SPECIAL ISSUE

the Chaplain

A JOURNAL FOR PROTESTANT CHAPLAINS

Christian Ethics in the Nuclear Age

•

FRONTIERS OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS

by Waldo Beach

•

THE ETHICS OF OUTER SPACE

by Walter Muelder

ARTICLES by Dana Dawson, Francis Garrett, James M. Gustafson, Richard Hughes, William H. Kirkland, Geddes MacGregor, Harvey K. McArthur, Stewart Meacham, Paul Ramsey, Albert T. Rasmussen, Martin H. Scharlemann, and Joseph Sittler

OCTOBER 1958

the Chaplain

A JOURNAL FOR PROTESTANT CHAPLAINS

Vol. 15, No. 5 • October 1958

ARTICLES

DEPARTMENTS

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED CHURCH PRESS

The Chaplain is published bimonthly by The General Commission on Chaplains and Armed Forces Personnel, an official co-operative agency representing 37 denominations (with a total membership of more than 30 million) in a liaison capacity with the federal government in matters affecting (1) the chaplaincy of the Armed Forces and the Veterans Administration and (2) the moral and religious welfare of Armed Forces personnel. Printed in the U.S.A.

Subscription rates to civilians and chaplains not on active duty: $2.00 a year (6 issues); 35¢ a copy.

Editorial office: 122 Maryland Ave., NE, Washington 2, D.C.

All scripture quotations, unless otherwise designated, are from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

Why This Issue?

Some chaplains in Washington were talking about THE CHAPLAIN magazine. One urged that the editors undertake a "special" issue, at least twice a year, on some subject of professional interest to chaplains as clergymen. Others agreed that this was an experiment worth trying. "Let's go after the most competent authors," they said, "and provide a solid issue in the style of a quarterly—something that will serve as a brief 'refresher course' in the chosen field."

Here is the first response to that suggestion. The next issue of THE CHAPLAIN will return to the usual format, with pictures and news and the regular departments; but this October issue follows the "quarterly" style. We have kept the same "trim size" but used more pages, on different paper, with a new type face (Bodoni Book). The emphasis is on thoughtful reading.

But why "Christian Ethics in the Nuclear Age"? This subject was chosen by chaplains, too. "Not the usual ethical questions brought to us in personal counseling," they said. "Not character guidance or moral leadership. . . . This time help us to wrestle with the larger, and emerging, ethical problems of our age."

Discussion is needed; for, as the National Council of Churches has said, "many issues of the nuclear-space age pose moral dilemmas which cannot be resolved in ignorance nor evaded in silence." The stakes are high in our "edge-of-space present," which Anthropologist Margaret Mead calls "man's most crucial era since the age of fire."

The following pages come to no consensus or conclusion, but they plow the ground for your own sowing of thoughtful action. They are presented in the hope of Hosea that if we "sow . . . in righteousness," we shall "reap in mercy." For it is "time to seek the Lord till he come and rain [not atomic fire but] righteousness upon you"!

Please tell us what you think of this experiment. Is it worth repeating? Would you welcome an occasional issue in this style? The address of the editorial office is 122 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington 2, D.C.

Contributors

WALDO BEACH is professor of Christian ethics at Duke Divinity School. He is author of *Conscience on the Campus* (Association 1958) and co-author of *Christian Ethics: Sources of the Living Tradition* (Ronald 1955).

DANA DAWSON is bishop of The Methodist Church, Kansas Area.

ELISABETH D. DODDS, a new reviewer, is the wife of the Rev. Robert C. Dodds of Waterbury, Conn., and a former staff writer and reviewer for *Vogue*. (Other reviewers are identified in connection with their reviews.)

FRANCIS L. GARRETT is head of the Training Branch, Chaplains Division, Bureau of Naval Personnel.

JAMES M. GUSTAFSON is assistant professor of Christian ethics at Yale Divinity School.

RICHARD B. HUGHES, recently an Air Force chaplain, is planning to study at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

WILLIAM H. KIRKLAND is associate professor of Christian ethics at McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

GEDDES MacGREGOR, professor of philosophy and religion at Bryn Mawr College, is spending this academic year as visiting professor at the Graduate School of the University of Southern California.

HARVEY K. McARTHUR is professor of New Testament at the Hartford Seminary Foundation.

STEWART MEACHAM is director of the Labor-International Affairs Program of the American Friends Service Committee.

WALTER G. MUELDER, dean and professor of social ethics at Boston University School of Theology, is author of *Religion and Economic Responsibility* (Scribner 1953) and *Idea of a Responsible Society* (Boston University 1955).

PAUL RAMSEY, professor of religion at Princeton University, is author of *Basic Christian Ethics* (Scribner 1950), editor of Jonathan Edwards' *Freedom of the Will* (Yale 1957), and editor and contributor for *Faith and Ethics: The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr* (Harper 1957).

ALBERT T. RASMUSSEN is professor of religion and society at Pacific School of Religion and author of *Christian Social Ethics* (Prentice-Hall 1956.)

MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN, who is active as a chaplain in the U.S. Air Force Reserve, is professor of New Testament exegesis and director of graduate studies at Concordia Seminary.

JOSEPH SITTLER is professor of systematic theology at the University of Chicago and author of the forthcoming book *The Structure of Christian Ethics* (Louisiana State University 1958).

WALDO BEACH

The Frontiers of Christian Ethics

THIS article will attempt a quick report on current developments in the field of Christian ethics, as a kind of spot check of a fast-moving front. It is hoped that it may prove of value to a chaplain here or there suffering from a vague sense of intellectual panic at being "out of touch," and a little homesick to go back to school, to catch up on what has gone on in the world of theology since he left seminary.

One illusion of such a chaplain, however, will have to be set aside at once. That is the "poor little me" illusion, the common human conviction that the really important things are going on elsewhere while *I'm* stuck off in this forlorn and dull post, out in the provinces away from all the exciting things going on at the capital. Yet when you go to the "capital," you are surprised to find that people there ask: "What's going on out on the field?" As a matter of fact, in the life of the church, each spot where serious thinking and worship and service are going on is as crucial and as central as any other spot. The theological schools or universities are no nearer the "center of things" than the parish minister in rural Iowa or the lonesome chaplain on the Aleutians. In God's geography, all provinces are equidistant from the capital, as in God's calendar all moments in time are equidistant from eternity.

Nevertheless, it remains true that there are new currents of thought in the life of the church, moving out from her intellectual centers, and moving in from the outposts, that affect deeply common church life and practice.

Christian ethics follows theology

In all periods of Christian history, the most profound reformations of Christian life take place first in the realm of theology. Renewed or novel understandings of the way God is acting and dealing with men

become the source of new explorations and new urgencies in the moral standards of those in the Christian community. In this sense one can say that Christian ethics is a branch of Christian theology.

Clearly this is true for current Christian ethics. The great theological revolution within Protestantism, every bit as momentous as the Reformation of the 16th century, is as powerful as it is fluid and indefinable. It is difficult to pin down what thinkers like Barth, Tillich, Brunner, Bultmann, and the Niebuhrs—the chief witnesses of this revolution—share in common. The words "neo-orthodox" and "neo-Protestant" are poor labels. But they can all be called "postliberal," in that Protestant theology has struck its tents and is on the march beyond the terrain of the "liberal" period. Most of the themes of the new theology are a recovery of key concepts out of the Bible, Augustine, and the classical Reformers. The radical sovereignty of God, the complexity of human nature in its freedom and sin, the eschatological dimension of ethics, the priority of faith—these are classic themes. But these concepts are not just antiques, dragged out of museums for show. They are rephrased and recast in contemporary thought forms to speak with power and meaning to citizens of the 20th century—homesick, insecure, strangers and afraid, lonely in the crowd. It is to this "existential" situation of man that the faith of Protestant liberalism fails somehow to speak, and to which evidently these postliberal theologians *do* speak. And Christian ethics in the 20th century has been taking shape and voice within the theological categories set by these thinkers rather than in liberal terms.

It would be a mistake, though, to say that the new theology is *anti*-liberal. It has gone *through* liberalism, and has taken *from* the liberal development—or, in its American version, the Social Gospel—many important ideas strange to the Bible or classical Reformation: the stress, for instance, on the corporate structure of society as the main arena of Christian ethical action; the processes of societal interaction with the "soul" of man; and the relevance of Christian concepts of sin for the understanding of political and economic mass behavior. This *societal* emphasis, characteristic of modern Christian ethics, is in a sense a recovery of the biblical corporate concept of human nature. In its modern form it is also deeply indebted to thinkers like Freud and Marx, and to the liberal reform movements of the 19th century.

The major revolution taking place in the life of the churches in our generation, as the context of the theological revival, has been the

ecumenical movement. With increasing strength and inclusive sweep this drive toward unity among the main non-Roman church bodies has become the chief point of forum for the discussion of Christian ethics. The "Faith and Order" and "Life and Work" sections of the World Council of Churches are both involved in the ethical witness of the church to the world, and the understanding of the grounding of that witness in the faith and order of the churches' own life. The best place to look for the most significant Christian ethical discussion today would be in the reports of the great recent ecumenical conferences, such as Oxford, Amsterdam, and Evanston.

The main ethical issues debated at these and other ecumenical conferences are issues pertaining to public policy rather than private vices and virtues. There is a great distance here between the frontier of Christian ecumenical ethical thinking and "church" ethics back home. That is, at the local church the image of Christian morality is one of the avoidance of fleshly sins and the cultivation of private purity. Indeed, a "good" person, in the Christian sense, means exactly one who avoids the sins of smoking, dancing, card playing, etc. Such an ideal, cultivated in the churches and homes of rural and devout piety, is certainly the prevailing popular image of Christian ethics in America.

Yet the crucial ethical thinking in the ecumenical movement hardly touches on these matters at all. The focus rather is on the great public issues of the day. What is the bearing of the Christian faith on questions of totalitarian power in the omnicompetent state, on the economic distribution of income and power, on race relations, on disarmament and nuclear warfare, on foreign policy? These matters of public policy, it is claimed, elusive and distant though they may seem from the "little guy" next door, are in fact profoundly crucial for common life. Illumination of their darkness by the light of the Christian faith, and guidance of policy into the ways of peace and justice, are as urgent as difficult. The way in which churches back home fuss about inconsequential matters, in the name of morality, is irresponsible to what the church should be: the conscience of the state.

The average chaplain, pastor, or teacher stands between the ethics of the ecumenical movement and the leading theologians of Protestantism on the one hand and, on the other, the ethics of the average, bewildered Protestant layman, the next man you meet, whose theology is little more than a grab bag of Bible verses and whose Christian ethics

is a list of petty prohibitions which only serve to make him feel a bit guilty when he is on a moral holiday. It becomes the task of the leaders of the church in the ranks to communicate and interpret the insights of frontier thinkers to themselves and to such a layman.

Christianity and politics

Among the many issues that are "hot" in contemporary Christian social ethics—and of which now we take a rapid survey—the relation of the Christian faith to politics looms large. American Protestants are curiously ambivalent in their thinking here. Sometimes they run in the direction of the slogan marked "Separation of Church and State" and under its protection affirm that religion should have nothing to do with politics, or public education, and that the enemy to religious liberty is the Roman Catholic Church. Sometimes they run in the opposite direction to a sign marked "This Nation Under God" and proclaim, in the face of "godless" communism, and in the language of what has been called "piety along the Potomac," that America must return to its religious foundations and recover its spiritual values.

One of the main matters that is getting close current attention in Protestant ethics is an attempt to formulate a positive Protestant consensus on the relation of Christianity to democracy, one that avoids the bad confusions of both these slogans. Clearly, separation of church and state should not mean the divorce of religion from common public life. And just as clearly, "This Nation Under God" should not mean "God Is on Our Side"—that would be tribal theology. The task is to formulate a position in which the church can be the "conscience" of the state, influencing democracy as a political form with norms of the Christian ethic, so that it is prevented both from anarchy and from tyranny. At the same time, the values of separation, of the precious and precarious rights of conscience against the state, or against church imperialism in Roman Catholic or Protestant form, are equally important. The Fund for the Republic is underwriting an important study in this area, on "Religion in a Free Society," and it is a hotly debated question at many seminaries and church conferences.

A second political issue of great moment is the relation of Christianity to the philosophy of American law. In the early part of this century the philosophy of most jurists, eminent and small, was that there is no "higher law" beyond the laws—that, as Justice Holmes said, the law is

"the prophecies of what the courts will do in fact, and nothing more pretentious." In this view, laws may be merely an expression of power, not of justice. Though this view still dominates American law, there is a rising minority sentiment, shared by Protestant and Catholic thinkers alike, that is searching for a "higher law" norm, by which laws can be called just or unjust. For many Christians, and not only Roman Catholics, the "natural law" tradition provides out of Christian ethics the basis for legal decision.

Under the heading of politics there is yet another matter high on the agenda of Christian social ethics: the problem of the moral controls of power in the nuclear age, within the given context of the East-West controversy, with satellites whirring overhead.

In the 1930's the debate between the pacifist and the nonpacifist took the center of the stage of the Christian conscience. Was it right for a Christian to go to war, or not? The events of World War II did not answer this ultimate question, of course. But for the majority of Christians the best answer was found in the proximate solution of the support of the war, though evil, lest the worse evil of tyranny overtake the free societies. At the same time, the civil rights of the pacifist were to be honored.

Immediately after the war, the pacifist question posed in this form was almost dead and rarely debated.

Now the issue is rising again, on university campuses and at church conferences, but not in the same form as before the war. The issue as now posed is not: Is it right or wrong for the Christian to take life as a soldier? The question is rather: Given nuclear weapons on both sides of the East-West conflict, how is it possible to expect moral controls on the use of such weapons that can prevent total annihilation? In this apocalyptic stalemate, of armistice on the very brink of total war, how can American foreign policy express Christian realism, at once holding firm against aggression and also maintaining the peaceful coexistence which is, in fact, the only alternative to "no existence"?

There are no purely right answers to this tragic dilemma, of course. The only possible alternatives for the nation to follow are between better and worse. But there is a strong ground-swell movement of the common people to speak out somehow against the accelerating drift toward universal disaster, and to break through the stalemate. This is a movement of little people on the back streets, not the voices of diplo-

mats on either side, who must assume the posture of belligerence. It shows up in the hunger for international cultural exchange between Russians and Americans, in the "walks for peace" and popular protests in America and Britain against nuclear tests in the Pacific, protests increasingly supported by church groups and journals not traditionally "pacifist." This is a minority movement, to be sure, hardy detectable amid the general hopelessness or apathy of Americans who hide from themselves the threat of the last holocaust by having fun. But it may prove a "creative minority" and a saving remnant.

Christian ethics and economics

Another area of social policy where the front lines are rapidly moving is the relation of Christian ethics to the American economy. Not many years ago the great debate, which grew out of the Social Gospel, concerned the relationship of Christianity to capitalism and "free enterprise" on the one hand or to socialism on the other. There were—and still are in a few quarters—fierce squabbles between those Christians who would identify Christianity with capitalism, in the name of freedom, and those equally conscientious Christians who called for some measure of state control of economy, in the name of justice. But this debate has proved rather unreal and academic, since in fact, beneath the placards, the American economy is neither privately nor publicly administered, but "mixed," with everybody accepting the mixture, more or less, as a necessary way of balancing freedom and justice.

The live issue in current Christian economic ethics is the moral problem of *abundance*, and what the Giant Mammon does to the soul of man. The mass media assume without question that the fantastic wealth of America and its high standard of living are morally good. But prophets of the Lord, inside and outside the churches, are not so sure. The biblical words that "a man's life does not consist in the abundance of his possessions" become sternly true. In a nation where obesity is a major health problem, where a two-car family is the ideal image, where three times as much is spent on liquor and tobacco as on religion and education, where comfort and convenience through gadgets are pursued with the same frenzy with which a medieval monk pursued the vision of God, it is not strange that the moral fiber of the American man is fast deteriorating. One insidious cause of this deterioration is the omnipresent Advertising Man, who haunts the American night and day—in

his car, in his TV set, in his reading—with wheedles and lures to a mirage of chromium happiness. There is no hiding place from this terror. In 1956, $10 billion was spent on advertising. The dignity of free choice of the individual as consumer is changed to a dull apathy by the benevolent despotism of the Smiling Ad Man. The rising standard of living seems to be bought at the price of a lowering standard of values.

The ethical problem of consumption, within this dire setting, constitutes one of the main problems for Christian ethics today. But the ethical problems of production are equally serious. If from the side of consumption the Christian conscience protests that the soul of man is being drowned in the flood of "things" and that salvation lies in a return to simpler living, the economist, from the side of production, will point out that the American economy *must* keep expanding, finding ever new markets, in order to survive. To contract would be to collapse. Plainer living would mean unemployment and human hardship. Here is a cruel dilemma: the health of our economy, and continued employment, seems to require the continual disgorging of gadgets and luxuries which brutalize the souls of producers and consumers alike.

It's easier to state the dilemma than to see the ethical solution. As with political policy, the proffered "back to God" or "come to Jesus" solutions are not much help. The kind of solutions needed must be based indeed on Christian norms, the understanding of God's will as seen in Jesus Christ. But they must also be realistic, taking into account the hard facts of economic life, operable in a market place rather than a monastery.

There are some important positive movements in current Christian economic ethics which seek realistic solutions. For example, the National Council of Churches has been sponsoring a study of "The Ethics and Economics of Society" (with nine volumes already published and more to come), studying every aspect of the American economy, with theologians and economists in fruitful conversation. Recent major conferences, both of the National Council of Churches and of the major denominations, have centered on such questions as Christian responsibility in an industrial society, and foreign policy and free trade. Another healthy sign is the revival of interest in the Protestant doctrines of vocation and stewardship. There are serious attempts in American Protestantism to relate worship to work—to find through retreats, conferences, pilot projects in industry, etc., a renewed Christian meaning

in everyday jobs, to combat the emptiness and dreariness of work life and make real the old Christian phrase *Laborare est orare.* And in the biblical concept of stewardship, the moderate use of things for the purposes of community, there lies guidance for the moral problems of abundance, beyond either asceticism or materialism.

The Christian conscience on race

In the last two decades the question of the church and race has moved rapidly from the background into the center stage. Up until recently, in the country at large not much less than in the South, the churches mirrored faithfully the racial divisions and attitudes of their environment, segregated and comfortable clubs, with little concern over the rising demand for racial justice, which came sweeping in during World War II. Now the Christian conscience is stirring within the churches, troubled by the awareness that the "secular" worlds of sports, labor, the military, and the judiciary have come to practice what the churches have preached and failed to practice.

Though in local practice still segregated, the churches have in their leadership moved now to a prophetic position, beginning to lead rather than follow public opinion. All the major church bodies have taken stands condemning involuntary segregation as a public policy and supporting the Supreme Court decision declaring public school segregation unconstitutional. In the South, the vigorous leadership for racial justice and equality is being found in the Negro churches, which have taken on new vitality. Martin Luther King, a Negro pastor in Montgomery, Alabama, bases his strategy explicitly on *agapē.* Many Negro pastors are leaders in the NAACP. The leaders in white churches in the South are rather more cautious (or "moderate," as they would say), but their prevailing and publicly announced moral approval is of integration. While it is true enough that the politicians in the Southern states are continuing to get much mileage out of racial prejudice, the churches are moving to a more morally sensitive position—agonizingly slowly but with irreversible movement. In the process of self-examination many Christians in the churches are discovering that Christianity is not the same thing as churchianity, that there are "costs of discipleship," that redemption involves suffering rather than "success," and that the authentic church is not an exclusive suburban club of those of similar tastes and color but a community of believers in Christ, and racially inclusive

by reason of that belief. In short, out of this trial the churches are beginning to find again what it means to be a Christian church.

The ground of integrity

All the issues we have surveyed above are in areas where public policy is used by the decisions of men to strengthen or tear the fabric of community. Yet the preoccupation of Christian thinkers with these issues of social ethics should not blind the church to the problems of private or individual ethics, which are just as serious. The swing of interest away from the narrow and negative concern of a nearsighted church piety has been healthy; but if it regards private virtue as insignificant, its vision of moral reality is blurred by farsightedness. Personal integrity, honesty and dependability, consideration for property and personality, simple decency—these qualities on which society depends have a moral priority over all questions of social policy.

American culture, from all signs, seems to be suffering from a serious deterioration in moral fiber precisely because these virtues are giving way. Not many generations back, American life was infused with the Puritan conscience, which had a feeling for the simple rightness of right, the respect for honor, and the binding trust of a man's word. This moral integrity of the Puritan was itself the product of "the fear of the Lord," a vivid sense that one always acted in the sight of a living God, the judge of all men.

Now that inheritance from Puritanism is almost all dissipated, as men generally have dispensed with the Puritan's belief in a morally serious and stern God and substituted—if they have any theology at all—an image more like that of a doddering and genial granddaddy. Men substitute other, finite gods as the motivation for their ethical actions—usually the god of the crowd. Whatever makes men happy, or what the crowd approves—this becomes the new principle of good. David Riesman's contrasting metaphors show the difference: whereas the Puritan made his decisions by a kind of inner gyroscope, of allegiance to "principles," the citizen of the twentieth century operates by a kind of "radar," steering his course by signals as they bounce off those in the crowd whom he encounters. Here's the difference between the "inner-directed" and "other-directed" self, or the difference between a principled person and one who has no built-in decency or honor at all. He's not a scoundrel. He's pleasant, easygoing, tolerant, indulging in de-

grading pastimes not out of malice but just to be "one of the boys." But he will also lie, steal, cheat, destroy property, cut all possible corners when no one is looking from the crowd, simply because he has no God beyond the crowd to whom he feels accountable. Expediency, therefore, is the only rule of his action.

It is this kind of morally bewildered, pathetic, potentially vicious American character—whether he be a well-heeled student on a college campus or a bored soldier doing his hitch in the service—who constitutes an almost overwhelming challenge to Christian ethics, at both theoretical and practical levels.

How to achieve a basic sense of integrity, which is true and faithful when no one is looking, is at first sight a moral problem. But on closer look it resolves itself into a theological problem. For goodness cannot be created or sustained apart from the sanctions and faiths that undergird it. Any grizzled teacher or chaplain can testify to the failure of moralism: you cannot create character by preaching at or counseling with people to "be good." Morality is always the issue, the fruit, of a certain kind of faith—a sense of being accountable to a Lord transcendent of the self or the crowd, "unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid." A sense of integrity and a "tender conscience" come out of intense faith and true worship.

A major task, then, of Protestantism is the perennial one—to recover the relevance of its classical doctrines: the sovereignty of a morally serious God, as much the proctor of the secret heart as the Lord of the nations; the doctrine of justification by grace through faith, as a guard against both moral legalism and moral anarchy; and the doctrine of vocation, the calling of every man, in whatever work, to serve the purposes of God, in patience, in trust, in faithfulness, amid all the drudgery and meaninglessness of finite life.

WALTER G. MUELDER

The Ethics of Outer Space

Soon after Russia launched its animal-bearing satellite, Dean Muelder made this address in Marsh Chapel at Boston University. Because of the importance of the subject and its thought-provoking treatment, the Editors have obtained permission to publish not only the address but also a symposium made up of responses from various persons. The symposium begins on page 20.

THE breakthroughs of modern science in the past two decades have burst the frontiers in many directions. Atomic fission, atomic fusion, photosynthesis, and the projection of earth satellites challenge the minds of men and women to enter a new age—a new world. It is an age of intellectual excitement, of fantasies made facts, of theoretical passion moving into technological probability.

Man has just embarked on his greatest physical adventure—the conquering of outer space. Such days recall the years of Galileo when he held with moral courage to the disciplines of reason and scientific method against the dogmas of Aristotle and the inquisitorial restraints of an authoritarian church. Freedom of the mind was pitted against fear and reaction in the social order. It was to be many years before a society evolved that could give to science the setting it needed. There has to be an adequate spiritual and moral setting if science and technology are to do their proper work.

The proper work of science is the unfettered exploration of truth. The great explorer Fridtjof Nansen once was asked why men seek to explore regions like the poles and replied: "The history of the human race is a continual struggle from darkness to light. It is, therefore, of no purpose to discuss the use of knowledge. Man wants to know, and when he ceases to do so, he is no longer man."

Yet, around the inquisitiveness of man there lurks always the dark threat of evil powers. The legends and dramas of ancient and medieval inquiries are replete with fears and foreboding, of revolt and reprisal, of compacts with demonic and satanic powers. Prometheus is presented as stealing something from heaven. Faust is depicted as making a bargain with Mephistopheles. Galileo is actually put on the rack, and Bruno is burned at the stake. These legends and historical events reveal the fateful situation that scientific discovery and human exploration are not isolated events. They may be sought out of love for light, but they are involved in profound psychological dilemmas and threatening social situations. A spiritual and ethical crisis radiates from the events of discovery because the mind of the scientist is the function of a person linked in indeterminate solidarity with all his fellow men.

Alfred Nobel was horrified with the use that was made of dynamite. You will recall his story. He was born in Stockholm, educated in St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) and the United States, where he studied mechanical engineering under the famous engineer John Ericsson. As a young man he experimented with nitroglycerin in his father's factory and hoped to make this dangerous explosive into a safe and useful explosive. He did prepare a nitroglycerin explosive, but so many accidents occurred when it was put on the market that Nobel was considered almost a public enemy. Finally in 1867, he combined nitroglycerin with an absorbent substance that formed dynamite—an explosive that could be readily handled and shipped. But dynamite could also be used in war. In later years he became increasingly ill and nervous, tormented by a feeling of guilt at having created a substance that caused so much death and injury in the world. He hated the thought of dynamite's being used in war when he had invented it for peace. In his will he set up a fund of $9,200,000, the interest from which was to be used for prizes annually.

Nobel is not the last scientist to have been spiritually, morally, and nervously distraught by the uses society made of his discoveries and inventions. The story of conscience since Hiroshima would comprise an epic whose dynamics would throw new light on the ancient dramas of Prometheus and Faust.

And so it is that the glorious adventure of man's entry into outer space raises moral issues that cannot be evaded. Perhaps there are dogmas of nations in deadly conflict with each other that prevent the

right release of scientific work on this great program. There is the problem of the development of sufficient moral freedom and maturity, of patterns of responsible economic and political life, appropriate to sustain right relations in outer space. It is as important to launch space ships from a sound social base as it is to try to launch them from a sound technological base. The flights of satellites into outer space are a special warning to the nations that they develop a unified and responsible social foundation together or they will be showered by a horror that dwarfs the collision of jet planes as these dwarf the entanglements of paper kites.

Two moral facts stand out from what we have thus far described:

1. The new projection of flight into outer space is a technical achievement that entails vast changes in the patterns of culture all over the world.

2. The speed, behavior, orbits, and final resting places of objects sent into outer space present challenges that can only be met by the unified and co-operative action of mankind as a whole.

A number of other lessons can be gleaned from the experiences of the past fifteen years—years showing that social dogmatism, self-righteousness, national pride, and reliance on violence are suicidal morals in this age.

1. The first lesson is that scientific and technological competence are not linked solely to our national pattern of social, economic, and political order. Contempt for other nations neither guarantees scientific advance at home nor prevents the method of science from being effective wherever it is applied.

2. The effort to guard, hide, and hoard the universal truths resultant from scientific method has only had the general effects of (*a*) deceiving our minds, (*b*) sacrificing our political liberties, (*c*) restricting our academic freedom, and (*d*) betraying our moral leadership in the world.

3. The conscience of the nations has become so calloused that political leaders deal in missiles with nuclear warheads as means to relieve economic recession. It is well for us who finance the conquest of outer space to remember that the consequences of an accident in a nuclear-driven satellite or space ship—or any similar error of this type—cannot be reversed by an eventual change in national policy, bipartisan repentance, or a NATO conference on its knees (if you can imagine

such a thing). The lethal effects of the release of radioactive materials in the nearer outer space would continue for an extended number of years. Nor would the horror be limited to a single generation. No change of heart can recall the objective guilt—the irreversible and irretrievable consequences—that the natural laws of God have written into the mechanisms of biological inheritance through many generations to come.

THE TRAGEDY of this great adventure is that mankind enters it not from a social platform of friendly competition, co-operation, and mutual respect. Ours has become an age of conflict, of rivalry. Men speak of overtaking their enemies, of transatmospheric deterrence, and of cosmic retaliation.

In *Time* magazine for January 20, 1958, I read:

> Space satellites have a crucial near future military value, e.g., reconnaissance, target-location and selection, intelligence. The Air Force is developing a Lockheed space project called Big Brother or Pied Piper, a system designed to throw out one or more space satellites into orbit at a 300-mile altitude. Function: a continual survey of the world, reported by television and other means. The Air Force is also considering other multi-billion dollar space projects that are years away but must be started up soon. Among them: a project to position four reconnaissance space satellites thousands of miles up; another that involves construction of space platforms serviced by manned gliders and provisioned by Atlas freighters. The military value of these projects leads inevitably to antisatellite missiles and to wholly new phases of the deterrent concept as the world moves into space.

For more than five years one of the nation's chief experts in the field, Mr. von Braun, has advocated tying the U. S. space-flight program to its military-missile effort. He has sought to have the U. S. build a "manned satellite to curb Russia's military ambitions." But the social ethics of such a policy is a diabolic downward spiral of destruction for everything a democracy once held dear. If you tie the scientific explorations and the technological developments of space flights to military efforts, you are not able to advance the former without intensifying the latter. You tie the noose of militarism tightly around the neck of a democratic people at the same time you hang 40 billion pieces of silver around its ankles in the form of a defense budget. The military

budget itself cannot be increased without appeals to fear, rivalry, and conflict. Consequently, the nation is doomed in its exploration of outer space unless this effort is separated from militarism. The argosies of transatmospheric commerce and well-being cannot be launched from the platforms of military strategy. Only cosmic warfare can shriek from the launching pads of militarism whether made in Moscow or Washington. These launching platforms will crush the people whose taxes are devoted to such satellite warfare.

Does this earnest and sober protest seem to you premature and emotional? It has already reached the stage of political appeal and action. The ethical issue has been publicly joined in a newsletter from Lyndon B. Johnson:

> Control of space means control of the world. . . . From space, the masters of infinity would have the power to control the earth's weather, to cause drought and flood, to change the tides and raise the levels of the sea, to divert the Gulf Stream and change temperate climate to frigid. . . . The urgent race we are now in—or which we must enter—is not the race to perfect long-range ballistic missiles. There is something more important than any ultimate weapon. That is the ultimate position—the position of total control over earth that lies somewhere out in space. . . . Whoever gains that position gains control, total control, over the earth, for purposes of tyranny or the service of freedom. . . . The task is as tremendous as the challenge.

What does it mean to say "total control for the service of freedom"? What does your conscience say to this? My mind goes back to a man whose temptations took him to an exceedingly high mountain from which he could see all the nations of the world. Satan said to him, "You can have all these if you will only bow down and worship me!"

To whom does outer space belong? For that matter, to whom does the earth belong?

There are many exciting problems for political scientists and economists and moralists when we consider—even under peaceful conditions—the ethics of outer space. What is to be the international law of space? Should the monopoly for space ventures be given to the UN? What in terms of transatmospheric space is the translation of freedom of the seas? What courtesies should be given to the makers and riders

of rockets and satellites when they fall from their orbits half a planet away from their launching pads?

Must we not say to our national government that the response to Russia's satellites must be at a profounder level than that of military deterrence? Must we not ask ourselves what values are most profoundly at stake?

Is it national prestige or international co-operation?

Is it physical prowess or a witness in technics for the underdeveloped nations?

Is it scientific and technical status, or is it global communication and scientific encouragement and fellowship?

Is it national military security, or is it negotiation and spiritual determination to build up the United Nations and its agencies?

Is it the reducing of outer space to a scare value or sharing of the abundance of the cosmos with all earth's folk?

BUT, YOU MAY SAY, we aren't up there yet. Let's get up there by any possible means and then we can consider these things.

I reply, the age of outer space must be launched from the social platform of universal responsibility. The solution to the ethical problems of outer space must be found, not in council chambers on the moon or in the fraternizing of enemy aliens in the Stygian blackness of dust-free skies, but in the conference rooms of earth, the sanctuaries of the churches, the classrooms of universities, and the conscience of each child of the Eternal.

Symposium

Responses to Dean Muelder's "The Ethics of Outer Space"

From MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN—

It is a privilege to have been invited to contribute toward a discussion of the ethical problems that men confront at the dawn of the space age. All of us are indebted to Mr. Muelder for his eloquent statement of the problem. Whatever is said here derives from a deep appreciation of the basic document, and the following observations are made only as suggestions in the interest of greater clarification. They fall into two general categories: first, a discussion of those statements that seem to rest on too easy assumptions and, second, a lament over the failure to point to our maximum resources.

I

It would seem that Mr. Muelder's presentation suffers most from the illusion that "sweet reasonableness" can and will prevail in the present ideological conflict. History itself provides very little evidence for the fact that enlightenment accomplishes much in an area where only the language of political power is used and understood. The fact is, we live in a world that is threatened by men who seriously believe that conflict and struggle are the very heart of reality. There is no possibility of communicating with that position from a viewpoint that harmony and peace are the essential ingredients of life. Mr. Muelder, therefore, is far too optimistic in believing that the ethical problems of outer space can be solved in the conference rooms of earth, the sanctuaries of the churches, the classrooms of universities, and in the conscience of each child of the Eternal. For what can the conscience of the individual accomplish if earth itself is taken over by men whose whole philosophy of life denies that the individual has a conscience?

In this connection we must realize that modern totalitarianism is indeed modern. Only the twentieth century has developed the means of mass communication and the psychological techniques of manipulating men en masse. For the first time in history men's thoughts can come under the control of a party apparatus. Under such conditions conference tables can only serve to encourage some wishful thinking.

Moreover, Mr. Muelder lists national prestige and international co-operation as items that mutually exclude each other. But they do not need to. In point of fact, the prestige of a single nation can often contribute very directly to international co-operation. Again, he contrasts physical prowess and "a witness in technics for the underdeveloped nations." Now, the United States is a rather good example of doing both at the same time. One might even say that, if it were not for our military might, our "physical prowess," we should long ago have been pushed out of precisely those areas of the world that need our help most.

There are people who use outer space as a "scare value." However, this may be as helpful as the man shouting "Fire! Fire!" to get his sleeping neighbor out of a burning house. The whole problem of space is tied up with our national survival and our basic freedoms. It is about time that this is used as a "scare value" if it will help to alert us to the acute dangers we face. It would be more correct to say that space has not been used enough as a "scare value." Soviet scientists have already devised the theory that will make it possible to observe everything on our globe from four space stations with special television cameras.

Mr. Muelder also assumes that military deterrence is of merely superficial value. This is a very strange statement to make in our generation when civilization itself has been preserved only by the deterrent power of the Strategic Air Command. To suggest that our response to Russia's satellites must occur "at a profounder level than that of military deterrence" is to start with a failure to comprehend the very essence of the present conflict.

The basic paper assumes that the United Nations and its agencies are a cure-all for the world's problems. Surely this is a gross oversimplification. As a matter of fact, the United Nations, if it were turned into a kind of world government agency, could conceivably turn into the worst possible instrument of tyranny, beyond which there would be no appeal. This is not to say that there should be no respect for universal laws of right and wrong. These, however, can be set forth and re-

spected also within the present framework of the multiple-state system, and, possibly, even more effectively.

To suggest in 1958 that moral progress can be made only by education and consultation represents a failure to reckon with what St. Augustine chose to call "the abyss" in man, which can be filled in only by that Holy Spirit who can work in each of us that humility of heart and contriteness of spirit which alone can make sense for ethics anywhere, including outer space.

II

This leads us to suggest that in all of his discussion Mr. Muelder has failed to point to the real source of hope in our situation. There is in his paper hardly a reference to either the church or the biblical revelation in general. There is a reference to the temptation account of our Savior, but it comes out rather askew.

Neither the church nor the biblical revelation in general operates on the assumption that "sweet reasonableness" will cure any problems. Neither suggests that conferences and discussions would really cure the basic problems of mankind, whether here or in outer space.

It would seem unnecessary to remind the author that it was not reasonableness and enlightenment that made Christians out of cannibals in such places as the South Pacific Islands. It was nothing less than the work of Christian missionaries, using as their source of power the Scriptures and the sacraments of the church. As a consequence, the Navy, for example, found on Bikini a group of native people who would not move from their island home for any atomic tests unless they could be assured of the fact that such explosions would somehow contribute to the welfare of men and to the glory of God. That's the kind of ethics men need to have also in outer space!

If there is any hope at all for mankind, it can be found only in the Creator and Redeemer himself. And he has left us his church as that new community which transcends all barriers of nation, race, and economic order. But there is nary a word of this in Mr. Muelder's plea!

From FRANCIS L. GARRETT—

"The Ethics of Outer Space" does not lend itself to the calm and logical review which any such learned address surely deserves. This

is by way of saying, at the very outset, that this review is being written primarily in terms of violent and sometimes emotional reactions to the ultimate thesis of the sermon.

The introduction is filled with truths that our generation sorely needs, and at first I doubted that I would find any areas of disagreement. It was good to see in print a profound statement such as this: "There has to be an adequate spiritual and moral setting if science and technology are to do their proper work." This is the sort of insight and conviction upon which mankind's further development may indeed depend, and I gladly leaped to the conclusion that this statement was the foundation upon which this discourse would be structured.

Such was not to be the case. No sooner was this statement uttered than the author made what we of the Navy would term a radical change of course. After his introduction has firmly established the need for a sense of direction in these perilous times, he then reveals that his major concern in this sermon is to advance the thesis that social morality is the one launching pad from which we may "blast off" in the effort to redeem this "age of conflict and rivalry." One is transported back across the decades to the early years of the century when, in the face of the rapid growth and urbanization of our nation, the social gospel became the golden note at whose sound all the walls of injustice and prejudice were to come tumbling down. There is no need to recall the events that served to engender a rejection of the social gospel, nor is there any reason to conclude now that this same "theology" is the answer to man's space problems. And yet this sermon pronounces that the "tragedy of this great adventure is that mankind enters it not from a social platform of friendly competition, co-operation and mutual respect."

Dr. Muelder then proceeds to identify military efforts in the outer space arena as the real villain in the drama, and he becomes prophetic in his assertion that the continued presence of the military in "the cast" of cosmic characters can result only in disaster. In the light of history any such prophecy becomes highly conjectural and extremely subjective. The value alternatives with which he concludes this sermon are perhaps the clearest evidence of his plea for a socioethical point of reference as we move out toward the awesome yet wonderful new world of outer space. He condenses it better than I! "The age of outer space must be launched from the social platform of universal responsibility."

Now I am not absolutely sure what all this means. I have an idea

that this sermon fails to draw any distinction between ultimate and intermediate solutions. I think it springs from a noble belief in the value of education and communication and from a worthy faith in the capacity of the individual to mature spiritually. I am certain its author does not intend to suggest that religion should play only a minor role in this conquest of outer space.

But I am sure of one thing! When I came to the conclusion of this sermon, I found even I was left drifting in outer space myself—somewhat helpless and vaguely hopeless—and I had so wanted to be brought at last and left at the foot of an ancient cross. If it is redemption we seek—we shall find it there! If it is a sense of direction we need—we shall find it there! And if it is a dynamic for which we search, a powerful motivation for the benevolent of beneficent conquest of space—that, too, can be found at the cross, where divine love made its shattering impact upon the whole family of mankind.

From RICHARD B. HUGHES—

Americans share with all mankind a fear of science unguided by ethics. We also share with the free world the fear of Communist domination.

Dr. Muelder should be commended for his brilliant elucidation of the first danger. He must be criticized for not discussing the first danger in the perspective of the second. The two problems are so interrelated that any workable solution for the first must consider the second.

There is a growing feeling among some sensitive social critics that nuclear war, the control of the earth from space, and biological mutations from nuclear fallout are such horrible prospects that they should be avoided at all costs—even Russian scientific and military supremacy. This is an ethically questionable position, and Dr. Muelder falls near it by insisting on the separation of the science of space from its military application without considering the military consequences.

It must be clear by now that the West can bargain with the Russians only from a position of strength. Churchill has stated this clearly: "There is nothing they (the Russians) admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness." This is a hard evaluation for Americans to swallow, with our deeply ingrained notions of human perfectibility

and our naïve attempts to build the good society without attending to the realities of power blocs and power politics.

During the years just after World War II, we used atomic supremacy to promote peace: I cannot believe the Russians would use space supremacy so responsibly.

Currently the Russians want peace. But this peace offensive must not blind us to the fact that *peace* is, for them, not a moral principle or a respect for other social systems; it is a tactical move. It means the absence of a shooting war (1) because war would lead to mutual annihilation during the present arms balance and (2) because there is the growing hope of world communization through propaganda and infiltration, arms shipments and economic aid, the decline of Western political and economic stability, and superior production and technology under the Soviet system. The Khrushchev revolution has brought profound internal changes, but none to suggest the Kremlin would not use any arms advantage of space science to press its perennial end of world domination.

The present arms balance gives us time to strengthen the controls of international law, project bold programs for the peaceful use of space science so that it will not be entirely linked with military ends, promote all kinds of intercultural penetration, especially exchange of scientific data, and consider all disarmament plans that are truly bilateral and offered in good faith. But we must not be panicked into acquiescence to Soviet military and scientific leadership.

It is terrifying to think that our ethical decisions may lead to nuclear war, fallout mutations, and immoral control of the earth from space. It is, however, just as terrifying to make decisions that would cause our grandchildren to grow up under the slow strangulation of Communist domination.

From GEDDES MacGREGOR—

The technological advances to which Dean Muelder refers are in fact remarkably belated. Take photosynthesis, for instance: our traditional ideas about food have changed very little since the Bronze Age. Agriculture reaps only a small fraction of the sun's energy falling on the earth—about one per cent during the life of a crop and less than that over the course of a year. But even with so much waste of God's bounty in the first place, the earth has generally yielded harvests that

would have been quite sufficient for human needs at any particular time had not humanity exhibited so much ingenuity in devising other means of starving itself. The conquest of outer space has been indubitably delayed by our lengthy preoccupation with the problem of avoiding human co-operation in the "conquest" of our "own" planet.

With the conquest of outer space, we shall of course abundantly extend our opportunities for the display of our barbarism and stupidity, which is at present considerably restricted by our earth-bound condition. After all, a mere increase in salary usually helps people to be more conspicuously vulgar than their circumstances formerly permitted them to be. It would therefore be indeed astonishing if human beings did not make bigger fools of themselves with week-end tickets to the moon than they can contrive to do in their present relatively impoverished condition.

There is no evidence from history that the human race is either more or less stupid than it was in the past. Aristotle was just as "scientific" in terms of his day as was Galileo in terms of his. He was not as good a writer as Plato and probably not as good a talker as Socrates; nevertheless, his works, when rediscovered fifteen hundred years after his death, had the effect of driving some churchmen into doing a little theology instead of continuing to congratulate themselves on their intellectual slumbers. "Authoritarian" seems to me an odd adjective for the church on the eve of the Reformation. It was anarchical, though no doubt almost anything looks orderly when compared with the ecclesiastical anarchy of modern Christendom. It is wonderful, however, what a really determined ecclesiasticism can do when it is sufficiently dedicated to the antitheological cause. When the satire of Erasmus could go so unheeded that there was nothing for it but the belated Reformation, it is unremarkable that Kierkegaard's satire could be recognized as early as seventy-five years after his death and still have no effect on Suburban Christianity a quarter of a century later. So I tremble more at the thought of the coming Second Reformation than at the relatively pedestrian activities of the atomic physicists.

All this has been well known in one way or another, of course, to God's elect since election began. To paraphrase St. Paul, we wrestle not against scientists but against the Devil, who ever has his chapel in the church; against ecclesiastical wickedness in high places; against those who pray with their lips for the coming of the Kingdom while seeking

with head and heart the tarrying thereof; against those who have consecrated themselves to turning the Body of Christ upside down. To us who know the church from the inside, does not Nobel's conscience seem to have been a bit hypersensitive?

From STEWART MEACHAM—

Dr. Muelder, in asking for a solution to the ethical problems of outer space, suggests that morality is relevant to the problem raised by satellites and nuclear explosions. Twenty years ago nearly everyone thought that morality had social relevance. Today scarcely anyone thinks so. We have lost our sense of corporate sin, and have therefore lost our capacity to repent, and to change for moral reasons.

Protestant theology today has three aspects: (1) fundamentalism, (2) positive thinking, and (3) neo-orthodoxy. These three differ, but they are alike in this: none has a moral view adequate to meet the problem of missiles and nuclear weapons. Each can make its own characteristic comment; but none can answer the plain question, "Is it right or is it wrong for a nation to manufacture and use weapons of mass destruction?" Each must reply, "I really do not know."

The more the scientists warn us of the radioactive doom that awaits us a few years hence, the more apparent is the moral bankruptcy of our painfully silent religious spokesmen. Liberal Christianity, which once affirmed a link between morals and social issues, was thrust aside in the thirties by neo-orthodoxy because it had gone flabby and could not meet the tests of sacrifice and brotherhood to which the great depression challenged men of good will. The radical wing of the liberal Christian movement, tempted by the moral relativism of neo-orthodoxy, fell victim to the illusion that violence, applied to the problem of social change, could speed solutions. History has shattered this illusion; but, ironically, disillusionment has not caused the disillusioned to reject violent means and seek more effective paths toward social change. Instead, the neo-orthodoxy of the late 1950's advocates testing and stockpiling the new weapons in defense of the status quo.

Our day hungers for moral answers to social questions. We are dismayed by the amoral authority of power blocs and rival force. Here and there, in such cases as the survival of the church in the Soviet Union and the triumph of the silent walkers in Montgomery, Alabama,

one sees how men and women, resisting social violence nonviolently, may demonstrate the relevance of the Christian life to social problems. They manage to lift up the Cross in terms so close to the power issues that they themselves end up nailed to that which they have lifted up.

Most of us have an understandable determination to avoid this end if we can. Nevertheless it is very likely that the Christian faith has nothing less to offer. If this is so, it is reassuring that those who have participated in this type of moral engagement seem to emerge as victors, and even those who suffer most have joy.

Perhaps the fate of Dean Muelder's plea for a moral reference point in outer space depends on whether this Christian victory can be carried into the area of international relations, and particularly the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

From PAUL RAMSEY

A Fable

Eve let her eyes fall that day upon the figure of her husband. She knew something of both his resolve and his apprehension over the future toward which they were going. Yesterday her gaze dwelt upon him lovingly with the unwavering support of a woman's eyes in a world long ago where there were no others and no distances between. Today it seemed that she had not known him then. "It is as important to launch this agricultural economy you are determined to have," said she to Adam, "from a sound social base as it is to try to launch it from a sound technological base. You have your wooden plow, but that is not enough. The age we are entering must have as the foundation of its great adventure a social platform of friendly competition, co-operation, and mutual respect. . . ."

A silence descended between them, while her words strove mightly against Adam. Eve's imagination—mother to all the living—grew replete with what was yet unborn. "The age of Abel the keeper of sheep," she murmured quietly with hope, "of Cain the tiller of the ground and the first to build a city, of Jabal the father of those who dwell in tents and have cattle, of Jubal the father of all those who play the lyre and pipe, of Tubal-cain the forger of instruments of bronze and iron, of Nimrod the mighty huntsman, and of all who make brick with bitumen

for mortar—this great age must be launched from the social platform of universal responsibility."

Adam looked with downcast eyes at the shadow upon their pathway cast from behind them by the angel's two flaming swords. He knew better than she the shape of the advancing generations. Yet his mind had no relish for this knowledge, and he too wished that this new age might be launched from some other platform than the No-Returning.

From WILLIAM H. KIRKLAND—

In a "science-fiction-turned-fact" world such as ours, we have become so accustomed to the startling, the dazzling, the inconceivable, that we have become practically "shock-proof." Yet Dean Muelder's forthright words convey the conviction that with man's forays into outer space we are really confronted by a problem of a *different order* than we have faced before. At the same time, this new problem greatly intensifies all the vexing problems that already beset us as nations trying to maintain tolerable relations with one another within the rather considerable limits of the earth itself.

Anything that anyone can do to dramatize the urgent necessity that our people rouse themselves from their complacent, contented slumber is greatly to be encouraged. And it is not just "they"—the masses of the people—who have been "fiddling while Rome was burning." It is all of us—the church, the clergy, the would-be "watchmen on the wall," as well as the citizenry at large—that have been deeply implicated in our national mood of noninvolvement and nonattachment. This mood Dean Muelder forcefully challenges.

It is when we consider the presuppositions upon which he launches his criticism of our national policies, and the alternatives he poses, that this writer feels the need to raise some questions. Muelder seems to base his criticism of our present policies on too much of an absolute, either-or differentiation among the alternatives. Even if we develop a space satellite program that is "separated from militarism," it will obviously have direct implications for our whole defense program that will have to be taken into account and correlated at some point in the upper echelons of our government. The separation of the two efforts will always be a relative matter, though I would surely agree with the dean that some degree of separation is highly important. The space

satellite program must not be made entirely a function of our military strategy.

The same general objection is applicable to the five alternatives Dean Muelder states in his conclusion. He asks which values are most profoundly at stake: (1) national prestige or international co-operation, (2) physical prowess or a witness in technics for the underdeveloped nations, (3) scientific status or scientific encouragement, (4) national military security or determination to build up United Nations, (5) reducing outer space to a scare value or sharing the cosmos with all earth's folk. The implications of his comments are that in each case it is the latter value that should be the primary motivation in our national policy.

Any policy that is politically possible for our nation to adopt will at best involve a rough mixture of the values contrasted in the listing. The most that can be realistically sought is the double emphasis on the values both of national self-interest and of international cooperation. Perhaps our best hope in the present situation is the possibility that all the leading nations can come to a agreement that will represent a tolerable coincidence of the actual interests of all the powers. To expect that "the age of outer space must be launched from the social platform of universal responsibility" is to expect too much from nations deeply entrenched in a cold war. And to expect *too much* is to invite a frame of mind that will ill prepare us patiently to seek the *best that is possible in the present set of circumstances.*

HARVEY K. McARTHUR

The Atom and the Eschaton

This keenly balanced interpretation appeared in Tower Topics, *a publication of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, in April of this year.*

ACCORDING to ancient myth, a vengeful Zeus condemned Prometheus to perpetual torment because he gave mankind the gifts of fire and inventions. "All human arts are from Prometheus." Had the latter looked forward to 1945—to the Promethean fire over Hiroshima and Nagasaki—he might have repented his act and approved the policy of Zeus, which he had flouted. For in 1945 a new and dubious age began. The early Christians *believed* they lived under the shadow of the Eschaton, i.e., the catastrophic finale of human history; today we *know* we live under that shadow. The Atom has brought us face to face with the Eschaton.

I do not insist that our destruction is inevitably imminent—or even inevitable. But we have now acquired the capacity to destroy ourselves through miscalculation or accident. There is no escape from this knowledge. It spreads from country to country. Today only the U. S., the U.S.S.R., and Great Britain have this capacity. Tomorrow it will be in the hands of France. The day after tomorrow . . . ? Admittedly the new age will bring material benefits—if we live to enjoy them. The phrasemakers assure us we must "grow up or blow up." The sword of Damocles was a baby's bauble compared with the menace now suspended over our heads.

What is the relevance of the gospel in a world threatened by an Atomic Eschaton? It does not guarantee human survival regardless of the decisions made. Neither does the gospel promise to those who accept it special protection against annihilation. At the risk of oversimplification I would suggest that the gospel has a double message for us and those we serve. It declares our responsibility to participate in the common effort of mankind to avoid destruction. It also speaks the word

of comfort that can sustain us though the future remains uncertain. (As always, God's Word is one of demand and of promise.)

The church has been more effective in picking up the pieces than in preventing war. But what if there are no pieces left worth picking up? If the church is to perform its function of reconciliation, it must do so now.

While this is being done, other things must also be done to save us from our folly. Perhaps the most immediate task is the ending of nuclear experiments which threaten to contaminate the entire earth. The precise extent of this danger is unknown; but we have no right to continue a policy that may deform our posterity, if they live at all.

Second in the order of urgency is the improvement of machinery for international arbitration, i.e., the UN. Or perhaps the machinery does not need improvement, only our commitment to it.

Thirdly, there is the task of guiding social change so that depressed areas move forward without chaos. The church, with its major foothold in the "developed" West, is more easily shocked at the violence in poverty-stricken nations than at the injustices which generate such violence. Our commitment to political democracy has frequently blinded our eyes to the fact that the forms of political democracy may not of themselves transform underdeveloped countries. Often the economic structures must be changed radically, and this may be impossible without violence.

The above tasks cannot be completed without an enormous increase in knowledge, understanding, and forgiveness in the life of the world. The church has no monopoly on these, but the areas of forgiveness and reconciliation are its special responsibility.

How do these broad, and perhaps grandiose, generalities affect the local church? At Evanston, D. T. Niles said: "It is the world that is the primary object of God's concern. If the church would converse with God, it must converse about the world." This applies to the local church. We must talk with people not simply about their souls but also about the world. The two belong together. We cannot regard emphasis on the world's problems as extracurricular activity. It is part of the central business of the church. Are we doing it?

The problems of mankind will never be totally solved in history. They may not be sufficiently solved to save us from the Atomic Eschaton. What is the message of the gospel as we face this ugly fact?

Remember that the Atomic Age has merely brought nearer a shadow always hanging over human existence. We have long known that "all men are mortal." (Though it has been easier to say this than to say, "I, Harvey McArthur, must die.") We have also known that human life began in time and, presumably, will end in time. The Atomic Age has underlined this fact. The mortality of ourselves and mankind as a whole is now vividly before our eyes.

Yet the central thrust of the gospel has always been directed precisely to this situation. Even though we are sinful—i.e., among other things, self-destroying—God "commendeth his love toward us." This love, proclaimed in Christ, is our final and only security. We have sought security in a thousand earthly ways. Now we know that no earthly security is possible. Our only unshakable hope is the divine security, which is deeper than death.

While we proclaim the demand of God upon our human life we must also proclaim this promise of his love made manifest in Christ. "Underneath *are* the everlasting arms." Our people must know whether we believe these words or whether they are an umbrella for sunny days only. We must live, teach, and if need be die, so as to give reality to the words of Paul: "I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Not even an Atomic Eschaton?

Yes, not even an Atomic Eschaton!

Moral Power in International Relations is the title of an excellent article by Ernest A. Gross in the Summer 1958 issue of Columbia University's *Journal of International Affairs.* It is available now in pamphlet form (10¢) from the Department of International Affairs, National Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Ave., N.Y. 10.

The pamphlet begins: "Exponents of *Realpolitik* tend to ignore moral power as an actual ingredient of strength and, indeed, are inclined to regard the phrase itself as a dangerous verbal trap. Their prejudice rests in part upon a confusion between 'morality' and 'moralization.' In part also . . . it is a reaction against our national practice of shunting between naked abstraction . . . and noisy threat."

ALBERT T. RASMUSSEN

Recent Literature in Social Ethics

WE LIVE in a period when dramatic crises and threats, both domestic and international, explosively intrude into our existence demanding solution. The future of all of us in countless ways depends upon critical decisions that must be made by top leaders, usually remote from the common man, that involve ethical decisions of gigantic import. In innumerable ways our personal destinies are involved in the destiny of our nation, region, corporation or labor union, so intricately interdependent has our existence become.

The great controlling decisions of our times are not personal in the sense that we make them sitting privately in our homes or in a small group of intimate associates. They are made by leaders in authority in government, or in vast organizations; and they are made in negotiations with other leaders in confronting the hard realities of powerful opponents, competitors, or enemies. Furthermore, they are often made in response to swiftly arising emergencies in which there is no time to take a poll of citizen opinion or take a vote of those involved. This is more clearly discernible in international affairs when a Korea, a Hungary, a Suez, or an Iraq breaks and demands almost immediate response. But it is also true in confronting Little Rocks, or economic recessions, or labor-management relations. In private organizations, such as corporations or labor unions, these are continuing decisions of vast import that will affect the lives of thousands or millions. The great decisions of our lives increasingly seem to be made for us, and all there is left to do is reap the consequences.

This is the growing problem of the seeming impotency of the little man in a mass organizational society in times of swift change. This is the gap between the petty routines of daily living and the glacial

momenta or catastrophic eruption of events. Increasingly the question is being asked, Does Christian ethics have any pertinence or efficacy to guide policy decisions at high organizational levels? Do Christians or the church have a responsibility in this sphere of decision and policy formation? There is a long gap between the petty personal ethics that concentrates on being gracious and kindly to one's intimates, or sober and respectable in personal relations, and the massive ethical issues involved in policy.

This raises the basic question of ethics in social and organizational policy and planning that have forced a rethinking of Christian ethics and responsibility. What are the power realities in the relations of nations, corporations, labor unions, even in small businesses and groups where sanctions of rewards and punishment are available to coerce or put pressure on the opposition or upon those inside the organization? This is the problem of relating ethics to power and power structures that provides the context in which so many people work and make their decisions. Several significant books and articles analyze this problem. Not all are written by Christian ethicists.

Kenneth Boulding's book *The Organizational Revolution* [1] is an eye-opener on the degree to which large organizations have become policy makers. *The Organization Man,*[2] by William H. Whyte, Jr., misinterprets the Protestant ethic but shows the pressures toward conformity exerted in an organizational society. Sylvia and Benjamin Selekman discuss the power problem in business in a provocative book, *Power and Morality in a Business Society;* [3] and Arthur Kornhauser (editor), in *Problems of Power in a Democracy.*[4] Another significant book on the local community level is Floyd Hunter's *Community Power Structure.*[5]

Another dimension in which a powerful influence toward conformity may be exerted in our society is that of mass communication, through which public opinion and the general ethos or value system may be manipulated. Three books, among many others, delve into this problem:

---

[1] New York: Harper & Bros., 1953
[2] New York: Simon & Schuster, 1956.
[3] New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1956.
[4] Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1958.
[5] Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Wilbur Shramm's *Responsibility in Mass Communication,*[6] *How to Understand Propaganda*[7] by Alfred McLung Lee, and Stanley Kelley's *Professional Public Relations and Political Power.*[8]

It is easy to see why David Riesman contends (*The Lonely Crowd*) that Americans are becoming increasingly other-directed. Human beings are not isolated individuals, creating their own attitudes and values within themselves and making their own decisions in a vacuum. They are conditioned, limited, pressed upon, given orders by authorities from above, occupying assigned roles in power structures, intimidated by public and peer opinion and the desire not to be considered eccentric or subversive.

Up to this point no specifically Christian ethics has been mentioned. But these books set the framework in which Christian ethics as related to social influence becomes crucial.

In *Faith, Reason and Existence,*[9] John Hutchison says the Christian faith is not made of mere rational beliefs or recitable propositions but of acts, decisions, responses. God is not served in disengagement or in the abstract, but in the actual arena of life. And that arena is the social context with its power hierarchies, limits, and necessary negotiations.

In the book *Christian Ethics: Sources of the Living Tradition,*[10] a splendid book of readings from key theologians across Christian history, Waldo Beach and H. Richard Niebuhr say that there are two trends shown in recent Christian ethics: the inward trend, emphasizing man's limited freedom and the personal springs of action; and the social dimension of man's life in community. The Christian view of man sees him as conditioned and yet capable of responding and being renewed by God's action.

In a highly recommended symposium dedicated to Reinhold Niebuhr and edited by John A. Hutchison entitled *Christian Faith and Social Action,*[11] Paul Lehmann contributes a much-quoted essay, "The Foundations and Pattern of Christian Behavior." Here the author delineates

---

[6] New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.
[7] New York: Rinehart & Co., 1953.
[8] Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1956.
[9] New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
[10] New York: Ronald Press, 1955.
[11] New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.

a contextual ethic, which he calls the Koinonia Ethic, which is rooted in the concrete fellowship of the church. The Christian acts, not by advance legal imperatives, but by response to what God is doing and what the ethical situation requires. The Christian does not withdraw from action to maintain a principle but plunges into participation to do what can be done as his faith sensitizes him to see it.

Alexander Miller, in *The Renewal of Man*,[12] also shows the Christian ethic as one calling for entrance into the arena of decision, armed not with fixed legal prescriptions but with a loyalty to Christ. Christian ethics is a combination of faith and facts. Faith is standing in loyalty and communion, and facts are all the technical and organizational realities of the situation. Thus we see that both the perspective of faith and the concrete contextual elements are ethically significant and determine what action is most fitting.

The Christian ethicist must study and consider all the social, economic, and political elements. Policy decisions, particularly, require a partnership between ethical sensitivity and technical factual understanding.

H. Richard Niebuhr has addressed himself to the critical problems of relating faith to decision. In his *Christ and Culture* (1951) he probes the relation of Christ to culture and goes beyond mere tension and judgment to stress the conversion or transformation of culture. Unfortunately, Professor Niebuhr's famous lectures in ethics from the perspective of "social existentialism" have not been published. But we do have the excellent volume edited by Paul Ramsey, *Faith and Ethics: The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr*.[13] All these contributions by distinguished scholars deserve careful reading. Especially interesting to this writer is James Gustafson's chapter on "Christian Ethics and Social Policy." Gustafson's thesis is that Christian ethics must combine three starting points: the Christian revelation and faith, the analysis of the self, and an understanding of social organization and processes. Ethics, then, becomes interested in the relations of men within the context of power and authority and under the sovereignty of God.

In the realistic contextual approach the actual case method becomes the most appropriate way of studying Christian social ethics. Kenneth Underwood's *Protestant and Catholic*[14] is an excellent example. He

[12] Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1955.

[13] New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

[14] Boston: The Beacon Press, 1957.

analyzes at length the actual conflicts and power relations in reference to described events in an actual city. He concludes that both Catholics with their rigid dicta on faith and morals and Protestants with their particularized principles, freeze the situations into obstinate demands so that they are unable to negotiate and form creative and workable solutions.

Even in a short review one cannot fail to cite the enormously influential work of Reinhold Niebuhr and John Bennett, who interpret Christian responsibility realistically but from a slightly different approach. Bennett argues down from the absolute of love to more tentative middle axioms and still more tentative concrete decisions. Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., follows this lead in his provocative *Conscience and Compromise.*[15]

Most of these writers concur that there are no absolute systems or models of political, economic, or social organization that manifest perfect love or justice, or that can be considered to be divinely sanctioned. The Christian is required to plunge into the processes of policy formation, humbly, under the judgment of God, and in relation to alternatives that can be discovered in the dynamic situations themselves.

Politics, economic activity, international relations, local community relations, racial and ethnic relations, provide the crucial areas of influence where Christian decision must be exercised.

In the political area several significant books have appeared: John Bennett's *The Christian as Citizen,*[16] William Muehl's *Politics for Christians,*[17] and John A. Hutchison's *The Two Cities: A Study of God and Human Politics.*[18] William Lee Miller's book, *The Christian and Politics,*[19] announced some time ago, has not yet come to this writer but in the light of lectures already delivered should be a major addition. All view the Christian's responsibility as urgent and necessary and to be confronted in the actual balancing of pressures and claims as they arise. All would agree that no groups or individuals are trustworthy or competent to impose their wills or decisions unilaterally on others without open channels legally to press counterclaims.

---

[15] Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.
[16] New York: Association Press, 1955.
[17] New York: Association Press, 1956.
[18] Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1957.
[19] Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1958.

In the field of race, two sociologists, G. E. Simpson and J. M. Yinger, draw on a vast number of works to assemble an arsenal of facts and theories in their text *Racial and Cultural Minorities.*[20] Liston Pope's *The Kingdom Beyond Caste* [21] and Benjamin May's *Seeking to Be Christian in Race Relations* [22] present a Christian perspective.

In the economic sphere, the volumes in the series on "The Ethics and Economics of Society," [23] produced by the Department of Church and Economic Life of the National Council of Churches, are very significant in discussing ethical responsibility in this basic area. Nine volumes have already appeared. (The books by Boulding and Schramm are in this series.) *Christian Values in Economic Life*, by John Bennett and others; *The Social Responsibilities of the Businessman*, by Howard R. Bowen; and *Social Responsibilities of Organized Labor*, by John A. Fitch, are also important.

In the currently critical field of international relations, the paperback book by Ernest Lefever, *Ethics and United States Foreign Policy*,[24] is highly interesting and controversial. It takes a realistic position but perhaps fails to spell out adequately just what the Christian perspective adds to *"Realpolitik"!*

There are a score of other recent books that struggle with the great policy issues of our times and seek the mode of guidance that the Christian faith provides. It is grossly unfair to stop here, but space ends. *Christianity and Crisis* [25] and the Presbyterians' *Social Progress* [26] are two especially significant periodicals that regularly wrestle with these issues for their readers.

---

[20] New York: Harper & Bros., 1953.

[21] New York: Friendship Press, 1957.

[22] New York: Friendship Press, 1957.

[23] New York: Harper & Bros., various dates.

[24] New York: Living Age Books, Meridian Books LA 19, 1957.

[25] 537 West 121st St., New York, N.Y.

[26] Published by The Department of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 830 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia 7, Pa.

JOSEPH SITTLER

Ethics as Faith-Doing

This article is an excerpt from the forthcoming book The Structure of Christian Ethics, *by Joseph Sittler, to be published October 15, copyright 1958, by the Louisiana State University Press. It is used by the kind permission of author and publisher.*

THE heartbreaking choices which confront us so sharply in the affairs of nations are but the transcript of the situation which is structural in the solitary life of the believing individual. In a recent book, *The Cruel Sea,* a dramatic instance of this is presented. The commander of a destroyer, convoying a fleet of merchant ships, has finally located the submarine which had sunk several ships and caused the loss of hundreds of lives. The sonar-device which located the hidden submarine indicated that it was precisely at the point where on the surface of the water, some hundreds of men, previously torpedoed, were swimming about. To drop a depth bomb for the destruction of the submarine would at the same time mean the destruction of the men swimming in the water. There was but an instant to make his choice, and the commander made it knowing that no choice available could be anything but death-dealing. The subsequent tormented statement of the commander, "One must do what one must do—and say one's prayers," is an eloquent condensation of the ethical situation. "One must *do*"—for inactivity, refusal to do anything, is already to do something. And that something is not good. ". . . what one *must* do . . ." is not an open choice; definite alternatives are absolutely given. Both are deadly. ". . . and say one's prayers" is an acknowledgment of deepest piety that no decision fulfills the will of God or releases man from that relation to God which dares to live only by the daily forgiveness of sins.

When the God-relationship is centrally informed by faith, then the actual situation of decision-pressed man is saved from the despair which would inevitably overtake him if this relationship were simply compounded of love. For love, no matter how deeply accepted from

God, obediently directed toward men, firmly held to as the motivation of action, both reveals and compels the acceptance of pragmatic choices, *all* possible variations of which are fraught with inadequacy, pain, and denial. In this sense love is the tutor of faith! Even the "law of love," no less than the law of Moses, is a schoolmaster who leads the believer to Christ. For, in Christ, the believing lover of men-in-Christ now stands with his Lord and supreme Lover precisely in his crucifixion! "I am crucified with Christ" is a term expressive not only of the Christian recapitulation of the Christ-life in the large, but a symbol of the inner content of numberless ethical decisions in their actual heartbreaking character. A Christian ethics must, therefore, work where love reveals need. It must do this work in faith which comes from God and not as accumulating achievements to present to God. In this working it must seek limited objectives without apology, and support failure without despair. It can accept ambiguity without lassitude, and seek justice without identifying justice and love.

Ours is a generation upon which two forces from opposite directions are beating with such fury that we are in danger of ethical paralysis between them. From the one side we are the heirs of an ethical analysis which properly insists upon the will of God as transcendent to the relativity of all cultural life, reveals the ambiguity of everything human, the admixture of self-interest in everything human, the lurking demonic in every positive course. The result of this penetrating effort to speak the truth about man as sinner in his modern situation has been that decisiveness before gigantic evils and shrieking human injustices has been paralyzed by the sheer fullness with which every man's evil has been revealed, and ethical complexity has been so elaborately analyzed as to stun the conscience.

From the other side, we are a generation before whose eyes every primal meaning of "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God and the communion of the Holy Ghost" has been blasted by spirits organized into effective powers and threatening to reshape all existence into a one-dimensional denial of that God-relationship which constitutes humanity. Between these two forces—of an analysis which reveals involvement and humbles arrogance, and of the fact of millions of men enslaved, betrayed, liquidated—the Christian believer is tempted to stand in horrified but inert repentance.

The repentance must remain, for it is the constant heartbeat of the man of faith in history; but the stasis must be overcome. We are sinners, to be sure, but precisely such sinners as are addressed by the word of St. John, that if a man see his brother in need and shut up his bowels of compassion, how dwelleth the love of God in him? Unless we can discover a way, both to acknowledge the facts, act in faith and love, and accept the consequences of our action, our generation will constitute a huge portrait of repentant believers with furrowed brows and inert hands.

The way of advance is to understand that it is a function of faith itself to discern the differences between facts and then act upon what it discerns. Faith without discrimination between facts is a sentiment that encourages brutality; faith without acts (works!) is dead. There is, to be sure, no human fact in which sin is not involved. But within some structures of fact there are alive, free, and operative forces of grace, insights of elemental justice, re-creating energies of love. In politics, as in theology, freedom is a precondition of regeneration. It is a fact that the Negro community in American life has been exploited, contemptuously handled, overtly insulted by public law. It is also a fact that within American public life concerned men and institutions have been free to combat injustice, illumine ignorance, plead and work for equality of treatment.

The body of fact presented, for instance, by the Soviet reading of history and man, is a body of fact of a quite different order. It is a legitimate and necessary function of faith to discern this difference. For this closed matrix of dogma and force permits no operational space for the very forces which alone could corrode its idolatry, disintegrate its monodimensional dogma about man and history, and force it open to the powers of grace, justice, and love.

We began with the assertion that to be a Christian is to accept what God gives. We end with a reiteration of that assertion now so elaborated, it is hoped, as to disclose how the structure of Christian ethics grows organically out of the fact and the content of the endlessly giving God. The Christian man is to accept what God gives as Creator: the world with its needs, problems, possibilities; its given orders of family, community, state, economy. Each of these is invested with the promise and potency of grace, and each of these is malleable to the perverse purposes of evil.

The Christian is to accept what God gives as Redeemer: the earth and all human life as the place where God's glory became flesh and dwelt among us, and, therefore, the holy place for life in forgiveness, in the obedience of faith, in the works of love. "Man becomes man because God became man." God has given the form of himself and his will in a man; and the ethical life is the birth-pangs attending the new-being of man in history, ". . . until Christ be formed in you."

The Christian is to accept what God gives as Holy Spirit the Sanctifier. This acceptance includes the gifts that God gives from above; and the tasks which he gives in the world around. This gift and these tasks belong together. The gift is celebrated in the doing of the tasks; the tasks are undertaken in faith as witnesses to the gift.

"The Church Has a Duty"

At present we are fascinated by the H-bomb and have ceased to think what we can do about it, like a chicken before a rattlesnake. The consequence is that the soldiers and technicians are prone to treat the bomb as a purely technical problem without much regard to the moral implications of it and other new inventions. This is not because high-ranking soldiers and scientists are morally obtuse; quite the reverse. But they are entitled to guidance on policy in such matters. And, so far as one can judge from outside, they do not get the guidance which they need. The politicians are more dependent on intelligent public opinion than is commonly realized. The Service chiefs, atomic scientists, and politicians comprise many Christian men who are deeply conscious that modern war faces them with moral problems which are too big for them. The Church has a pastoral duty to such men which it is failing to perform. And the Church means not only the clergy but the faithful lay people.

—From an editorial in the first issue (January 1958) of *Frontier*, a quarterly published in London which incorporates *Christian Newsletter* and *World Dominion*

JAMES M. GUSTAFSON

Justice

This little article is reprinted by permission from Handbook of Christian Theology, *copyright 1958 by Meridian Books. The extremely useful paperback* Handbook (*a Living Age "original"*) *consists of 101 "definition essays on concepts and movements of thought in contemporary Protestantism" written by 71 distinguished theologians from Europe, Great Britain, and the United States. It is called to the attention of chaplains as a trustworthy "guide through the labyrinth of contemporary theological discussion."*

IN CHRISTIAN ethics the idea of justice has, as in philosophical ethics, three major referents: 1) God's justice or righteousness (comparable to a norm of absolute justice in the philosophical tradition), 2) the right ordering of life among men (social justice), and 3) the virtue of justice (being the just man).

The Bible tells of God's righteousness. God is holy and just; the content of His righteousness is disclosed in part in the Law. God requires fidelity and obedience to Himself; the wicked and the just man each will receive his due recompense. Yet even in the Old Testament God's love and mercy are never separated from the wrath of His righteousness. In the New Testament God's righteousness appears to refer to His character, His action, and includes His merciful justification of man.

Biblical literature also knows human justice as it is urged by the eighth-century prophets. Amos, for example, says, "Let justice roll down like water," and speaks specifically to the situation of the people of Israel. God requires a right ordering of social relationships. To some extent this is described in the law code, in part it must be discerned in the particular situation.

The biblical idea of the just man is one who is obedient and faithful to God. External conformity to the law is not enough (Jeremiah, Jesus); the law must be written on the heart, internalized in motivation. Yet

finally man's just and righteous life is not enough (Paul); man is saved by God's righteousness (which includes His mercy).

Contemporary Christian ethicists deal with several aspects of the problem of justice. Some persons work on justice in relation to its ultimate source and ground. Thus the Roman Catholic Jacques Maritain and the Anglican V. A. Demant base their understanding of right order among men on a theory of the moral law of nature that is rooted in the classic traditional Plato and Aristotle and became a major part of the Christian tradition in St. Thomas Aquinas. A created order and purpose exists in the essence of man and human relations. This purpose seeks fulfillment in the restoration of man and society to their true nature. Jesus Christ is morally important in part because through Him and the Church this restoration has begun to take place. The right order of life in contemporary society is grounded in and reflects the right order that is given in creation and continues to exist in essential form in spite of sin and human disorder.

The Protestant Paul Tillich understands justice, like love and power, to be the "form of Being"; i.e., the social category of justice is grounded in the "cosmic hierarchy" of ultimate reality. Love, power, and justice are inseparable both ontologically and historically. There are various levels of human justice, e.g., proportional justice and creative justice. Fundamental to these, however, is "the intrinsic claim for justice of everything that has being."

Unlike Maritain, Demant, and Tillich, all of whom speculate about the ultimate ground of justice knowable through human reason, other important contemporary theologians eschew such theories. They are concerned with a more "biblical" interpretation of justice. In the Reformation tradition the law and the major institutions of life exist to maintain justice in a world of sinful and unfaithful men, to lead men to repentance (they can never fulfill the law), and to be a form of discipline and action even for the man who in God's grace lives a life of love. Thus for Emil Brunner justice is necessary because we cannot have a society of spontaneous loving relationships in history. There are "orders of creation," e.g., the family, work, and the state, in and through which we can act justly, and which become a "school" for the true community of love. Love, compared with justice, is free, spontaneous action in community. In the life of divine love, to be fully known only in the Kingdom of God, the forms and structures of justice

are overcome. Thus one has in Brunner a sharp separation of love and justice.

Reinhold Niebuhr also eschews a positive theory of natural law and the ontological ground of justice. Man stands as one condemned under the law of love given in Jesus Christ. The life of perfect realization of love is an impossibility in man's state of unfaithfulness to God and of consequent sin. Thus in the most intimate human relationships relative justice is involved, e.g., a definition or understanding of the limitations of the rights and privileges of others. In the impersonal social structures the Christian is called upon to engage in power struggles, knowing that relative justice is the best that can be achieved. He can do this because he knows the justification of God, i.e., that in the end one's failures are redeemed in God's mercy.

Other theologians see justice and love in immediate relation to each other both as qualities in human relations, and as ultimately grounded in the unity of God, the Creator-Redeemer, e.g., in Karl Barth on the one hand, and D. D. Williams on the other.

Between Morality and Power

There is, alas, little reason to think that this nation now realizes what World War III—a war fought with massive thermonuclear weapons—would mean. We are duly grim about warfare, of course, but ours is the grimness proper to a pre-thermonuclear world. We still tend (on the popular level, at least) to think and to speak of a new world war as a last-resort option. "How dead can you be, after all?"

Unfortunately, "you," we, they—all together—can now be deader than was ever possible before in human history. For the first time in human history everyone, everything, can be dead. And this fact gives the moral problem of armaments an urgency, a relevancy, it never had before. To treat power as power pure and simple, divorced from morality, is the ultimate unreality. We live in a world where power and morality are irrevocably joined.

—From an editorial in *Worldview: A Journal of Ethics and Foreign Affairs,* June 1958.

DANA DAWSON

Russia Challenges Christianity

Bishop Dawson had visited Russia in 1934. He returned last year with Sherwood Eddy, who was making his seventeenth visit to that country. The following article offers in brief the Methodist bishop's message to American churches about what is good and what is bad in the Soviet Union, and about the challenge to Christianity presented by both.

VISITING Russia today is in a sense like reading the Bible. One may find what he wishes to find. If one goes searching for something to bolster communism and condemn capitalism, or the reverse, he will not be disappointed. We went fairly free of prejudice, seeking only the truth, humbled by the thought that it is difficult for any human being to see all six sides of a cube in equal perspective, especially the cube presented by the Russian Revolution.

Russia defies analysis. Sir Winston Churchill once described Russia as "a riddle, surrounded by mystery, and wrapped inside an enigma."

First, we have no country with which to compare Russia. She is sailing an uncharted sea. She is attempting to build a civilization on an entirely new foundation.

Second, there's the very magnitude of the country. Present-day Russia has within her borders one-sixth of the land surface of the globe. From Moscow across Russia to Manchuria is a journey of ten days on an express train that makes few and short stops. One may float for a week down the navigable part of the Volga, which flows to a length of 2,500 miles through the very heart of European Russia until it meets the Caspian Sea at Astrakhan, an old stronghold of the Tartar khans. Russia has a population of 200 million (only eight million of whom are members of the Communist Party). But the most obvious feature of the Soviet Union is its size.

Third, there's the problem of isolation. No one outside Russia travels across Russia to get anywhere. Until the death of Stalin, Russia's contacts with the outside world were distinctly slight. This feeling of isolation is strengthened when one registers at a hotel and finds his name transliterated into unpronounceable Russian. Another fact that contributes to the feeling of isolation is the language barrier. One has more difficulty communicating in Russia than in the countries of western Europe. Consequently, we had our own interpreter, who met our plane at Kiev, in the Ukraine, and remained with us throughout Russia until we emplaned for East Berlin.

Modern Russia is an exceedingly difficult field for the foreign observer. To get a full and fair picture would require years of patient investigation, and history alone will write the final verdict of the Russian experiment. We know that Russia wants a society without religion, and a society in which the individual depends for his salvation not on himself but on the group. She wants a society in which women must be economically independent, on an equality with men in industry, government, and war. (And when they say equality, they mean equality. We saw women mixing mortar, carrying bricks, laying concrete. That is equality with a vengeance.) We found a land of enormous natural vitality, which after the shattering blows of war, famine, invasion, and purges is increasing in population every year by a number greater than the combined annual increase of all the countries of Europe—a land where the worker is king, where the churchman is the supreme ignoramus, and where the believer in private property is the slimiest creature that walks the face of the earth. Such is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

But in spite of enigmas and contradictions we got the feel of Russia. We were allowed to go where we pleased. Our mail was not censored; our money was not counted; our suitcases were never opened. We rode Russian trains, planes, subways, and buses. We had conferences with the American ambassador, with Andrei Gromyko, Jr., and with Russian writers and American newspapermen—among the latter, Mr. Henry Shapiro, Jr., who has lived in Russia for years, who married a Russian woman, who has a daughter in the Russian schools, and who speaks Russian as fluently as he speaks English. We attended Russian opera, ballet, circus, cinema, and one session of the much-publicized Youth

Festival, at which time the program was presented by ten thousand Russian youth.

A philosopher once said, "There are some things you do not see with your eyes, but only by the knitting of your brows." We tried to knit our brows about Russia. We found both good and bad, and I shall discuss them in this order—and then four conclusions.

The good

In 1917, the year of the Russian Revolution, 10 per cent of the people were literate. Today, with compulsory education for all from seven to seventeen years of age, 90 per cent of the people are literate. One foreign language is required, and I was surprised to learn that the majority choose English.

I was greatly impressed by the friendliness of the Russian people and especially their kindness to Americans. They insisted on giving us their seats in crowded subways and stadiums. In long queues they invited us to the head of the line. The young people threw flowers into our cars, saying, *Druzhba, Druzhba, Druzhba*—"friendship, friendship, friendship."

There is no tipping in Russia. The government frowns on it. No one expects it, and no one does it. After the hotel porters and taxicab drivers in New York and Paris, this seemed a welcome relief.

The Russian cities impress one with their wholesome morality. There are no brothels. I saw no drunks. There is no vulgar display of sex on the streets, in the theaters, or in movie advertisements. I asked our interpreter what she thought of Elvis Presley. She knitted her brow and said, "Elvis Presley—what's that?" And the members of our party thought that a very good reply—"What's that?"

I was greatly interested in the reaction of the Russians to *Porgy and Bess*. You know *Porgy and Bess*, a folk opera, is the story of a moderately successful prostitute. A committee of the United States Congress recently voted $685,000 of public money, from the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs, to assist in sending this group to Europe to help the nations understand us. The Russians invited it to the Soviet Union and guaranteed to underwrite losses. Evidently *Porgy and Bess* is a picture of Western life that the rulers in the Kremlin are glad for their people to see. It played in the Bolshoi Theater in Moscow for some time; and the Russians were surprised to learn that Negroes had

such good voices, wore such fine clothing, received such splendid salaries, were allowed to travel anywhere; but they were disgusted with *Porgy and Bess* itself. Believe it or not, sections of it had to be cut for Russian audiences.

To walk through the city of Moscow at night is almost to feel oneself in a Puritan city. Now I would not wish to imply that the Soviet capital has reached a state of puritanical grace that even England could not achieve despite Milton's eloquence or Cromwell's sword. Heavy drinking and irregular sex relations are not uncommon in the Soviet capital, but there is no external gilding for these things. The vast pleasure-seeking, organized night life of Paris, London, and New York simply has no parallel in Russian cities.

Another item on the credit side of the ledger is the belief, shared by American newspapermen in Moscow, that certain policies are being altered. For instance, when Bulganin and Khrushchev went to Belgrade to apologize to Tito for Stalinism, they announced that the Socialist state could be reached by evolutionary as well as revolutionary methods. This means, they said, that war is not inevitable.

Now the Russians have by no means abandoned their convictions of the truth of communism and the need for its ultimate triumph in the world. But they are adopting different methods to reach this end—for example, economic assistance to underdeveloped and uncommitted countries. Russia is out to make friends abroad. We saw delegations arriving daily in Moscow from China, North Korea, Burma, Afghanistan, and other Eastern and Southeastern countries. In this battle for competitive co-existence, Russia is out to win.

It belongs on the credit side, also, that the membership of the Presidium has been enlarged, that there is a decentralization of industry, and that the words "classless society" do not appear in any current Soviet literature for the very good reason that such a society does not exist. (The top government officials, the scientists, the opera stars, the army brass, and the writers constitute the new Russian intelligentsia.)

I shall mention only one more thing on the credit side of the ledger, and that's the higher standard of living. Nothing impressed me more than the contrast I found between the Russia I saw this summer and the Russia I experienced in 1934. The standard of living is still far below that of the West; but it is superior, far superior, to anything the Russians have ever known. In 1934 there were few automobiles. Now one

must be alert in crossing the streets of the cities because of auto traffic. In 1934 there was one small airport in Moscow with two planes on the field. Last summer we found one of the most modern of airports with about fifty planes on the field, and among them two streamlined jets. In 1934 there was one subway line in Moscow. Today there are four, one below the other. You take an escalator and go down to the first level, the second, the third, or the fourth. No two lines cross each other. And the subway stations are the pride of Russia, with their mosaic ceilings and their marble walls. In 1934 there were no skyscrapers in Moscow. Today there are six. One is the 32-story Moscow University, built at a cost of $35 million, with as much floor space as Yale University and with 20,000 students.

The bad

Now there are many items on the debit side of the ledger. At least four things remained unchanged in Russia. A state economy is one. Everything is owned by the state—land, buildings, church buildings, systems of communication and transportation. The second thing that remains unchanged is political dictatorship. Hatred of religion remains. Some concessions were made to the church during World War II, but the official attitude has not changed. And the same world objectives remain.

There is little family life in Russia. Most families live in one- and two-room apartments sharing a communal bath and kitchen with several other families. The majority of the women work in factories and plants. It's against the law to teach children under eighteen years of age religion outside the home—which means there are no Sunday schools. And then the Soviet government sets forth to downgrade the home. During our entire time in Russia, I remember seeing only one family together on the streets or in the parks. That is stark tragedy.

A major item on the debit side of the ledger is propaganda. Now Russia has moved to the right as far as the United States has moved to the left, and it would seem natural to assume that with a reasonable amount of flexibility the East and the West could resolve their difficulties. They *can* do so IF we can avoid an atomic war, but that is a big IF with the propaganda departments in the Kremlin and the Pentagon working feverishly. The Russians have all read biased articles about us. We have read biased articles about the Russians. We frequently re-

port things not as *they* are but as *we* are. If propaganda could be abolished, I doubt if there would ever be another war. And of one thing I am certain: the United States and Russia are two nations suffering from headline jitters.

Another item on the debit side is the official attitude toward religion. A good motto in Russia would be, "There is no God, and Karl Marx is his prophet." If an atheist is a person who has no invisible means of support, Russia is the land of atheists. Organized religion has been pretty effectively squashed.

Yet we attended church services in Kiev, Zagorsk, Leningrad, and Moscow and found all the churches crowded. About twice as many women as men attended, and about four times as many women as young people were present. Next to the Russian Orthodox Church, the Baptists have the largest number of churches in Russia—some 5,500. There are 57 churches in Moscow for five million people—54 Russian Orthodox, one Roman Catholic, one Seventh-Day Adventist, and one Baptist.

We attended services in the Baptist church in Moscow on two successive Sundays. We had a conference with the pastor and his staff. Their church has 4,250 members. The building seats about 1,000 persons, and there were at least 2,000 present each Sunday we were there, many of them standing through the two-hour service. They heartily welcomed us as fellow Christians from America. They had a special prayer for us; and when the pastor prayed, the great congregation stood; there was not room to kneel. The congregational singing was inspiring; led by a good organ and a choir. When the pastor prayed, I could see many lips moving in prayer and tears on many cheeks. These people knew the meaning of suffering. They had experienced war, famine, invasion, and purges; and I'm still haunted by the tragedy imbedded in the faces of that congregation. In India I heard this proverb: "Those who are born in the fire will not fade in the sun." The Russian people have been born in the fire, and they will not fade in the sun.

At the close of the service they sang "God Be with You till We Meet Again." No music in heaven will ever sound sweeter to me than that Christian hymn in far-off Moscow on that Sunday morning. They kissed me good-by, and I kissed them—whiskers and all. Outside in the street, as far as we could see, they were standing there waving good-by with handkerchiefs. I unashamedly wept and said to a member of our party, "The pastors of *that* church are saints in Caesar's household."

Conclusions

Now my four brief conclusions are these:

First, the gulf is fixed for all time between these two tremendous movements—Christianity and communism—and an alert church will keep itself strong and vigorous in opposition to communism.

Second, there is a permanence about the present Russian government that the West does not realize. There is no evidence whatever that anyone now living in Russia will ever live under any form of government except the one they now have. They take the Communist government for granted. The British take the House of Commons for granted; Americans take the Constitution of the United States for granted; the Egyptians take the Nile for granted; the Arabs take the desert for granted; and the Russians take their Communist government for granted.

Third, in our dealings with Russia we have two alternatives: an atomic war, or a political truce.

Fourth, the only alternative to communism is Christianity—not a dead formalism, but a living force.

Christians say, "Well, what can one person do?" Many have said to me, "What can I do?" I answer: "Nearly everything that needs to be done. You can think in *world* terms. You can practice Christian principles in politics. You can rise above race prejudice. You can put Christian motives into business. You can work for Christian education. You can help form public opinion that is Christian. You can make your local church vital. You can dedicate your home completely to God. Until you have done these things, do not ask me, 'What can I do for world peace?' "

A Christian educator has said, "Communism is man's challenge to Christianity and God's judgment on flabby churches."

I have come back from Russia eager to carry over to my people the tremendous spiritual challenge that came to me behind the Iron Curtain —namely, that *true* Christianity is the only answer to dialectical materialism. It has inspired in me a desire to preach the fresh, vital gospel of Jesus Christ. For if Christianity cannot be demonstrated in social, political, economic, and international life, its validity has departed.

BOOKS

The Immense Journey by LOREN EISELEY. Random House. 210 pp. $3.50.

This is a rare book, which baffles comment for the same reason that it is hard to make a thank-you speech at a testimonial banquet, or to say good-by at a ship's sailing—one's feelings are too strong. Dr. Eiseley, head of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, is a reverent man, an awed asker of questions. He is also a superb writer, in whom the humor and lucidity of an E. B. White merge with a majesty of style and subject comparable to Sir Thomas Browne. Here in a series of essays, each able to stand alone yet strung in a mounting sequence so that the effect is cumulative, he asks what geology and anthropology say about the ultimate questions:

What is the mystery that makes the difference between living matter and dead matter?

Where did man come from?

What are the secrets of the "most remarkable creation in the world—the human brain"?

While most of us these days are roaring off into space, Dr. Eiseley journeys into time, back to "the croaking gloom of carboniferous swamps," and still farther back. There he finds clues of the utmost relevance to our search into space.

No more religious book was ever written by a theologian than this one by a scientist. It is significant that he begins with a quote from William Temple and ends with one from Hardy, that "matter . . . may . . be . . . but one mask of many worn by the Great Face behind."

In Dr. Eiseley's own words, this is an "unconventional record of the prowlings of one mind which has sought to explore, to understand and to enjoy the miracles of this world, . . . mud and the fire within it we call life, vast waters, and something—space, air, the intangible substance of hope which at the last proves unanalyzable by science, yet out of which the human dream is made."

For preachers, this book bubbles with homiletic material. The only faint quibble I might make about the book is that some of its parables are murky in their meaning. However, the materialist, the dogged humanist, particularly the scientist who is absorbed in method and scorns to consider meaning, would gag at everything about the book.

"To some greater ear than ours, man's optimistic pronouncements about his role and destiny may make a . . . little ringing sound that travels a small way out into the night," says

this man—and the humanist's teeth must grate at it.

A preoccupation that persistently crops up here is the tussle between theology and science over the origins of man. Eiseley feels this is not a settled question. "After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself having to create a mythology of its own."

Of the probabilities of life on other planets, he flat-footedly claims there can't be any as we know it. "The truth is that man is a solitary and peculiar development. . . . Biological principles . . . have totally removed the likelihood that our descendants will be entertaining little men from Mars. I would be much more willing to consider the possibility of sitting down to lunch with a purple polyp, but even this has anatomical comparisons with the life of this planet. . . . Nowhere in all space . . . will there be men to share our loneliness. There may be wisdom; there may be power, . . . great instruments handled by strange manipulative organs. . . . (But) of men elsewhere . . . there will be none forever."

It is by now clear that the only way to discuss this book is to quote it so unstintingly that my victims would do better to read it all for themselves.

Perhaps the only comment one can make is a personal testimony. I read it in my own garden, surrounded by my small children and noisy squadrons of their friends. They were screeching around me on bikes, tumbling off swings, making in the sandpile some ominous stuff they call "mushy gooey." Yet in the midst of all that commotion I, usually a compulsively busy mother, simply sat for a long time in the sun and thought about the book I had just been reading.

—Elisabeth D. Dodds, *Waterbury, Conn.*

A Companion to the Bible, ed. J. J. von Allmen. Oxford 1958. 479 pp. $6.00.

This is a book of the sort that should be of the greatest use to serious preachers and students of the Bible. Its original title (*Vocabulaire Biblique*) indicates its nature: it is a dictionary of those biblical words and concepts that are of the greatest theological importance. Every preacher is aware of the current revival of interest in biblical theology and no doubt senses the possibilities this holds for an increased depth and effectiveness in preaching. He is also aware that biblical preaching, like biblical theology, rests in good part on the understanding of words—words which are the vehicles of the Bible's message, yet which are often freighted with connotations and shadings of meaning not obvious on the surface. Truly, to understand the Bible's Word is (to paraphrase Professor von Allmen) to understand its words. But, unfortunately, the average preacher is in no position

to dig out the meaning of the words for himself, or even to familiarize himself with the manifold studies that have appeared on the various aspects of biblical theology. A book such as the present one should, therefore, be just the sort of tool that he needs.

The book was prepared by a team of French and Swiss scholars and first published in French (Paris and Neuchâtel, Delachaux et Niestlé, 1954). The fact that it is now brought into English is some indication of the fact that it has filled a need. Its treatment is selective rather than comprehensive. It concentrates on a limited number of articles, which are given rather generous space, rather than providing a vast number of very brief entries. The user thus gets more while getting less. But, if this be a defect, it is in good part compensated for by abundant cross references which in most cases allow the reader to find what he wants, albeit at times not without searching. The aim of the book is practical, with the needs of the working pastor and the serious layman kept in mind. Technical jargon is avoided and bibliographical notes dispensed with. One may regret the latter; but, in view of the purpose of the book, the decision was possibly wise, since valuable space is saved.

The reviewer has sampled a number of the articles and has a decidedly favorable impression of the whole. The most nearly comparable work is probably *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* (Alan Richardson, ed., 1951). To illustrate the differences, one might note that where Richardson's book has some 255 articles in some 290 pages, the work under review has only some 162 in its nearly 480 (somewhat smaller) pages. The reader might do well to examine the two and get the one best suited to his needs—or, better still, get and use both, for they frequently supplement each other. In any event, the present book is heartily to be commended. Every preacher and teacher of the Bible needs something of the sort at his elbow.

—John Bright, *Professor of Hebrew and the Interpretation of the Old Testament, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.*

The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Studies by Frank Moore Cross, Jr. Doubleday 1958. 196 pp. $4.50.

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Living Church by Carl G. Howie. John Knox 1958. 128 pp. $2.50.

These two recent discussions of the Dead Sea Scrolls differ in purpose, scope, and merit. The publication of Frank Cross's Haskell Lectures, delivered to the Graduate School of Theology of Oberlin College, provides those interested in the significance of the discovery of the scrolls with new information about the Qumran Sect and its literature and with a competent and trustworthy appraisal of the importance of the

scrolls for an understanding of this sect in its relationship to Jewish and Christian developments prior to and during the period of Christian origins. Carl Howie's book limits the discussion to a single but highly important aspect of the problem—the possible influence exerted by the sect upon the founder of the church and upon its subsequent leaders.

By bringing his readers up to date on the most recent discoveries, Frank Cross has given them some concept of the magnitude of the Qumran library and the tremendous literary creativity of the sect. In addition, this author has given special consideration to three significant phases of recent research: the role of the Righteous Teacher in Essene origins, the importance of the Qumran documents for studies of the Old Testament text, and the possible impact of the sect upon the primitive church. These discoveries, in Frank Cross's opinion, "will chart new courses by which progress will be made toward a more accurate, more intelligent Old Testament." For an understanding of early Christian origins, the role of the Righteous Teacher in the sect is a fascinating issue. The attitude of the sect toward its leader is comparable to that of the early church toward Jesus: a respect approaching adoration, a belief in his teaching as a guarantee of salvation, and the association of him with the New Age. While Frank Cross has pointed out such similarities between the sect and the church, nevertheless he maintains quite correctly that the crucial difference between the sect and the church lay in the Cross. Salvation was no longer a hopeful dream but a reality for the church, no longer an idea but an event.

Carl Howie's discussion of the relationship between the sect and the church astonished this reviewer by a lack of information regarding recent research in the field of New Testament literature, by the presentation of ideas without evidence or reasoned argumentation, and by an inaccurate or inexact use of words. In speaking of rites this author can label John the Baptist's baptismal ceremony as a sacrament (p. 47), refer to the Fourth Evangelist's allusion to the Lord's Supper as a symbolic meal (p. 66), and state that Jesus transformed the elements into memorial symbols (p. 58). Had the author defined the meaning given to the words "symbol" and "sacrament," the reader would probably be less confused. Examples of statements for which evidence is lacking are the following: that Paul and Jesus withdrew during their wilderness sojourn to the Essene community, that John the Baptist's rite of baptism influenced the comparable Christian rite, and that many Essenes became Christians. A comparative study of the Qumran Sect and the early church needs to be made, but such a work must be undertaken by one whose training has given him a degree of competence in Semitic and New Testament studies.

Of the two books, Frank Cross's book deserves the highest praise and belongs on the shelf beside the works of such scholars as Millar Burrows and John Allegro. The person who is not disturbed by the upside-down printing of the Hebrew text of the scrolls in Carl Howie's book will probably find his comparative study of the sect and the early church informative and interesting and will not be troubled by its lack of precision in dealing with factual material.

—LUCETTA MOWRY, *Professor of Biblical History, Literature and Interpretation, Wellesley College, Mass.*

The Meaning of Christ by ROBERT CLYDE JOHNSON. Westminster 1958. 96 pp. $1.00.

Finding a better buy in books than that offered in the Layman's Theological Library, edited by Robert McAfee Brown, would be extremely difficult if not impossible. One of the most worthy in this series is this sparkling book by Robert Clyde Johnson. Dr. Johnson is professor of systematic theology at Western Theological Seminary. Though this is his first book, it is a distinguished one. It is refreshing and dynamic and will appeal to and stimulate layman and minister alike. This is the type of book (and series) every chaplain needs to help him phrase his messages in new and provocative ways or to place in the hands of those he would serve.

The five chapters are entitled "In the Beginning God . . . ," "The Man Jesus," "The Cross," "The Incarnation," "The Gospel of God." Within these chapters important heresies concerning Jesus are candidly reviewed. In the process Professor Johnson clarifies in a very necessary way the fuzzy thinking that often passes for orthodoxy but that borders "on the ragged edge of blasphemy."

The author makes it crystal clear that when Christians turn to Christ it is God and God alone they seek. He contends, along with Paul, that in Christ "*God did something that entirely changed the relationship of man to himself.*" In Christ, God invaded history and reconciled the world to himself. In Christ, God is revealed; and "it is in and through the Biblical word picture of him that God discloses himself to us today." Optically speaking, Christ must be regarded as transparent. When one looks at Christ, the focus must be on God.

A predominant theme in the life of the man Jesus was the swift and bitter opposition he created. He won few friends and was executed as an undesirable. As a reinterpreter of the law of God, Jesus became "Man's Great Accuser." Men could not stand before his penetrating accusations; they could not bear him to live. The Cross was man's answer for the unwanted God; it is also God's answer for the evil of man. The Cross is the supreme enigma revealing at once the sinfulness of men and the unconquerable and unfathomable love

of God. Before it, one must take sides.

In wrestling with the significance of the Incarnation, Dr. Johnson clearly presents the three great heresies against which the church framed its creedal statements. These three heresies represent the same kinds of misunderstanding into which men frequently fall today in their attempts to understand Christ. They are believing that Jesus was (1) a manlike God (but not really a man), who was never really tempted to go against the will of God; (2) a God-like man (but not really God); (3) God/man (but neither really God nor really man). The historic affirmation of the church is that he is very man and very God, fully human in every respect—a Jew of his day, and yet fully God—"one substance with the Father." Through this One, God was acting to redeem man. His story is the gospel of God, which, when it confronts man, demands the responses of repentance and faith.

Dr. Johnson's invigorating presentation of the meaning of Christ should be a very welcome addition to the libraries of all who seek further illumination of the mystery of faith.

—Samuel D. Maloney, *Professor of Bible and Religion, Davidson College, Davidson, N.C.*

Making Ethical Decisions by Howard Clark Kee. Westminster 1957. 96 pp. $1.00.

The everyday concern of every Christian is to "think about, or talk about, or communicate, his Christian faith." In such everyday activity there confronts the Christian at every turn the matter of "making ethical decisions." It is not enough for church leaders to confront their people with the admonition that they ought to be better, even though all are aware of the variance between what we do and what we ought to do or ought to be. From that focal point, the author seeks to develop the thought of how "practical, in the best sense, are the resources of Bible, Church, and Spirit, in aiding the modern Christian not 'to be good' in the abstract sense, but in making concrete ethical decisions."

From this approach, the author examines the Christian point of view in making ethical decisions in certain fields: for example, the adage that "everybody does it—why shouldn't I?; the Christian attitude toward divorce and remarriage with frequent looks at marriage itself; the Christian home; finding meaning in our daily work, 'not a boring chore'; with respect to friendships, does Christianity make a difference with respect to friendship?"

In making ethical decisions in the areas listed above, a cross section of daily living, the author lists three resources on which the Christian can draw: (1) The long life of the church, for from the lessons of the past "we can draw wisdom and strength for what we must do in our day"; (2) the Bible, "not merely as a record of past events of an ancient

people, but as a testimony to the life lived in obedience to God by a community of faith that stretches across time; (3) the church inasmuch as "the Christian is the one who need not make his decisions alone, for he is a part of the community." He will no longer be alone.

In summation, the Christian cannot always judge the rightness of his decisions by the way the outcome affects him. "For the Christian is called not to be the master of his own fate, but to be the servant of God."

This is a book, current in its application, that is highly recommended.

—R. M. SCHWYHART, *Chaplain (Capt.), USN*

Marriage Counseling: A Casebook, ed. by EMILY H. MUDD, MAURICE J. KARPF, ABRAHAM STONE, JANET FOWLER NELSON. Association 1958. 488 pp. $6.50.

Husbands and wives long have had problems, but only recently has marriage guidance been emerging as a new counseling speciality.

"To be sure," the authors say, "marriage counseling has been carried on through the ages by families and friends, doctors, ministers, teachers—informally, semiformally, and more recently formally.

"Yet . . . it is new . . . in the sense of a developing awareness of its own special area within the whole field of education for marriage and family living. It is new in its insistent emphasis on high professional standards of training, experience, and performance."

So far, such counseling is not widely considered a new profession but is a special skill in many professions—law, medicine, psychiatry, psychology, sociology, social work, family-life education, and the ministry. Representing these disciplines, 38 members of the American Association of Marriage Counselors present 41 cases dealing with marital problems in this excellent new book.

The cases treat a variety of problems that arise before and during marriage and sometimes when it has been ended by death or divorce.

The premarital guidance deals with medical consultations, guidance in important areas of adjustment needed in the early days following the wedding, postponement of marriage because of job problems, withdrawal from engagements, sex problems, problems of mate selection, and cultural differences as they relate to choice of a partner.

The marriage counseling cases cover such divergent areas as personality conflicts, dominance and submission, quarreling, breakdown in communication, hostility, psychological blocks, family problems, need of psychotherapy for the emotionally immature. A section on problems of the unmarried describes rehabilitation of a divorcee, stress of a youth during her parents' divorce, the problems of the middle-aged single woman.

Twenty-six of these interesting

histories were contributed by male counselors and the rest by women. Sixteen cases were seen in private practice and the rest at college or university campuses, family or marriage counseling services, educational institutes, social casework agencies, or other centers.

The first section of the book relates general principles underlying marriage counseling. The authors bring out the trend to early marriage, the shift from large to small families, the employment to more married women and the marriage-career emotional conflicts, the new attitudes toward sex, the increasing number of divorces (3,442,000 in 1946-53).

"Two generations ago, because of later marriage, more children and earlier death, there was a fifty-fifty chance that one spouse would die at least two years before the last of five children married," the authors said. As a result of increased life expectancy, one-third (14 years) of one's married life is ahead after two or three children leave home to work or attend college. So counselors must help the middle-aged women to develop creative outside interests.

The authors contend there are greater demands today by people for a "good marriage." Chaplains and other counselors can be helped by this book to strengthen family life. This book will help marriage guidance experts learn better how to establish rapport, reduce hostility in counselees, develop their insight and objectivity, reorient them, develop new goals and perspective, and implement plans for change.

—James W. Carty, Jr., *Religious News Editor,* The Nashville Tennessean

Leading in Public Prayer by Andrew W. Blackwood. Abingdon 1958. 207 pp. $3.00

Dr. Blackwood believes that leading in public prayer is "one of the most difficult" aspects of today's ministry. His purpose in writing this book is best stated in his own words: "I am opening up my heart to tell what I have learned, first by trial and error, and later by conferring with others and by reading books."

Every chaplain on active duty should have a copy in his library. Men with liturgical backgrounds will appreciate the thinking of an accomplished prayer artist as he analyzes and re-evaluates the philosophy and modes of corporate worship. Others, with nonliturgical training, will be chagrined, and then inspired, as they are led to realize—possibly for the first time—the wealth of biblical, hymnal, and classical religious resources which are available for use and experimentation.

Part I describes the kinds of prayers and shows how they may be used most appropriately for both religious and secular purposes. The innate relationship between prayers and religious feeling, and the role of prayers in leading up to and climaxing the sermon's message, receive careful emphases.

Part II presents the skills and

tools of the prayer leader's craft. The author explains how important is the minister's personal experience of God. He insists that the most relevant measurement of success in this field is the progress which a congregation makes in its willing participation. Quoting from Archbishop Magee, he lists three kinds of prayer leaders: (1) one whom the people can follow if they make a special effort, (2) one whom they cannot follow, and (3) one whom they always follow.

Dr. Blackwood decries the all-too-common situation in which a good sermon stands out in contrast to the carelessly composed and indifferently rendered petitions. The realism and pertinence of the message should be matched by the beauty and warmth of the prayers. An enlightened and creative use of public prayer will, even more than pulpit oratory, help worshipers to experience what Paul Tillich calls the vertical dimension in religion.

—Mert M. Lampson, *Chaplain (Lt. Col.) USA*

Christ Be with Me by Walter Russell Bowie. Abingdon 1958. 137 pp. $1.75.

Another book of daily meditations and prayers? No, not just another book—this one is different! It does not in the least resemble the trite and trivial musings that often pass for devotional "literature." This belongs in the lofty company of John Baillie's *A Diary of Private Prayer* and Fosdick's three "*Meaning's.*"

Taking his title from St. Patrick's beautiful hymn, Dr. Bowie faces life today in the recollection of Jesus and the presence of his Spirit. For each day of the month the book provides a brief meditation, a related prayer for morning and another for evening, and a single sentence from the Bible to serve as the watchword for the day. No single word is wasted; each polished page shines with what I can only call the beauty of holiness.

The appealing jacket seems to say, "Pick me up"; and the attractive format says, "Read me." You will think, "I should get this to give to a friend." But then you'll find it hard to part with a book that has so much value for *you.*

—J. A. L.

The Nature of the Unity We Seek (Official Report of the North American Conference on Faith and Order, Oberlin, Ohio, Sept. 3-10, 1957), ed. Paul S. Minear. Bethany 1958. 304 pp. $4.00.

A Guide to Christian Unity by George L. Hunt. Bethany 1958. 96 pp. $1.00 (Paper).

The most authentic movement of the Spirit in our time is the reaching out of Christians from every branch of the church for the unity that is of the essence of the church's life. This movement is an answer to the prayer of our Lord that they may

all be one in order "that the world may believe."

The Oberlin Conference was neither the beginning nor the end of this movement. As Paul Minear points out in his splendid introductory essay, the first steps leading to this conference were taken half a century ago, and Faith and Order itself is only one of the streams that have contributed to the mighty river of ecumenic interest and action.

After several world conferences it was decided at Lund (1952) and at the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches (1954) that the time had come to begin regional studies of questions related to Faith and Order. The Oberlin Conference, preceded by 16 preparatory study groups in different parts of North America, was the result of this decision.

Every Christian, minister or layman, who is concerned about the movement toward Christian unity, or who wants to understand it better, should read ***The Nature of the Unity We Seek.***

The greatest danger for the ecumenic movement is that unity should be interpreted in terms of "least common denominators." Occasionally zeal for ecumenic fellowship drives ministers into co-operative programs which, while good in themselves, are not an expression of Christian unity and, in so far as they are confused with Christian unity, may actually become an obstacle to its ever being realized. The World Council of Churches has, on the whole, been amazingly successful in resisting the temptation to substitute least common denominators of agreement for genuine Christian unity. And in this respect the Oberlin Conference was magnificent. Bishop Angus Dun's opening sermon not only put the program of the conference in exactly the right setting but gave the clearest exposition I have read of "order" as well as of "unity."

In addition to containing the 10 principal addresses of the conference, this book contains 100 pages of reports of the 12 sections, which devoted themselves to the doctrinal and structural aspects of Christian unity and also to the impact of culture on both doctrine and structure.

To its great credit, the conference also addressed itself to the problem of achieving unity in particular localities, recognizing that the "body of Christ" is both universal and in every community. Concern for the local work of the church is a long-overdue emphasis in the ecumenic movement, and we can all be grateful to Oberlin for voicing this concern —even though the report does not throw much light on how the church universal can manifest its life locally.

In addition to this comprehensive report of the conference, there is also available an admirable study guide based on the Oberlin material called ***A Guide to Christian Unity.*** This has been prepared for use in discussion groups and should be of

immense help to local congregations.

My only quarrel with the *Guide* is that so many of the suggestions listed under "Projects for Study and Action" are utterly beyond the powers and capabilities of the ordinary church member. Only an extraordinarily able and wise denominational leader could be expected to tackle some of them. However, it is just as well to set our sights high.

—Francis Pickens Miller, *Member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches*

Rabbinic Stories for Christian Ministers and Teachers by William B. Silverman. Abingdon 1958. 221 pp. $3.50.

"This is a book written by a rabbi offering Jewish homiletical source material for Christian ministers and teachers." The author, who is rabbi of the temple at Nashville, Tennessee, has delved into the vast treasure of rabbinic literature and has selected and translated several hundred stories, homilies, aphorisms, and maxims, which are arranged and indexed according to subject and theme. These excerpts have been taken from postbiblical, rabbinic literature of the Talmud, Midrash, and Hasidic rabbis.

Apart from the inherent value of the great literature represented in this book, Dr. Silverman's compilation brings its own benefits: (1) He shows what a tremendous literary heritage the Jews and Christians have in common; (2) his selection appeals to catholic tastes everywhere; and (3) the arrangement of these selections provides us with a large volume which can be picked up and read intermittently. As Halford Luccock writes in the Introduction: "This book will be a real influence in understanding, appreciation, and gratitude."

—Donald Macleod, *Associate Professor of Homiletics, Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J.*

The Humanity of Words: A Primer of Semantics by Bess Sondel. World 1958. 245 pp. $4.00.

Dr. Bess Sondel, professorial lecturer in communication at the Uni-

versity of Chicago, is interested in words as a means of communication. She would like to help people toward a more intelligent use of language to transmit ideas from one mind to another. In such earlier books as *Are You Telling Them?* and *Everyday Speech, Speak Up* she has sought to apply semantics to the everyday life of people who use words.

For the benefit of readers not entirely familiar with the field of semantics Dr. Sondel says in her opening chapter that "the subject matter of semantics is here limited to the study of techniques by which to accomplish purposes through the use of words." Chaplains as well as editors, reporters, ministers, teachers, and public speakers would readily agree that they could well employ techniques "by which to accomplish purposes through the use of words."

Explaining the selection of her title, "The Humanity of Words," Dr. Sondel points out that words have the power to bind persons and peoples and generations together, that man can change his world by the use of words, and that language makes it possible for human beings to think together, to feel together, and to act together.

The central portion of this volume is devoted to Dr. Sondel's discussion of three significant works in the field of semantics: *The Meaning of Meaning* by C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, *Science and Sanity* by Alfred Korzybski, and *Signs, Language and Behavior* by Charles Morris. Since all three of these books are somewhat technical in both conception and execution, Dr. Sondel performs a valuable service in extracting the essence of their ideas.

All the first 170 pages are "introductory" to Part V, says Author Sondel, and there she presents her own distinctive "field theory of communication." The word "field" is taken from physics and used to mean the constant changes in personality and in the opinions and thoughts of an individual. The chief problem that faces an intelligent human being, she says, is discovering order in his changing social and physical environment. Here she suggests the use of "verbal patterns."

By this time many irritated readers may well wish that an "expert in words" would use fewer abstract words to express concrete ideas and that an "expert in communication" could communicate more effectively.

Dr. Sondel's book may possibly be useful as a textbook in classes where the author is on hand to analyze, interpret, and explain her own work. It is hardly probable that a reader alone will be able to extract much useful meaning. Sociology, law, and medicine have for years employed a jargon that is almost unintelligible to the lay reader. It seems peculiarly inappropriate that the profession of semantics should fall into a similar word trap.

—Walter Spearman, *Professor of Journalism, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.*

AT YOUR SERVICE

Religious Music

Miniature facsimiles of its published religious music will be sent free to chaplains and choral directors by the firm of Schmitt, Hall & McCreary, Park Ave. at Sixth St., Minneapolis 15, Minn. These small books showing complete words and music enable you to know exactly, before ordering, whether the selections will suit your needs—or in a pinch can be used themselves.

International Affairs

Timely, pertinent discussion of the thorny path to peace is provided in three recent pamphlets from the Public Affairs Committee, 22 E. 38th St., New York 16, N.Y. These are ***Effects of Radiation and Fallout*** by James F. Crow, ***A UN Peace Force?*** by William R. Frye, and ***We Must Find a Basis for Peace*** by Paul Hoffman. 25¢ each.

A significant recent address now in pamphlet form interprets the work of **Church World Service.** Entitled "A Christian Presence," the address was given by R. Norris Wilson to the General Board of the National Council of Churches at its June meeting. Dr. Wilson had just returned from visiting CWS centers in Japan, Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Malaya, India, Pakistan, and the Middle East. Available from Church World Service, 215 Fourth Ave., New York 3, N.Y.

Our Moral and Spiritual Resources for International Cooperation is a work paper by Reinhold Niebuhr with discussion outline by F. Ernest Johnson prepared for citizen consultations sponsored by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO in co-operation with the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. Prepared in 1956, it is still available, at 30¢, from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Identify as Catalog No. S 1.70/4: Un 34/no. 28.

Upper Room Booklets

Fresh sermonic material is provided in ***The Upper Room Chapel Talks.*** These 18 devotional talks were delivered in The Upper Room Chapel in Nashville by outstanding ministers from around the world. 128 pp. 50¢. Order from The Upper Room, 1908 Grand Ave., Nashville, Tenn.

A new booklet in the "Finding God" series is ***Finding God in the Redemptive Fellowship*** by D. Elton Trueblood. 32 pp. 15¢.

An especially usable study of the Lord's Prayer is entitled ***With Joyful Surprise,*** by Rita F. Snowden of New Zealand. 32 pp. 15¢.

Sex Ethics

The most helpful booklet of its kind ever called to our attention is ***Questions Men Ask*** by William P. Wylie. Published in England in 1956, it is now available in the U.S.A. exclusively through Outlook Publishers, 1 N. 6th St., Richmond 19, Va. (24 pp.; 20¢).

The questions have all been asked in Padre's Hours in the Royal Air Force or the Army. These were chosen "either because they represent problems that are always cropping up or because they represent trends of thought that are very common among young men today." The answers are short and snappy, honest, Christian.