical. They assume that people today can find value in studying

---

22. Quoted in ibid., p. 25.
Modern history owes a great deal to the classical and Christian traditions, but its modern status is largely the result of the post-medieval world and represents a movement away from the assumptions upon which much of medieval scholarship was premised.

what people did in the past. Barriers between the theologians and the historians are by no means impregnable, but theologians have displayed more interest in penetrating them than historians. Most orthodox historians, men like Christopher Dawson excepted, agree with E. H. Carr who writes that "history is a game played, so to speak, without a joker in the pack."26 They tend to compartmentalize their faith and their work. Still, they remain interested in what the theologian says because they need to know themselves and because they realize that they do, after all, put a good deal of themselves into their work. Moreover, they are always concerned about concepts of time, and on this topic theologians have much to say. It might be added that in 1948 Kenneth Scott Latourette devoted his presidential address to the American Historical Association to the topic: "The Christian Understanding of History." In that address he argued that questions about pattern, meaning, and direction are important to the historian and that "history must be seen in its entire setting and that that setting is the universe."27 He also dealt with the influence of the Western Christian experience as an historical element and the way in which it has transformed, or helped to transform, either suddenly or gradually, Western culture and life.

THE IDEA THAT HISTORIANS STAND APART from others brings us to the old yet always current question: is history part of the humanities or is it a science of some description? Occasionally, it surfaces in a confusing, even humorous way. At my own university, curriculum designers, no doubt with the best intentions in mind, categorized history as a subject in the humanities as well as one in the social sciences. Established as either, in fact, we are neither. On the one side, there is little question that history is closely related to the humanities if that term is broadly defined as humane studies. But if it is narrowed to mean man's great achievements in literature, philosophy, and perhaps the fine arts, then history does not fit into the category. Concerned with what man has done as well as what he has created, history rests on a different and more practical base. Historians, for instance, are attracted to the verifiable record of man's actions in social, economic, and political realms. Nevertheless, the relationship between history and the humanities is a compatible one. Knowledge of subjects covered in the humanities increases our comprehension of history, and the reverse is also true.

It might be questioned if a similar compatible spirit characterizes history's relationship to the social (more recently the behavioral) sciences. Although many things draw history toward the social sciences, it would seem that differences remain to give history a separate status. Historians approach the past in a different manner and from a different perspective than the social scientists. They are, for instance, constantly involved in value judgments, more interested in narrative, less able to measure, less drawn to quantitative analysis, and since history does not repeat itself, far less concerned with repetitive phenomena than social scientists. Historians, moreover, are less attracted to "factor analysis" than social scientists and J. H. Hexter goes to great length to suggest that "factor analysis" if carried to its logical conclusion tends "to dissolve and destroy...[the] tendons and ligaments that hold historical stories together."28 Although the differences that separate historians and social scientists are much more extensive and involved than sketched above, perhaps enough has been said to underscore the idea that history in the twentieth century has encountered a transformation resulting in clearer understanding of its focus. It has become an independent academic discipline.

Before proceeding further, several observations should be made. First, discussions on the nature of history are frequently confused by the fact that until recently many people who have commented on it have not been historians. Since the key to understanding history lies in doing history, such comments can be either misleading or confusing. Second, the fact that history, like other academic disciplines, has become autonomous does not mean that historians wish to isolate themselves from the "Sister Disciplines." To the contrary, many lines of common interest run between the disciplines. Considering the gigantic body of knowledge that the modern scholar contemplates and the demographic and technological changes that are so characteristic of the twentieth century, it is clear that historians need to keep abreast of related work in associated fields of knowledge. Even if they are not social scientists themselves they have, as Richard Hofstadter said, many contacts with the social scientist. The reverse is surely just as true. Finally, the question is sometimes raised, not by historians but by others, about whether or not there is a separate field called history. Is it not simply a dimension of some other subject? Could not the political sci-

Historians today would all agree that their work must be conducted in an atmosphere that emancipates rather than crushes the mind. A free environment, as a condition, is the irreducible minimum that is necessary for the conduct of an unfettered and critical exploration of the past.

THERE IS VALUE IN THE CONTINUING DEBATE over whether history is part of humanities or one of the social sciences. It forces a clearer delineation of the term history and, consequently, gives sharper definition to the work of historians. Arthur Marwick’s term “Straight Line Professional” applies here as well as it does to the methodology employed by historians. It can be argued that most historians are positioned with one foot extended towards the humanities and the other towards the sciences. Another useful perspective that can help us understand the status of the men and women who are the present practitioners of the craft can be found in considering the common assumptions that they share. Of course, such a consideration is a broad proposition; the brief account that follows is intended merely as a suggestive introduction.

Although they are different in many ways, historians today do share a number of common interests. They would all agree, for instance, that their work must be conducted in an atmosphere that emancipates rather than crushes the mind. A free environment, as a condition, is the irreducible minimum that is necessary for the conduct of an unfettered and critical exploration of the past. Likewise, all historians would agree that their work serves a purpose. So much has been written to support this claim that it is superfluous to elaborate at length on the purposes themselves. They vary of course, from historian to historian, but all would agree that it has an educative value, it broadens one’s mental horizons, flexes one’s mind, builds perspective, and provides a rational as well as an integrative way of looking into the past. Would not all historians today agree with Carl Becker’s observation: “History prepares men to live more fluently in the present, and to meet, rather than foretell, the future”?20 The point is obvious and should not have to be made; unfortunately, there is too much evidence today that proves that it must be made.

Historians would also agree that they are involved in a “subjective process of re-creation.” There is no doubt that we have been shaped by the events that have most influenced our time and, like historians in all ages, we

...
If education is more than a life experience, then what is it? Is it not a process that deals with the development of the mind? History along with other disciplines addresses itself to doing just that. It is geared to arouse, expand, and direct the mind and to equip it with a sense of standards.

Itally the methods of research? It is even a part of an undergraduate history major’s work, and any failure to make it so would be a mistake of the first order. History minus research would be as empty as history minus standards. There is, of course, no one type of research any more than there is one type of historical method. It varies with the interests of the historian who does the searching. Nevertheless, for most historians research is the bedrock of their professional activity.

Most practicing historians attach significance to history as a creative narrative. Early in the century a good deal of history lost its narrative appeal. The nineteenth-century masters were usually powerful writers, but as history became more scientific it became duller. Yet even at that time voices were raised to alert others to dangers involved in history as science. The most engaging was that of George Macaulay Trevelyan who in 1913 asked that Clio be rediscovered and warned that the scientific historians had “neglected what is after all the principal craft of the historian—the art of narrative.” There followed a dispute, which was interwoven among the issues that shaped history’s development as sketched in this essay, that has continued to the present time on the question of whether history is an art or a science. Of course, the answer depends on what is meant by either term, but a consensus of opinion is detectable today.

Many appraisals of history by historians in recent years claim that history communicates in a narrative way. Although the same could be said for many disciplines, there are several things that together distinguish the historical narrative. Based on the materials of the past, it provides a framework for interpreting those materials in their proper setting. As a narrative it is written in language that relates, as Carl Becker said, to “Mr. Everyman.” But if the language of the narrative seems easy to understand, it should not be forgotten as Trevelyan warned us that “what is easy to read has been difficult to write.” The point pertains to the questions the historian asks as well as to the elements of clear and attractive exposition. The historical narrative is a record-based, analytical, and integrative one. It should produce what J. H. Hexter calls “processive explanation.” As a narrative it delineates (rather than measures) and engages the past as much on its own terms as it is possible to do; it probes for the truth of an historical reality through sympathetic understanding.

Finally, historians unite in contending that history deserves a significant place in the curriculum and life of institutions of higher education. If education is more than a life experience, then what is it? Is it not a process that deals with the development of the mind? History along with other disciplines addresses itself to doing just that. It is geared to arouse, expand, and direct the mind and to equip it with a sense of standards. In short, it concerns itself with the rational process. It is, again like other disciplines, devoted to scholarship. Because scholarship is essential to modern life, and because it can flourish at no other place in our society as it can at the college or university, the commitment of institutions of higher learning to scholarship is obvious. Historians, in kinship with scholars in many fields, are attached to this commitment. Furthermore, when one contemplates the unique historical consciousness of our Western Civilization, the importance of the long and time-honored tradition of historical scholarship becomes clear. It lies near the center rather than on the fringe of college and university activity.

There remain several other reasons that substantiate the rationale for history’s place in the college and university curriculum. It represents, for instance, a jargon-free exploration of an important part of what man has done. Knowing that, we are able at least to glimpse at what man can do. Perhaps it instills a type of restraint on our expectations. Moreover, considering present forces of intellectual and cultural fragmentation as well as an all too widespread anti-intellectualism, history’s commitment to wholeness acquires a special meaning. In an age like our own, which manifests cultural chaos, growing parochialism, a retreat to self, lowering of standards, and flights to mysticism of one form or another, people feel a sense of loss. Among those things that appear to have been lost is historical perspective, and historians believe it should be restored. They are not suggesting that we return to old-fashioned notions of progress, though progress does exist and should be comprehended, but neither are they content with the idea that the guilt-ridden and self-doubting syndrome as a guide to the past is a healthy thing for society. Mistakes abound in the past and so do achievements; without a clear historical perspective we can learn from neither.

When students come to the college or university campus, they will acquire a sense of the past. Like their counterparts in all walks of life, they will do so every day. The current nostalgia fad, which is suggestive in many ways, reminds us of this once again. Consequently, professors of history do not ask whether or not the students will acquire a mental framework for viewing

34. Ibid., p. 240.
that past. They will. The question professors must ask is, will it be acquired wisely?

At present historians face many new and some old problems, both within and without the discipline, but the role of history as a major scholarly resource is established beyond doubt. It should surprise no one that historians, who claim to be able to understand a different people who lived in a different time, believe that they rather than others should continue in the work they were trained to do: to decipher the past in a fair, critical, and intelligible manner in the belief that the result will serve the best interests of society. That is, after all, what the men who reshaped history nearly a hundred years ago had in mind.

GARY STEEL PLANT

One should be able to say things like:
"Pig iron, squat and grunting in corners"
"Ladies dipping metal like soup; running it into the wombs of mothering forms,"
but there are no corners here;
the fire shifts space as though it were setting steel beams in frames. The dippers camp discreetly in another room.

Everything goes by tracks, overhead or below. The Bessemer converters swing on gimbals big as a man's head:
a Ukrainian Jew's, perhaps, or the head of one of these Polish tough-boys eating thick sausage, eyes fired by steel into savage recesses.

Its mouth is always open, a gaping wound waiting for the lance. The lining covers its thin walls, holds back the fire; then, through that hole the lance slips, oiling the air it cuts smooth as icing, breathing pure oxygen through its welded lip. This is the heart of the process. Oxygen pumped in over metal, the surgeon's delicate long instrument bringing fire, bursting into the eyeless body; a trick, fire making flowers come out of the mouth. It is done by wire and relays from a room on the other side.

Then the beast rests. What can one do but pant, giving birth? It holds its sides stiff and charred afraid to move, frightened of the load it has not yet delivered. Then it heaves itself over, empties itself into the waiting trucks.

STUART SILVERMAN

September, 1975
IT WOULD SURELY BE STRANGE IF, IN THESE
days after Pentecost, we did not say something about the
on-going relationship of God's people with the living
Christ. The interchange between the living Christ and
his disciples comes into sharp focus, comes to a head and
repeated climax in the Christian assembly. Then the liv-
ing stones become really alive. They they actively func-
tion as priests. Then they offer those spiritual sacrifices
that St. Peter talks about in the Epistle.

The priesthood referred to here existed long before
we were born. That's first; that's primary. When you and
I came onto the scene, we were incorporated into it; we
had nothing to do with its establishment or its struc-
ture. We became members of an ancient family, and that,
if we viewed it rightly, gave us a great sense of security.
It means that we were not alone in an unfriendly world,
but had acquired a large number of brothers and sis-
ters, and above them all, a loving Father. Into what is at
once a fraternity and a sorority, and a world-wide one
to boot, we were initiated by the Sacrament of Holy
Baptism. Since that time we have lived in one chapter
house or another, presently in this Chapel of the Resur-
rection. There we have had our meals; there we have
been helped by the Word of God, both spoken and vis-
ible. It's been a most reassuring experience to be at
home in the Father's house.

We soon discovered, after we came into the family
that, precisely because that family had a long tradition,
there were certain ways of doing things. Some of these
practices, like Sunday bulletins, offering envelopes,
and mixed choirs, were fairly recent, but most of them
were quite ancient. The Church, we came to realize,
was inclined to be rather conservative in preserving
these customs; it had a feeling that in most cases they
were still of value, since the Christian faith was the same
as it had been in the beginning, and since human be-
ings, in spite of their radically altered environment,
had really not undergone any basic change. So many of
the traditions were kept because they still had validity.

It is the responsibility of every generation and in-
deed of each individual to rediscover the significance of
the Church's ways of expressing the ancient faith. Some-
times practices have lost their meaning and need to be
discarded; more often they have sufficient symbolic
value to be retained. Always, constantly, over and over
again, they need to be reviewed, explored, re-appre-
ciated. The purpose of this, as St. Peter would put it,
is that we might be "a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual
sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."

It is worth more than a passing note that the apostle
speaks here of a priesthood, not a haphazard collection
of priests, unrelated to one another, each doing his or
her own thing. In other words, he is talking here about
corporate worship, in which each worshiper fits himself
into a common project. We are, he says, "like living
stones built into a spiritual house." What we do, we do
together. This means that there must be some predeter-
nined structure to our common service. In short, there
must be a liturgy, and the origin of that word, as you may know, means “the people's work.”

**SO HERE WE ARE AGAIN IN THIS ROOM assembled to do the work of the people of God, and we are doing it in a pretty traditional way. May I now be a fiddler on the roof of your consciousness and ask you to ask yourself some questions about this tradition. Here I am, then, at the beginning of the service, kneeling with everybody else. Why am I doing this? Because the rubric on the bulletin says I should? There must be a better reason than that. Because religious people from time immemorial have bowed their knees in worship? That's better; but it is so very traditional. Because of the highly existential reason that “the Lord is a great God,” and his prophet says to me, “Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker”? That's adequate; it says that God IS and I AM, and we are undertaking to speak to each other, and in the relationship of the less to the greater, the sinner to the Holy One.

There are those chaps in white gowns, lugging that big book around from place to place, first to the reading desk, then back into the middle of the congregation, finally into the pulpit. Why are they doing that? Maybe they are trying to say that they regard this book as the compendium of divine revelation, that they think it highly important that its message continue to be proclaimed, that the record of the words and works of Jesus Christ are of paramount value, and that the old truths of the Bible be made relevant by somebody like me, who is attempting to do that very thing.

Here we are standing up and reciting in unison a creed that is now over sixteen hundred years old. Isn't that pretty dusty and moldy by now? Should we not try to come up with something a bit fresher and more contemporary? Maybe so, but, you see, the Church's use of this ancient statement of Nicea is her way of saying that the old verities are still that, that we moderns, like the ancients, continue to believe that God made all things, that his Son, Jesus Christ, for us men and for our salvation, suffered, died, and rose again, and that the Holy Spirit still calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church. As these things were in the beginning, so are they now.

Why are those people walking up the center aisle carrying those dishes and pitchers? Why are they placed so reverently on that table up front by one of those chaps in white, who, since last I looked at him, seems to have thrown over his body another garment that looks like a fancy Mexican poncho? Well, it is at this point, you see, that the people of God do in fact offer some sacrifices to God, although the question of whether or not they are acceptable sacrifices is one to which we shall have to return later. For the moment let us only observe that the people are returning to God what he has first given them, but are returning it as something which they have worked on. He has given them wheat and grapes; they have taken these and manufactured bread and wine, so that it may be said, as we may clearly say of the offered money, that they are presenting to God the fruit of their labors. The minister, who, once more to demonstrate the Church's conservatism, wears a garment which has been largely unchanged since Roman times, prepares to put these gifts into the service of God, so that they may again be returned to the people, but this time with a huge plus, or should we rather say, marked with the sign of the cross: the body and the blood of our Savior Jesus Christ.

Why do we then, a few moments later, all gather round, and having greeted people whom we don't know from Adam, kneel down with them to receive the same food and drink? Not only because Christ's people have been doing this since the beginning, but because this is still the sacramental bridge between him and us, because, as at Emmaus, he becomes known to us in the breaking of bread.

Why, at the end of the service, as I may have done several times before that, do I make the sign of the cross on my body? Because that is the traditional way of blessing oneself? Well, yes, but it is also a sign that even now I recognize that all God's blessings are climaxed in the cross, and that in Holy Baptism I have become a participant in and sharer of Jesus' death and resurrection. This too has unchanging validity: the event in which all history — and my own too — is centered.

**LET US CEASE THIS ITEMIZING; LET US stand off and look at the people's work from a distance. This is our job, this is our solemn responsibility, to take our places in the royal priesthood and to offer acceptable spiritual sacrifices through Jesus Christ. If we don't do it, we are "goofing off" in a way that is highly dangerous to our souls. But, on the other hand, if a man does his job only out of necessity, doing it in sheer boredom, perhaps even hating it, that man is to be pitied. Blessed is the man who finds joy in his work, who does it not only out of a sense of obligation, but because he considers it to be a privilege to be a co-worker with God in the on-going work of creation and redemption. However you may think of your daily work, think of the work of God, the doing of this liturgy, as being the most joyful thing in which you can engage, so that you will say and sing and do the things that are here prescribed with a thankful and happy heart. In this way your sacrifices will be acceptable to God, for God loves a cheerful giver. He will accept them as expressions of your faith and love, and you will go forth from his house ready to "declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."

This now leads into an altogether new side of this business of offering up spiritual sacrifices. For it will certainly be noted that nothing was said from the pulpit this morning about the function of a Christian priest in between church services. But that is Part II of this sermon, which will have to wait for another time and probably another preacher.
THE EIGHT STRANGERS clambered about, hurrying to stow themselves, their cameras, and their gear. The captain hollered “All aboard!” and the expedition embarked for eighteen days. We cruised not among uncharted seas, but down endless highways under trackless night skies. At the helm was George Strimbu, in real life a mercurial photography instructor whose duties outside Carmel had provided the opportunity or excuse for a photography field trip to the West.

George found many resources in his able crew: an assortment of personalities; an abundance of energy; a shortage of tempers; all contained in the four men and three women who came to reverence their captain with words like, “George, this is another fine mess you’ve gotten us into!” It was soon obvious that in the six-person motor home the eight-person crew was going to be “cozy” at best. (Many other adjectives were employed to describe the twenty-four hours times twenty square feet times eighteen days of togetherness of the group, “cozy” being a rather rose-colored view of the situation.)

But our spirits soared as high as the summits of the Rockies when they first appeared, and we gloried in the joys of our first stop—the showers at the University of Colorado in Boulder. That night, spent buried in a snow storm somewhere between Trinidad, Colorado and Raton, New Mexico, brought down the last strange barriers between the previously unacquainted crew members as they traded jokes, stories, and last wills and testaments.

When the skies and the pass simultaneously were cleared, the group pushed on for Taos, New Mexico. Traditionally among a tribal people, when a danger (imaginary or real) has passed there is rejoicing and feasting. With our drivers (nicknamed “Crash,” “A.J.,” “The Brake Kid,” and “The Mad Driver,” we were continually passing through danger. Thus, at the end of every day we came to enjoy landmark cuisine. We had tacos in Taos, sopapillas in Santa Fe, a 79¢ lunch in Las Vegas, and shellfish of all sorts in San Francisco. And Pepto-Bismol periodically. Of course, as to the rejoicing, we rejoiced at every available opportunity.

There was a grim side, too, to the rugged southwestern country which escaped neither the mind’s nor the camera’s eye. The many Pueblo Indian villages we visited in New Mexico evidenced the bleakest poverty and the apathy and despair of the people. But the Rocky Mountain range with its towering pinnacles and sparkling streams provided a perfect setting for the photographic expedition.
such poverty creates. The remaining vestiges of native pride pricked, then stabbed, at least some of the group members’ consciences, compelling one young man to paste to the bumper of our motor home the slogan “If you want to lose weight, move to a reservation.”

The motor home crawled through the canyons of New Mexico into the canyons of Arizona until coming to rest at the most magnificent of them all, the Grand Canyon. Ever searching for the exciting visual image, seven photographer-explorers descended to the depths of the Grand Canyon astride mules. George declined. We figured he had his wife and family to consider, though he mumbled something about having done it before. Though the jaunt caused spirits to tumble, no mules did; however, the guide was forced to stop seven times to retrieve lens caps and sunglasses and to urge bawky mules onward. Once the initial fatalistic attitude changed into adventurous enjoyment, the solid yet shadow-shifting beauty of the canyon was much photographed. As our guide put it, “The Canyon’s always changing; I never get tired of it. But the people...” Whereupon seven greenhorn cowpokes shared their lunches with him and one smitten female offered to marry him. But the heart of the tall-in-the-saddle, tough-on-the-range cowboy from Joliet, Illinois, was not to be moved.

That same night, weary and bowlegged, the travellers stopped beside the Hoover Dam. A low, sinister hum emanated from the dam, which rose monstrously phosphorescent against the black heavens. It seemed not to be anything made by man, but an ancient creation left long ago by alien people to honor some demon god whose dark omnipotence still trembled in the air.

It was a fitting gate to the hypnotic decadence of Las Vegas. The many oaths sworn to resist becoming Vegas’ prey had proved difficult if impossible to keep. It was hard to escape from the mesmerizing rhythm of the dice tables, or block out the fascinating ring of the jackpots. The sophistication of the gambling tables did not carry over to the crowd, which seemed to have come from the bowling lanes of mid-America. Outside, glinting against the desert sun, a mobile home village harbored the white, middle-class, elderly people who comprised at least half the casino’s patronage. Via the motor home, grandma and grandpa do not have to stay at home in the shade but have become one of the mobile forces of America, an elderly, toned-down version of the motorcycle gang.

We drifted, too, this time tired, and so at a more leisurely pace, up the Pacific coast highway. Weather along the ocean’s edge was sunny and windy—good growing weather for the restless spirit. We trekked with cameras up to a mountain waterfall and rambled through the mists and half-light of the Redwood forests. Not so romantically, one wanderer got both a ticket for trespassing and poison oak on the same afternoon.

Then we burst into that intoxicatingly exotic city, San Francisco. More than ready to meet the city, the group scattered in eight different directions, channeling their various energies into the composite currents which are San Francisco. The camera caught the great weathered fishing wharves, the densely oriental feeling of Chinatown, the cosmopolitan mystique of the San

Francisco pyramid, and in general the Camelot aura cast by the Golden Gate.

That night we all gathered together to take the trolley cars to Chinatown, got off too soon, and whetted our appetites by climbing the hills which make those trolley cars famous. The Far East met the Midwest at the edge of Chinatown in a bar called Vesuvio's, the alleged birthplace of the beatnik movement. It seemed typical of San Francisco that everything in the world was at your fingertips, so it was a jolt to leave for the trek home.

We crossed the vast deserts and craggy, lunar peaks of Nevada to Reno, then trundled down the ethereal stretches of the Great Salt Flats. Having already come some 4500 miles, we thought we'd seen and photographed everything in basic American landscapes. But the weird salt flats were still a shock. The powdery salt, like heavy hoarfrost, stretched for miles to the horizon, where mountains, water, and air swirled together, making it impossible to distinguish one element from another. Via Salt Lake City, which impressed us with its clean, quiet sense of authority, we came to Arches National Park. We discovered that the entire southeastern corner of Utah is a national park—there could be no better use for it. The glacial rock arches, soaring randomly under infinite glass-blue skies, were awesome. Back in Colorado again, we scurried from the comfort of the hot springs in Glenwood Springs to Denver, just ahead of a storm.

With our farewell to Denver, we said good-bye to the West and made plans to relive the experience of the trip together not only in memory but through the thousands of frames filled with what George termed "delicate images." Although there was really nothing delicate about most of the country we traveled through, one doesn't quarrel with a man who has just enabled seven people to travel more than six thousand miles.

The more we thought about it, the closer to each other we felt and the more memories we had to share. So there was really nothing left to do but fill the motor home's bathroom with Coors from "the last stop West" and head for Valparaiso to begin reminiscing and to start developing all those "delicate images."

George's cohorts in camera exploits were: Pat Kalmar, Ron Reigle, Jeff Ostrom, Dale Moser, Bob Gibbs, Cathy Cremer, and Jacki Lyden.
EVERYBODY CARRIES HIS whole world with him. It is not big­
ger and does not reach farther than his inner eye. We always stand at the
shore of an ocean and we constantly gaze from the heights of a mountain
into the depths. The end of the ho­
rizon is the same wherever we may be.
Everywhere is the natural confine­
ment in space.

Earthbound man dreams of fly­
ing as a symbolic gesture of his be­
ing. We desire to escape our every­
day feelings and find our way into
an imagined Sunday. We will never
get rid of our icarus dream. An ar­
cane, inexplicable desire so often
searches for things we do not have,
dream into modern terms and pushed
an imagined Sunday. We will never
asks to be where we are not. Ren­
cle and strong enough to capture
the dream about our greatness to the
shore of an ocean and we constantly
into the depths. The end of the

gaze from the heights of a mountain
Everywhere is the natural confine­
ment in space.

We should be afraid of bigness
which engenders more and more
bigness; of cartels, syndicates, and
professional prophets for the politi­
cal parties whose promises offer
damnation at reduced prices. Unfor­
tunately, bigness becomes man's
final place of appeal; it is authority
and power behind manipulating
hands which have a hold on every­
thing. Advertising techniques make
us believe that we are able to choose,
while in reality we are not. One day
we may be ruled by figures. Every­
thing abstract will then become dis­
proportionately immense, while
everything human will be reduced
to insignificance.

We can but reflect on the nucleus
of our littleness in order to become
aware of the inner greatness of our
being. We must daily try to break
out of the chains of a fictitious reality
in order, for example, to live with
the symbol of a tree. In the final
analysis, what is really important
lies in the seemingly insignificant.

Do we not praise quality before
quantity? Does not an epigram of­
ten contain more knowledge and
wisdom than a short-story; can a
short-story not be weightier than a
novella and a novella more pro­
found than a long novel? The Japan­
ese painter knows that he need not
paint a forest or a tree, but only the
branch of a tree, to conjure up in us
the wonders of spring. Michelangelo
saw the secret of beauty in the omiss­
ion of all superfluity. Leonardo
discovered that small rooms dis­
cline the mind, while large ones

distract it.

We can learn more from the es­

tence of smallness than from far­
reaching dimensions which ultima­
tely lead into infinity. If we feel
induced to escape the narrowness of
our being, the best and fastest way
leads through the deep within­
ness of our selves. There, and only there,
lies the wonder of the littleness of
human greatness.

ALL THIS AND MORE HAS
made me ponder for a long time
where I would like to be when the
sun of my life will have touched the
edge of the horizon. I am a born city
dweller with dreams of living among
trees. I looked for a small city with
gestures of cultural bigness. I found
it in Zurich, where the woody hills
reach—as if with caressing hands—
into the city, where lake and river
give it a rustic image, and yet where
a city of many contradictions rises
from their shores.

Being the country's largest small
city and commercial center, it is full
of brisk activities which those who
are not a part of it never feel. The
ordinary citizen rises early so as not
to forget that he is of peasant stock.
In addition, the Zürcher is attuned
to the competitive world of com­
cerce which his ambition has helped
him to master, and consequently
works longer hours. Despite the
seeming synchronization of the

clocks with the work world, this gar­
den city is full of trees and flowers
(even the windows of the soldiers’
barracks sport flower pots). Zurich's
scenic beauty stems in part from dis­
tant, snow-capped mountains, cre­
a ting a contagious air of resort-like
leisure. One can watch the sea gulls
at the Limmat River, which cuts
through the city, or feed the swans
and ducks on the lake.
A city lives, for me, when I can stroll through it, finding surprises hidden behind familiar sights; or when it pleases my eye and stimulates my senses. At first there seems to be something grave about the city's many towers and church spires. This is Zwingli's city but with Chagall windows in the Fraumünster Church; medieval-style buildings next to those with Baroque features stand among nineteenth-century and modern structures. But together they create a feeling of solidity reaching from yesterday into the future. In crooked lanes in the heart of the city it is not unusual to find birth dates of houses which go back to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Their medieval façades, however, hide totally modernized insides.

I like to walk streets that Goethe must have walked when he visited Johann Kaspar Lavater, whose studies of physiognomy intrigued him. ("Culture around Lake Zurich has really reached the highest point, and the time of vintage makes everything very lively," Goethe wrote.) Zurich has been a haven for many great minds, from Georg Büchner and Richard Wagner to Thomas Mann and countless others in our traumatically troubled and refugee-rich century.

Walking through the Altstadt, the old town of Zurich, and passing Spiegelgasse, I speculate about how often Lenin may have frequented the Café-Voltaire, the literary cabaret which gave birth to Dadaism during World War I. I sometimes imagine James Joyce walking there and thinking of another intricate passage for his *Ulysses*, (the greater part of which was written in Zurich, where Joyce lies buried). Or I try to find Thornton Wilder's favorite cafés and to figure out what made him write his most American play, *Our Town*, in Zurich.

Living with the past creates a stronger and more secure sense for experiencing the nowness of the day in this city which is culturally very much alive. Yet one would not notice culture with a capital C anymore than one can recognize a Swiss millionaire by his clothes, outward gestures, or habits. Zurich has more book stores than movie houses and certainly more book stores than banks, for which it is known worldwide. However, there are more restaurants and cafés than book stores, for Zurich is one of very few cities of central Europe still carrying on the nineteenth-century tradition of the leisurely coffeehouse life with touches of the once-flourishing literary atmosphere.

Since Pestalozzi's days (the world's greatest educator was born in Zurich) the city has never lost a taste for learning and teaching. An amazing variety of lectures is offered continuously by schools and museums. Even more surprising is the number of writers who, as their own interpreters, are regularly invited to read their works publicly or to talk about literary subjects. (Mary McCarthy, Eugene Ionesco, and James Baldwin will be there this year. I was assured that any well-known American author who happened to be in Europe would be invited to appear for such a public engagement in Zurich.)

This city does have plenty of movie houses and, despite a Zwinglian image of sobriety, has a goodly number of shows, cabarets, and bars. The saying of "les extrêmes ses touchent" can easily be applied to the city's many contradictions. It is indicative of this technologically modern place that one can find a farm right behind its second largest railway station; or while riding Zurich's trams on city streets one may be surprised suddenly to see sheep or cows grazing on a small meadow. The Zürcher, known to be matter-of-fact and withdrawn, lives with his doors closed but not locked, as if waiting for someone to knock and enter his life. He is far more outgoing and adventurous than the stigma of his sobriety would suggest; knowing what he owes his reputation, he is careful to let no one notice how passionate his real self is. Small wonder then that Zurich is a psychoanalytic stronghold. Eugen Bleuler, a son of Zurich, is the first to have worked with and influenced Freud and Jung; Hermann Rorschach, known for his inkblot tests, was also a Zürcher. Nowadays Zurich is mainly associated with Carl Gustav Jung and his institute, where most of the lectures are delivered in English since the majority of Jungian students come from the United States and England. The city recently celebrated the hundredth anniversary of Jung's birth, and Thomas Mann's a month later. Mann loved to live there. "The five years of my life spent there have made me feel so heartily attached to the country that thinking of it looks to me like homesickness," he wrote Herrmann Hesse from California in 1941, long before he returned to Zurich to live and die.

A MAGIC ATTRACTION HOVERS over this city whose sobriety always calls one back to his senses at the very moment when he is about to fall too much in love with it. Its cultural life is rich enough to ignite the sparks of imagination. Some of the greatest experiences in my musical life go back to Zurich's symphonic orchestras. During the last war the Zurich Schauspielhaus was destined to fulfill a historic mission, to preserve the spirit of the German theatre and to remain a symbol of the dignity of man while Hitler manacled and maimed the German mind. The political events of those years turned the Swiss theatre into a sanctuary, a place of refuge for the writer, into a platform of discussion for playwrights of all languages. In those years of Switzerland's isolation and fear of invasion, many plays found their way across the Swiss borders, including some of Brecht's most important. Both John Steinbeck's *The Moon Is Down* and Thornton Wilder's *Alcestiade*, waiting to be produced in their native country, were first produced by the Schauspielhaus. This was a time of historic greatness for histrionics. After the war the spirit of the Zürcher Schauspielhaus produced two major playwrights, Friedrich Dürrenmatt and Max Frisch.
Dürrenmatt (who once wisely remarked, "A play is never finished. A play is becoming") said, "Just because of its imperfections, the Zürcher Schauspielhaus is a perfect theatre, and therefore I love it more than any other theatre." I fully agree. Of course, there are also a number of smaller stages in the city, mainly experimental in one or another way, showing either daring productions of established works or avant-garde plays. One of the best-known among them is the Theatre am Neumarkt.

The concept of bringing the arts to the public is very much alive in this city. Last fall a kind of street theatre, *Thearena*, proved this point. It ran successfully for two weeks and offered a program ranging from theatre performances to circus numbers, from both serious and pop music to poetry recited by the poet himself. Moreover, at one booth the public was given a chance to try out its own histrionic gifts.

Assisted by three young experts in various fields of the arts and humanism is Zurich's Stadtpresident (as the mayor is called), Dr. Sigmund Widmer, who is the mastermind of most of these cultural experiments. He is a middle-aged man of urbane manners and somewhat erudite historian who has just recently been re-elected to his office. Moreover, at one of our booths the public was given a chance to try out its own histrionic gifts.

One of his greatest and favorite enterprises is Theater 11, a huge house for which he engages world-famous stage directors and their groups. While living in Zurich during my sabbatical year I was puzzled by the choice of his repertory. I saw Rochelle Owens' musical, *The Karl Marx Play*, which originated in New York's American Place Theatre; a highly experimental production on the French Revolution by a group from France; and a German classic staged by the famous Berlin ensemble of Peter Stein. Theater 11 thinks big, offering a cross-section of the latest and the newest—puzzling sometimes, but always stimulating.

Later I hope to have the opportunity to report on Peter Brook's experimental Parisian group performing *Timon of Athens* in French. With Brook's work, the language never matters as much as the engrossing and startling visual aspects. Theater 11 also invited Jean-Louis Barrault to bring his Nietzsche adventure, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, to Zurich. All over the world the theatre has lost a great deal of its fascination for the young, but Theater 11, with its exciting and controversial programs of international scope as well as low prices, has attracted the city's youth.

I SPOKE TO THE STADTPRÄSIDENT about the cultural activities going on in his city. "It is amazing," he said, "that culture reaches such a wide spectrum of this rather small community where one man can keep it on its cultural toes. With the triumvirate help of his staff, he manages two theatres, establishes concerts and lecture series, and arranges exhibitions continuously throughout the year. Some of these events are small, but others are incredibly large.

One of his greatest and favorite enterprises is Theater 11, a huge house for which he engages world-famous stage directors and their groups. While living in Zurich during my sabbatical year I was puzzled by the choice of his repertory. I saw Rochelle Owens' musical, *The Karl Marx Play*, which originated in New York's American Place Theatre; a highly experimental production on the French Revolution by a group from France; and a German classic staged by the famous Berlin ensemble of Peter Stein. Theater 11 thinks big, offering a cross-section of the latest and the newest—puzzling sometimes, but always stimulating.

Later I hope to have the opportunity to report on Peter Brook's experimental Parisian group performing *Timon of Athens* in French. With Brook's work, the language never matters as much as the engrossing and startling visual aspects. Theater 11 also invited Jean-Louis Barrault to bring his Nietzsche adventure, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, to Zurich. All over the world the theatre has lost a great deal of its fascination for the young, but Theater 11, with its exciting and controversial programs of international scope as well as low prices, has attracted the city's youth.

I SPOKE TO THE STADTPRÄSIDENT about the cultural activities going on in his city. "It is amazing," he said, "that culture reaches such a wide spectrum of this rather small community where one man can keep it on its cultural toes. With the triumvirate help of his staff, he manages two theatres, establishes concerts and lecture series, and arranges exhibitions continuously throughout the year. Some of these events are small, but others are incredibly large.

One of his greatest and favorite enterprises is Theater 11, a huge house for which he engages world-famous stage directors and their groups. While living in Zurich during my sabbatical year I was puzzled by the choice of his repertory. I saw Rochelle Owens' musical, *The Karl Marx Play*, which originated in New York's American Place Theatre; a highly experimental production on the French Revolution by a group from France; and a German classic staged by the famous Berlin ensemble of Peter Stein. Theater 11 thinks big, offering a cross-section of the latest and the newest—puzzling sometimes, but always stimulating.

Later I hope to have the opportunity to report on Peter Brook's experimental Parisian group performing *Timon of Athens* in French. With Brook's work, the language never matters as much as the engrossing and startling visual aspects. Theater 11 also invited Jean-Louis Barrault to bring his Nietzsche adventure, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, to Zurich. All over the world the theatre has lost a great deal of its fascination for the young, but Theater 11, with its exciting and controversial programs of international scope as well as low prices, has attracted the city's youth.
the most contrasting works of art of all kinds to be exposed and discussed."

ZURICH LIES IN THE HEART of Europe. Within a couple of hours you can be almost anywhere from here. Some people—most of them born Zürchers—maintain facetiously that Zurich's great advantage is that one can get away from it so easily. This has never been the cause of its attraction for me. I imagine one meets a city like a human being. Quite unawares, one puts out feelers; one gropes and navigates to find out what kind of person he faces.

For me, a city has all the attributes of a woman. Is she human, I immediately ask myself, and does her humanness fit into my sphere of control? Are her charms artificial, a mask and put-on, or are they real? Will her warmth ever permit me to put my head into her lap and feel at home with her? I may be drawn to her instantaneously or I may feel indifferent to her being. I may learn to accept her or I may learn to love her more and more without being blind to her faults. Indeed, if I were not to find flaws in her features I would miss a vital part of the city. If one falls seriously in love with a city, then her image may have lived within his unconscious for quite a while. And suddenly it is there and alive. Zurich created in me a feeling of having invented her. In reality, perhaps we have the same experiences with cities as with human beings—what we see in them is actually in ourselves—an illusion for us to believe in.

For me Zurich has become the reality of a beautiful illusion—a big city with the aura of littleness. In fact, it is a small city with the gesture of bigness. It is like a woman into whose lap I can lay my head without fear, and feel at home.

UNA SEVILLANA

How musically her face enchanted the Sevillan dusk. And after the sun-baked grammar of Madrid's formality I bent hungry. Soft notes, faint stars, settled like good friends on the sidewalk café. She was one to take orders like a curved guitar and then give them like stung melody in pursuit of memories. Her words were castanets, her smile a dance and her peppermint dress blew in crescendo. But I had no rhythm to control the brush of her arm as she lifted my plate. Her name was a grace I could not pronounce. I rose in cacophony to tender the ridiculous check.

THOMAS KRETZ
THE MISSION OF INDEPENDENCE

THIS MORNING OUR SEMINARY handy man came to the office to report the discovery of an old and very large bomb. He found it, its nose protruding from the earth and only half-covered by grass, as he was driving the tractor through that part of the campus reserved for our herd of twenty Zebu-cross cattle. We rang the demolitions people at Igam Barracks. When they come to attend to the bomb, we will also give them the rusty but still intact hand grenade that some students brought in a few weeks ago from their freshly-plowed garden.

Papua New Guinea, as this country is officially known today, has not claimed much attention in world news since the World War II days when these pieces of military hardware were new and shiny. But a great deal has happened here since 1945.

For the two and a half million people of today’s Papua New Guinea, 1976 will bring national independence. Unlike the American Colonies, however, Papua New Guinea’s independence is not being challenged by a metropolitan power. Instead the Australian government is waiting, pen poised, to hand over the last tokens of power and divest itself of its colonial role and image at the earliest opportunity.

Politics and Economics

Chief Minister Michael Somare, 39, who brought a coalition government into office three years ago, has been leading the country with skill and unflagging energy toward Independence Day. The date has now been set for September 16. Australia has given Somare full cooperation, progressively transferring the powers needed for an orderly and constructive transition.

Preparation for independence has included a campaign of public education to overcome widespread apprehension about independence and its implications, to strengthen the sense of national unity, and to blunt the edge of a number of threatened secession movements. An all-party Constitutional Planning Committee traveled to all districts to gather opinion and background for a home-grown constitutional document. The foreign segment of the public service has been reduced, with Papua New Guineans taking hold at all levels, including most of the top positions.

To further increase Papua New Guinean participation in the national economy, legislation was brought in reducing, with Papua New Guineans taking hold at all levels, including most of the top positions.

Other new measures provide for the compulsory purchase by the government of foreign-owned plantations and other properties for resale to local groups, and for the re-registration of all foreign-owned companies, with the aim of directing foreign investment toward the sectors of the economy where it will do the most good for national development. Chief Minister Somare personally led the team which renegotiated Papua New Guinea’s agreement with the multi-national corporation which operates the highly profitable Bougainville copper mine, assuring a considerably larger share for the government treasury from this national resource. Feasibility studies are under way for the development of another major copper deposit in the Papuan highlands and for a hydroelectric project on the Purari River which if realized could support industrialization on a massive scale.

In April Mr. Somare and the Finance Minister, Mr. Julius Chan, formally introduced the country’s new currency. The kina (rhymes with Neenah) and the toea (ditto with Goya) replaced the Australian dollar and cent as legal tender. The information campaign which accompanied the introduction of the kina and toea was helped when Mrs. Chan gave birth to a daughter on National Currency Day. A special resolution of the cabinet named the baby Toea.

The government has set out its aims for economic improvement of the nation in the following eight points, which have been widely publicized.

1. A rapid increase in the proportion of the economy under the con-
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control of Papua New Guinean individuals and groups and in the proportion of personal and property income that goes to Papua New Guineans.

2. More equal distribution of economic benefits, including movement toward equalization of incomes among people and toward equalization of services among different areas of the country.

3. Decentralization of economic activity, planning and government spending, with emphasis on agricultural development, village industry, better internal trade, and more spending channeled to local and area bodies.

4. An emphasis on small scale artisan, service and business activity, relying where possible on typically Papua New Guinean forms of business activity.

5. A more self-reliant economy, less dependent for its needs on imported goods and services and better able to meet the needs of its people through local production.

6. An increasing capacity for meeting government spending needs from locally raised revenue.

7. A rapid increase in the equal and active participation of women in all forms of economic and social activity.


During Mr. Somare's term of office there have been major government studies of the national education system at all levels as well as a number of inquiries into pressing social problems, such as continuing tribal violence and the need for more effective control of alcohol consumption.

Under the leadership of the Minister for Defense, Foreign Relations and Trade, Sir Maori Kiki, the country has also taken preliminary steps into the international arena. Sir Maori has made several overseas trips in promotion of trade, and has opened Papua New Guinea offices in Canberra, Sydney, Wellington, Jakarta, and Washington. Papua New Guinea's wish to continue close ties with the Commonwealth was indicated in a recent House of Assembly decision to ask the Queen to serve in the symbolic role of Head of State, at least during the early years of independence.

**Malaria, Education, Unity**

Dr. John T. Gunther stands high on the list of Australian career officers who helped bring Papua New Guinea toward its rendezvous with national independence. Dr. Gunther, who received a knighthood in this year's Queen's Birthday list, came to Port Moresby in 1949 as Director of Public Health for what was then called the Territory of Papua and New Guinea. Eight years later he became the Territory's Assistant Administrator and in 1966 was given the assignment of setting up Papua New Guinea's first university. As the founding Vice-chancellor of the University of Papua New Guinea from 1966 to 1972, Dr. Gunther built this national institution from the ground up.

Returning from retirement in April this year to deliver a lecture on science and the eight-point development plan before the Papua New Guinea Scientific Society, Dr. Gunther referred to three of the major national problems facing the country: malaria; education and manpower; and unity.

Malaria, he said, continues to be by far the most important socio-economic disease in the country. Malaria parasites rob people of much of their potential. A man with only 80 per cent of his hemoglobin has a limited energy output and a limited learning capacity. His deficient nutritional state will not improve until the dead hand of malaria has been removed. While a great deal of effort has been put into health education and into malaria eradication and control, experts have not been able to fulfill expectations and assurances. The people, particularly the rural people, must be persuaded of the need for control. They must play their part. Decentralization of economic activity and small-scale artisan activity could be largely meaningless in areas of heavy infestation by malaria parasites. There should be a national science advisory body to maintain a vital interest in the anti-malarial program and by its constant surveillance insure its efficiency.

A scientific approach was also needed, Dr. Gunther said, to deal with the enormous problems of education. "The eight aims cannot be achieved unless there is a sufficient number of individuals to promote them, to assess and supervise their progress. Nor will they be accomplished unless there is an adequate proportion of the population sufficiently educated to understand their ideals. I believe Papua New Guinea has yet to solve the problem of the kind of education it wants and how to get it" (Papua New Guinea Post-Courier, April 22, 1975, p. 4).

Furthermore, Dr. Gunther continued, the demand that Papua New Guinea be one nation must become even louder and more strident than it is at present. It is hard, he said, to speak convincingly of unity when there are 700 languages and 700 societies and cultures in 2.5 million people. "It is in rural development, which I would prefer to call rural transformation, where overt action has to be taken if Papua New Guineans are to achieve equality and self-reliance and to accept decentralization and yet unity and nationalism."

**The Word of God**

Papua New Guinea, 1975, with its people, its open doors to the future, and its pressing problems, is the setting of Martin Luther Seminary, the theological college of the Lutheran churches in this country. The seminary is located in the country's second largest city, Lae. Its
campus is a 100-acre section of coconut and cattle plantation formerly owned by the Lutheran mission but now held in the name of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of New Guinea. During World War II what is now the seminary site was used in turn by Japanese and Australian forces as a military encampment. The objects that surface when the soil is turned, the craters still found here and there on the campus, and the shellscarred trunks of a few toughly surviving palms all continue to tell their story of strafing and bombardment. The seminary, like the University of Papua New Guinea, was started in 1966. Its modern, well-designed buildings, grouped around an open-sided chapel, were an investment in the future of Lutheranism in Papua New Guinea by the overseas churches which conducted Lutheran missions in the country during the past years.

In Papua New Guinea a large majority of the people claim allegiance to the Christian church. Lutherans make up about a fifth of the country's population, while the Catholic, United, Anglican, and Evangelical Alliance churches also have large memberships. The role which the missions and churches have had in building the nation of Papua New Guinea would be a story in itself, one which could be told effectively through the graduates is now coming from the six-year English-language theological program of Martin Luther Seminary, for which the entrance requirement is successful completion of four years of high school and a recommendation by the student's church district and circuit. To date most of the graduates from Martin Luther Seminary have been assigned to specialized ministries related to contemporary change in the church and the country—urban parishes, high school chaplaincies, army and police chaplaincies, or administrative posts in newly-localized church offices. Some men are sent into rural circuits for work formerly done by overseas missionaries.

Martin Luther Seminary is accredited by the Melanesian Association of Theological Schools. In the 1975 school year the seminary has fifty-six students in residence, with another ten out for their year of vicarage. The students come from all areas of the Lutheran church in Papua New Guinea. Among them they represent about thirty of the country's 600 vernacular languages, besides the English and Pidgin which they have in common. There are eight teachers on the faculty this year. Five are missionaries with extensive experience in the Lutheran church in this country. Two are young New Guineans who are gaining experience and qualifications through the seminary's faculty development program. The eighth is Valparaiso University's Dean of Chapel, Dr. Norman Nagel, serving as guest professor. Because English is the medium of instruction, the seminary has been able to welcome a distinguished series of guest teachers who, like Dr. Nagel, have used all or part of a sabbatical to make a direct and personal contribution to ministerial training in Papua New Guinea.

P.S. The demolitions people came and, after inspection, reported that the big bomb was harmless but that the hand grenade was bad news indeed. We were glad to see them take it away. Is there a parable here?

BOOKS

Both the significance of the material covered in Dr. Klein's book and the depth of response we received to the review of that work (The Cresset, April, 1975) call for some opportunity for response. Since The Cresset does not have provision for "Letters to the Editor," we have decided to publish another review of the Klein work, a review which takes Dr. Huber's review into account. Dr. Marcus Riedel teaches philosophy and is Head of the Department of Philosophy, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.

—KFK

POSITIVISM AND CHRISTIANITY.


A BEAUTIFULLY CLEAR EXPOSITION of the controversy over the positivist's verifiability criterion of meaning, Professor Klein's book is also a serious effort to wrestle with the problems generated for a person who holds what Klein takes to be the traditional Christian conception of God but who also accepts the positivist's philosophic scheme. The book issues in a series of six dilemmas, the last and most serious one concerning the idea of the transcendence of God.

Some of the dilemmas are generated by the critical efforts of philosophers who tried to modify the verifiability criterion so that it would not rule out as nonsense theoretical statements from the sciences. Either because the language of science was part of the conventional linguistic equipment, or because of the overwhelming practical success of the sciences, their statements were taken
as a norm of meaningfulness. Some of the dilemmas are generated by an interpretation of selected writers in the Christian theological tradition who speak of the transcendence of God. The interpretation of these writers is taken to yield a normative, or orthodox, theory of the nature of God as unavailable to experience which is at variance with the soteriological message of the Bible and with the ordinary Christian’s faith that God indeed deals with men.

In Klein’s exposition, the technical difficulties found by philosophers even after many refinements of the criterion of meaning appear to be the product of a conflict between its literal requirement of testability for meaningful statements, on the one hand, and a commitment to a more general empiricist and physicalist philosophic view which cannot be made to yield up a precise literal statement on the other hand. The difficulties with the transcendence of God, though Professor Klein makes a perfunctory bow to the possibility that a beatific vision of God might be a verifying experience, seem to me to arise from the fact that Professor Klein takes the things said in credal and theological statements about God’s transcendence or absoluteness and translates them into literal or univocal predicates which will fit the requirements of the syntax of symbolic logic. The transformed attributes are then easily enough seen to be ruled out by the empiricist criterion.

What Professor Klein appropriately calls the “program” of logical positivism has several strands. A quick resume of these will clarify the preceding point and prepare the way for an outline of an alternate account of the significance of religious uses of language. First is a dogmatic and excessively simple division of meaningful utterances into analytic statements which say nothing about the world, but simply declare our linguistic intentions, empirical statements which state facts about the world, and emotive utterances which express our emotions but assert nothing true or false. The first exception which has to be made from these categories is the statement of the verifiability criterion itself. No a priori logical justification has ever been given for it, and Klein simply assumes it. It cannot pass muster as an empirical, scientific hypothesis since that would presuppose a knowledge of what statements were meaningful prior to the application of the criterion. Positivists could scarcely admit their thesis to be the lyric expression of a metaphysical passion. So it was interpreted as a proposal. The proposal amounts to this: “Let us see if we cannot fit all meaningful statements into these classes”.

Second, the method of forming significant propositions was determined by a point of view adopted from a model in which statements in everyday language are vague and in need of reconstruction according to an ideal or paradigm of clear language in which complex statements are built up from simple elements about which there can be no dispute because either they are defined by fiat or they refer to nothing but the data of sense. About these one can presumably not be mistaken in one’s own case or in that of “any competent observer.” One could, therefore, abstract from any utterance whatever it had of factual content and state it clearly. Thus, the program was, as Professor Klein might say, “motivated” by a value, clarity. The value is defined, for this theory, in terms of putting sharp-edged building blocks of meaning together to form the intelligible world.

Third, for us to know that a putative statement about the world referred only to observable entities required operations of testing of which it could be said that they were “in principle” performable by the aforementioned competent observers. Finally, the epistemological requirements of empirical observability was nevertheless accompanied by a metaphysics of physicalism. The counterparts of names, propositions and operations of testing are the entities, structures and events of the natural world as the form of the laws of physics permits them to be.

The logical difficulties of observation by non-existent observers has had ample commentary. So has the naiveté of the classification of meaningful statements. I shall say something later about the character of religious statements. The “fiat” character of the truths that issue from the program perhaps needs further comment. That the truth of analytic propositions is a matter of fiat is part of positivist dogma. In them, the predicate simply specifies what the language user has definitionally declared the subject to mean. That the foundations of empirical propositions are equally authoritarian appears clearly in Klein’s discussion of his first dilemma (p. 156). If we are attempting to find the meaning of a statement in science which is not clear, or to determine whether it is meaningful because it is incompletely verifiable, we “precise” the empirical concept in it, determining by linguistic decision what it shall mean thereafter or until we make a new decision. Any of reality that may go beyond the observable (or its silent under-girding physical Atlas) has already been eliminated by the proclamation of the empiricist thesis. Whatever remains of uncertainty is excluded “according to need”. The need in question is that of clarity or precision. Thus the positivist answer to the question “Why is language clearly meaningful?” is “Because we decide what each term contains, what clear perceptions each term refers to and then carry out the consequences of our linguistic decisions according to simple arithmetical operations which are equally clear.”

Presumably, not to want clarity is either not rigorous or dishonest. It should now be clear though that, given the definition of clarity in use by Professor Klein’s ideal positivist, no one need have the slightest hesitation in declining to be governed by that value. The charges of
dogmatism and of unclarity about the nature of one's premises should be marked "return to sender." There is no independent justification of the empiricist thesis, of the physicalist thesis or of the logicist program. Nor has there been an overt recognition that the value, clarity, governs the program. Everything depends then on the consequences of carrying it out and on the value of this value among other values. Professor Klein's only defense, finally, is that although the operations of testing that are required by the strict statement of the criterion of meaning cannot be carried out, the world may yet be made only of the required sort of entities, hence it may be the case that they suffice to stand as the referents of the names in true propositions. One is tempted to respond that indeed it may be so. There's nothing wrong with the senses or with physical matter. After all, as C. S. Lewis said, God made it. But then I still don't know what to make of God. Meanwhile, the claims of unfathomed mysteries and unencompassed vistas of reality are at least as strong as the delights of building transparent block houses.

What gives Klein's treatment so much appeal is his insistence that religious believers take their credal affirmations to be true and his stout resistance of the view that religion can be reduced to morality. A believer must then presumably accept the challenge to show how his statements make sense as saying something about the world. I agree that the believer claims truth value for his statements. (In fact, I think that a satisfactory verification structure can be set up for "God exists" since Professor Klein is willing to accept a notion of experience wide enough to cover the experience of a person who survives after death. As I think Terence Penelhum has shown in *Religion and Rationality*, the concept of a bodiless spiritual being is not logically contradictory. There is sufficiently strong evidence of an observational sort to make the idea of mind to mind contact tenable. And I think one can make sense of communicating with a person whom one nevertheless perceives to have, say, knowledge capacities of another order than oneself.) But having rejected the division of propositions into tautologies and empirical fact statements, I cannot be expected to show that affirmations of salvation by the grace of God state facts. Nor will I follow the positivist in saying that I am doing nothing more than proposing a program. Nor, important as the conduct of life is to the believer, given the positivist reduction of morality to recommendations based on sentiment, can I equate religion with morality. I scarcely have space to outline a view of the logic of religious uses of language. However, I shall combine some remarks about that with a response to Professor Klein's charge that the orthodox Christian concept of God as transcendent remains an intransigent problem.

The problem appears to arise from Klein's persistent attempt to take as literally defined predicates words which do not function so in context and the correlated attempt to make theological and religious utterances propositional in the same sense as the "factual assertions" of positivist doctrine. It will not do to take terms out of their context so. The technical use of terms like "wholly other" or "the Absolute Godhead," and severances like "Never forget that God is inaccessible" must be understood in the terms of the systems in which they were invented, each of which may have its own logic of connectives. Various fields of study may have different logics because of the different functions which determine their structure and the different subject matters they refer to. The technical use of "absolute" in physics to refer to a temperature is not the same as the historian's in "Louis XIV was an absolute monarch." The ordinary worshipper who says, "I believe in God Almighty" would not say them if he did not believe that God had awesome powers. But to *worship* God Almighty is not the same as to *define* God, in a putatively literal use, as "that being who is capable of doing anything whatever, even logically impossible things." Nor is it to entertain as a hypothesis subject to empirical test that a being with such predicates exists.

Note that having implicitly *used* a distinction between technical and ordinary uses of a word does not commit me to the view that all philosophic problems arise from the confusions of philosophers while ordinary uses are logically impeccable. Both are subject to error. Meanwhile, it is as important an aspect of devotional language that its cognitive content is not clearly stated as it is of, say, ceremonial patriotic language that its legal content is not clearly stated.

The point is that no such wholesale rejection of the language of the believer or the language of traditional Christianity is justified. What is required is first of all an assessment of the function of theology (or of the language of worship, if that is one's problem), then of the specific form and content of each particular theology. In Rudolph Otto's case, that God is "wholly other" cannot conceivably be taken to mean "absolutely and in every respect other and inaccessible to man". The term is invented in a regressive argument whose aim is to construct concepts which will interpret and account for the specific features of an experience of contact with God. I will not try here to lay out the logic of mystical theologians. It should, however, be noted that Dionysius, the Areopagite, *calls* God by personal pronouns and *affirms* that God transcends all affirmation. Lest this be rejected too quickly by analytic philosophers as nonsense, it is precisely analogous in form to Wittgenstein's *assertion* that his assertions are nonsense. Wittgenstein, too, uses regressive arguments to reveal the necessary conditions of meaning. He finds that they can be revealed and *grasped*, but that they cannot be *stated*. There are three kinds of nonsense in Witt-
genstein. Only the kind that consists in self-contradiction is bad. The showing forth of the structure of the universe of logic or of the rules of a language game are dreadfully important nonsense for philosophers to engage in just because of their cognitive interests.

We can perhaps take a clue from this about the nature of religious thought. It cannot be conceived as a disinterested pursuit for its own sake of knowledge about the world considered as external object. It is, rather, a reasoned effort to uncover the necessary conditions of the experience of meaningfulness in existence which a people has had. It is like the sciences in that it tries to discover the conditions of events in the world and then to organize what is experienced systematically. But the experiences it is concerned with are not only experiences of the physical world. They are primarily the experiences of love and hate, judgment and redemption, good and evil, misery and joy. The search is indeed for true assertions about the world, but they must be truths that found meaning and ground commitment. To achieve a meaningful existence for man involves commitment to behave toward oneself and others as beings of a particular kind. Such commitment if it is not arbitrary must be grounded in truths about the world. But conversely, what one says about the world is tested against the possibilities of meaning and commitment that are revealed in the reflected-upon-experience of a person and his community.

The "theologically sophisticated Christian" that Professor Klein refers to is not, then, the one who simply gives up credal claims because physics stops talking about gods or psychology stops talking about minds. He realizes that, on the one hand, worship which is cognitively vacuous is not worship, while, on the other hand, scientific knowledge about God or mind which simply satisfied the testability requirement could have no value-determining, commitment-founding or religious force.

When he tries to clarify the meaning of traditional Christianity or of received doctrines he will approach them as the result of a historical dialectic between several things: the experience of a people and their cultural reflection on it, the striking experiences of particular religious geniuses and the creative theologizing of religious reformers. He may begin from basic religious intuitions such as that the significance of our activity in this world is not simply self-determined, but is nevertheless a function of what we and the world are, or that the norms of the commitments which successful life requires are more deeply rooted than in our momentary desires or approvals. He may well modify his theology when confronted with counter claims and the interpretations others place on their experience. No doubt he will have to wrestle with the problem of the magnitude of experienced evil. What he will take as verifying or falsifying his beliefs will indeed be apparent facts—not often neutral facts about objects, but meaning-revealing or meaning-destructive facts.

If the categories of revelation and mystery emerge as important for the explanation of the occurrence of significant knowledge or for the justification of attitudes called forth, well, he will not, as Aristotle cautioned, seek greater clarity and precision than the subject matter permits. Nor will he be upset because he cannot restate all he thinks in a system of propositions ordered according to techniques invented by geometers for quite different purposes.

The theological sophisticate will also, I should think, realize that he does not live in the skies of intellect but, rather, returns to plod the same earth he began from. It is a troubled earth where commitment and resolve are in need of enrichment and strengthening. So he will find ways, perhaps ritual and ceremonial, to give a hold on his life to the truths discovered. If he has been so fortunate as to find something worthy of adoration to pin his hope on, it is not to be wondered at that his language, thought and action now fall into the syntax of lyric celebration; for its use is worship founded on Majesty.

I had at first intended in this review to take specific umbrage at Professor Huber's non-philosophic remarks and rather tasteless humor about Valparaiso's Philosophy Department and the Missouri Synod (The Cresset, April, 1975). His technical criticisms, however, seem to me to be clearly correct. Further, the controversy between positivists and non-positivists has long seemed to me to have remarkable affinities to that between "fundamentalist" and "liberal" theologians. Particularly, this is true with regard to the interpretation of the Scriptures and the grounds of faith. Like strict constructionists in the law, fundamentalists give the same literal readings to all parts of the Bible which yield what they think of as the "plain natural meaning" of the words; whereas liberals approach each text with a view to the kind of writing it is and the logic of its own theological stance. The fear of fundamentalists that their faith is not secure if the word-for-word inerrancy of the Scriptures is not itself the first and founding item of faith is analogous to the positivists' insistence that they have said nothing unless each sentence can be measured by a visible and indisputable canon of clarity.

One can only caution them that through such fear of uncertainty and such insistence on clarity, the grace of God not preventing, they may well make impossible saying anything significant for either the conduct of life or the advancement of science or taking the first confident-hesitant step of faith which is required for any salvation worthy of the name.

MARC RIEDEL
The Master of Our Schools

The current reappraisals of the meaning of the Holy Christian Church are agonizing indeed. They plough up the definitions once shared by many good people, they threaten the foundations of law and order for important institutions, they seem to foment rebellion against constituted authorities.

Yet their method is no more incendiary than Franz Pieper’s, a half century ago, when he attacked “Caesaropapists” working for centralization of synodical authority (Christian Dogmatics III 432): “In defense of their wrong position they invoke the Fourth Commandment, to wit, that parents have authority to order their children to do things that are not commanded in God’s Word as long as those things are not in conflict with God’s Word. Pastors and other ecclesiastical superiors, it is urged, belong to the spiritual fathers; therefore one owes them obedience by God’s order in all things not commanded in God’s Word. . . . This argument is false. . . . God has not invested the Church, or individuals in the Church, with legislative authority; on the contrary, here the rule is, ‘One is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren’ (Matt. 23:8).”

When Our Lord first spoke the word “One is your Master” he was attacking the pretensions not of politicians but of schoolmen; He said, “One is your teacher.” Louis Benson (The Lutheran Hymnal, 486) closed his hymn on the ministry of teaching with this reverence for Jesus:

Thy life the bond of fellowship,
Thy love the law that rules,
Thy name, proclaimed by every lip,
The Master of our schools.

Yet the Lord’s word to teachers pertains to the politicians equally. For their pretensions are always also in the domain of the teaching, the shaping of Christian truth down inside of the beliefs and moods and life styles of God’s people.

The debate goes on whether current crises in the synod are political or doctrinal. The answer might just be “yes.” Other domains crowd in also when Jesus says, “One is your Master” — educational, intellectual, cultural.

This is not to supplant the survey of human thought, the parade of philosophies, the insights into science and technology, the preparation for vocations, with tabloid collections of Bible passages. Whatever damage might be involved in the former can happen in the latter, too. “Back to the Bible” can be just as Christless a proposal as “Back to Aristotle.”

What does happen when Jesus Christ is Master?

1. It’s the total person He wants and not just the brain. He proposes to give life and not just information. He is the Truth, which means not just irrefutable fact, but God keeping His Word and making His plan come true for the calling of His people and the life that does not end, as He intervened in our situation through Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

2. It’s fuel for life and not just roadmaps that He gives when He is Master. A Christian school no less than a Christian pulpit provides fuel, “will to” and not just know-how. Some months ago I helped at the wedding of a graduate of Valparaiso University School of Law. What she had received there was not just ultimate legal information, for she still had to study for bar examinations and proposed to toil at the legal task for years to come. But with her friends she had found direction and power for family and life, for people and vocation; and I saw it to be in Christ, the Master of the school.

3. “One is your Master” does not give license to forget everything that an education provides except the name Jesus Christ. But it means that the presence of Jesus Christ takes over the vocation and calling, the moods and culture of life, as the One From and the One For, the Author and Finisher of faith. Right, we are always only on the way and still imperfect. But like a very good educator indeed, He puts us on the way and He does not drop us when we fumble.