



PROCEEDINGS

1971 Christian Life
Commission Seminar

*"National Priorities
and
Christian
Responsibility"*

SOUTHERN BAPTIST HISTORICAL
LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES
Nashville, Tennessee

\$2.50

FOREWORD

National priorities have been receiving widespread attention in recent months. When the Southern Baptist Christian Life Commission members met in annual session in 1969 they voted to devote the Commission's 1971 national conference to the subject of "National Priorities and Christian Responsibility." By March 1-3, 1971, when the conference was actually held in New York, the national mood was so seriously affected by the unresolved crises related to the continued erosion of spiritual values, the war in Indochina, the continuing racial conflict, the impending ecological armageddon, the rise of lawlessness, and the unabated advance of technology, inflation, and urbanization that the topic seemed considerably more timely and appropriate than when it was first chosen.

These issues in one form or another, of course, are ever before us. Christians are finding it extremely hard, however, to know what to do about them today.

The conference where these addresses were given was designed (1) to acquaint Southern Baptists with some of the most pressing issues along with some of the personalities involved prominently in dealing with them and (2) to consider our Christian responsibility for shaping national priorities so as to move toward a satisfactory solution of the problems.

Our commitment to Jesus Christ which issues naturally in missions and evangelism also issues naturally in redemptive involvement in helping those who hurt and in changing those systems and institutions which exploit and degrade people. The conference was planned in the conviction that with God's guidance Christians can find ways to discharge our responsibility for helping to shape and meet national priorities.

The conference program utilized a variety of approaches. The very best resource people available were asked to speak on subjects deemed especially important. The speakers were universally busy people whose addresses were prepared for oral delivery in the conference, not for formal publication.

The presentation of those addresses in the form of these printed proceedings is primarily a reportorial service to the more than 400 registrants who attended the meeting. It is hoped that further utilization of this excellent resource material may contribute to the growing interest in our Christian responsibility regarding national priorities.

It is further hoped that this material may stimulate pastors and other church leaders to work at affecting national priorities for God and for good.

Foy Valentine, Executive Secretary
The Christian Life Commission of the
Southern Baptist Convention

Table of Contents

Proceedings of the 1971 Christian Life Commission Seminar "National Priorities and Christian Responsibility" held in the Commodore Hotel, New York, New York March 1-3, 1971

SUBJECT	PAGE
"Spiritual Values: The Number One National Priority" Leighton Ford, The Billy Graham Evangelistic Association	7
"The Federal Budget and the Reordering of National Priorities" Arthur S. Flemming, President, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota	10
"Saving God's Earth" Eric C. Rust, Professor of Christ Philosophy, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky	13
"National Priorities: An Overview" Bill Moyers, Long Island, New York	19
"Student Commitment: New Directions for Change" John Gaventa, President, Vanderbilt Student Association, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee	24
"Reaction to John Gaventa's Address on Student Commitment: New Directions for Change" James Ralph Scales, President, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina	28
"Consumer Rights and Corporate Responsibility" Kate Blackwell, Research Assistant to Ralph Nader, Washington, D. C.	29
"Developing Quality Education in Public Schools" James E. Allen, Visiting Lecturer, Education and Public Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey	33
"Our Responsibility to the Rule of Law" Leon Jaworski, President-Elect, American Bar Association, Houston, Texas	36
"Black Fulfillment and Christian Responsibility" Gardner Taylor, Pastor, The Concord Baptist Church of Christ, Brooklyn, New York	40
"A Brotherhood of Belief" The Honorable John V. Lindsay, Mayor, The City of New York, New York	43
"Communicating Across Barriers" William M. Dyal, Jr., Regional Director for North Africa, the Near East, and South Asia, Peace Corps, Washington, D. C.	44
"The Power of the People: Personal Responsibility" The Honorable George W. Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D. C.	46
"How to Help Shape and Meet National Priorities: The Role of the Minister in the Local Church" J. Herbert Gilmore, Jr., Pastor, Baptist Church of the Covenant, Birmingham, Alabama	50

"How to Help Shape and Meet National Priorities: The Role of Christian Education" Robert L. Yates, Minister of Education, First Baptist Church, Waynesboro, Virginia	52
"How to Help Shape and Meet National Priorities: A Layman's View" Walker L. Knight, Editor, <i>Home Missions</i> , Atlanta, Georgia	53
"How to Help Shape and Meet National Priorities: Perspective—The Pastor in the Community and Denomination" Jimmy R. Allen, Pastor, First Baptist Church, San Antonio, Texas	54
"National Priorities and International Responsibility" The Honorable George Bush, The Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, New York, New York	57
"Christian Responsibility: New Persons—New Priorities" Grady C. Cothen, President, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana	60

Spiritual Values:
The Number One National Priority
Leighton Ford

Last July 4 Bishop Fulton Sheen was asked to conclude the Honor America Day ceremonies in Washington. Before he gave the benediction the Bishop paused, with his usual dramatic flair, and made a gripping symbolic proposal:

"The time has come," he said, "for Americans to erect on the West Coast of this Nation a statue of responsibility to match the Statue of Liberty on our East Coast."

A statue of responsibility!

Surely we who are Christ's people must be among the first to join in such a project!

The Austrian psychiatrist, Viktor Frankl, once commented that the founding fathers of America would have done better if instead of writing of the "pursuit of happiness" they had spoken of the "discharge of responsibility." For there is no society that becomes great and that stays free without a deep sense of spiritual and moral responsibility.

God underlined that lesson early for the Jews. Directly after he liberated them, he summoned them to Mount Sinai and said, "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. You shall have no other gods before me."

It is ironic that while Moses was at the summit, learning that freedom implied responsibility, one of history's great acts of irresponsibility was being played out below. The people wearied of waiting for Moses to come down and asked Aaron to make them some substitute gods. Aaron melted down their jewelry and shaped a golden calf. When Moses came down from the mountain, he ground that calf to powder and demanded of Aaron, "Why did you do this?"

Aaron copped out. Instead of admitting, "I was wrong," he said, in effect: "The people made me do it. I just threw the gold into the fire and out came the calf. Blame the people. Blame the fire. But don't blame me."

Aaron was a thoroughly modern man who would not take the rap. He was one of the first to play the great evasion game.

The Nazi war criminals were playing the same game when they said, "We were just following orders when we destroyed the Jews." Likewise, the criminal who says, "I'm the product of my neighborhood—blame the environment" and the alcoholic who says, "My problem is a psychological hang-up. Blame my childhood"; and the rioter who says, "I've been looted, so I'll loot"; and the soldier who says, "I was just doing what I was told when I shot down those women and children"; and the student or the businessman who cheats and says, "Everybody else is doing it. Blame the system." All are playing the great evasion game.

The name of the game is denial. It started in the Garden of Eden when Adam blamed Eve and Eve blamed the snake, and they started a chain reaction that has never stopped. Each of us in some way is tempted to do a latter day Adam and Eve act. The capitalist blames the Communist, the Communist

blames the capitalist. The white man calls racial trouble the "black problem" and the black man calls it the "white problem." Parents pin the generation gap on the children and children point the finger at their parents. Conservatives blame the radicals for the problems of the church and the liberals blame the reactionaries.

As Will Rogers once said, "The history of America can be written in three phrases: the passing of the Indian, the passing of the buffalo, and the passing of the buck!"

A psychiatrist gave me a bit of verse which ridicules this whole trend:

I went to my psychiatrist to be psychoanalyzed,
To find out why I kicked the cat and blacked my
wife's eyes.

He laid me on a downy couch to see what he
could find,
And this is what he dredged up from my sub-
conscious mind.

When I was one my mommy hid my dolly in the
trunk,
And so it follows naturally that I am always
drunk.

When I was two I saw my father kiss the maid
one day,
And that is why I suffer now from klep-to-man-i-a.

When I was three I suffered from ambivalence
toward my brothers,
And so it follows naturally I've poisoned all my
lovers.

I'm so glad at last I've learned the lesson this has
taught,
That everything I do that's wrong is someone else's
fault.

Hey, Libido, bats in the belfry,
Hey, Libido, bats in the belfry,
Hey, Libido, bats in the belfry,
Jolly old Sigmund Freud!

Now, there are signs that many people are sick of this irresponsibility kick and that a reversal may be coming. Psychologist William Parker of the University of Redlands claims that "psychology is moving away from the theory of the unconscious as a dark sinister force . . . it is beginning to insist on people's assuming responsibility for thoughts, feeling, and behavior." It is interesting in current politics to notice the emphasis on participatory democracy. The President of the United States finds common ground with many of America's youthful critics when he asks Congress to return "power to the people."

At the same time there are also indications that we are ripe for a new spiritual awakening. Witness the "Jesus revolution" in the youth culture. Listen to the pop song hits, many of which have an unmistakable spiritual message. Norman Greenbaum, who wrote "Spirit in the Sky," said, "It's no put on. The love generation fizzled into revolution. Religion has got to give the answers."

Young adults also give some evidence of a new in-

terest in things of the spirit. The Young President's Organization took a poll of its Chicago members two years running to find out what they considered to be our biggest problems. Two years ago they mentioned external problems such as inflation and pollution. Last year they listed "internal-type" problems such as the lack of spiritual and moral values.

This moment in history presents to the Christian church a unique opportunity: to tie together spiritual awakening with moral and social responsibility. Something akin to the Wesleyan revival in Britain may be waiting in the wings.

For decades we Christians have been our own worst enemies, stymied by the pietist-activist gap. We have been nearly paralyzed while the "pietists" argued for individual evangelism and the "activists" sought to turn the church into a social action agency.

If the church in America has a future, it lies in the hands of evangelicals with a social conscience. There is, I am convinced, a new breed of Christian emerging for whom the old arguments are out of date. He sees the "pietist-activist gap" as a false hang-up which is bridged by a recovery of genuine biblical evangelism and biblical holiness.

Take the 12,000 students who gathered at the Urbana Convention over Christmas. Clearly, for them, it would be an act of utter irresponsibility for the Christian church to emphasize social action at the expense of world evangelism. It was equally clear that these students believed that to practice an evangelism that divorces faith from action would be just as great an error. They sang, studied the Bible, met to pray, and applauded condemnations of racism with equal enthusiasm!

It is my conviction that our first priority for this hour must be evangelism, provided it is evangelism of the right kind.

Some socially concerned Christians see evangelism as a "cop-out." They regard it as a code word that means: keep people out of hell, but don't worry about getting the hell out of people; "open housing" in glory, but every man for himself down below.

Biblical evangelism, however, is not a cop-out, but just the opposite. No recovery of genuine responsibility will come until men are confronted again with the Living God of the Bible.

Daniel Webster was once asked, "What is the greatest thought you ever had?" He replied, "That someday I must give an account of my life to Almighty God."

Tragically, that sense of accountability is fading. Few of the thought-makers of our culture regard man as a moral being who must answer to God. Rather he is a pawn of chemical forces or the prisoner of his past.

This is what writer Terry Southern meant when he said that we are the first generation in history to do away with crime. He didn't mean there is no crime, but that we no longer call it crime. We explain everything as purely psychological.

A case in point is Richard Speck, the man who killed eight nurses in Chicago. His psychologist wrote in a book that Speck could no more keep from killing them than another man could keep from sneezing. That raises some grave questions. What about the nurses who were killed? Do we just write them off? What about society? Is it just a big machine dealing with

little machines? And what about Speck himself? On that theory he too becomes a ripple without significance.

When we say the drunken hit-and-run driver is just sick, or that the criminal is merely a victim, or that the soldier who massacred civilians is only a military robot, or that children who go wrong are just a product of their homes, we are not being more humanitarian. In the most sickening way we are dehumanizing them and saying, "You don't count."

That is why I say our first priority is biblical evangelism—the incessant broad-scale announcement of the message of the Bible. Zen Buddhism says, "Man goes into the water and causes no ripple." A biblical view sees man making ripples that never end. Not a zero; not an animal to be trained or a computer to be programmed; man is a moral being accountable to God. God's word, plus man's response adds up to responsibility. There are moral laws which are binding because of God's character. When men break these commands, they are guilty. Man is lost and needs to be saved—not just from guilt feelings but from real guilt before God.

Evangelism must make this clear and then say to man: God has taken responsibility for you. God is for you. He has stood in your place, identified with your sin, died with your death. He does not want to be on your back but in your heart, to make you what he created you to be—a true person, a responsible son of God.

True evangelism creates responsibility because it confronts man with God in Christ and demands decision. The gospel asks a man first to bow, to acknowledge in God's presence that he is a sinner. And then the gospel asks a man to stand before this God and say, "Here I am, Lord. What do you want me to do?"

Year after next, Christians in America will have an unparalleled opportunity to evangelize together. The Key '73 movement will join scores of Christian groups to confront every American more fully and more forcefully with the gospel of Christ. Southern Baptists led in the initial stages of this cooperative evangelism. I hope you will continue to give strong and energetic leadership. By the power of the Spirit of God this nation in 1973 could take a giant step toward the recovery of spiritual responsibility.

This will not happen, however, if evangelism is narrow, parochial, shallow, and unrelated to the great ethical, cultural, and social realities of our day. That is why we must have not just evangelism but *the right kind of evangelism*.

A favorite slogan of evangelical Christians has been "change men and you'll change society." Yet too often we have been content with an evangelism that has changed neither men nor society. We have been very good at finding out what produces decisions but not so good at finding out what decisions produce, that is, in terms of real change. "Change men and you'll change society" has too often been an escapist slogan that has let us evade the rigorous demands of following Christ.

A decision for Christ that does not produce a disciple of Christ is a fraud. Jesus our Lord cared more about making disciples than about getting decisions. If a big crowd was following him, he would say something that would make half of them turn

around and go home. He made it clear that unless men were willing to forsake all they had, they could not be his disciples.

We evangelicals are quite good for the most part at sharing with men the plan of salvation. We haven't been nearly so effective at tying the Christian way of salvation together with the Christian way of life. Often we've forgotten that in the Great Commission Jesus told us not only to get decisions and to enlist church members but also to "teach them to observe all things I have commanded you." We've produced a generation of professing Christians who have memorized John 3:16 but who are strangely unfamiliar with the Sermon on the Mount. We have cut Jesus in half, letting people think they can have Christ as Savior and ignore him as Lord. Too often we have turned out followers of a culture Christ—a Jesus who wears red, white, and blue: a Savior who makes us citizens of Heaven, but who lets us call the shots about our citizenship on earth. This failure to link together our Lord's evangelistic mandate with his ethical teachings ends with a kind of church member who can get very excited about sending missionaries to Africa but who can be just as emotional against letting an African student join his church in America!

It is this kind of plastic Christianity that leads young people to hold up signs on our campuses that read: "Jesus, yes; Christianity, no!"

And how do we change this situation? Not by abandoning evangelism, certainly. That would mean spiritual suicide for the church. The answer is the New Testament answer: evangelism must go hand-in-hand with holiness.

"Holiness" is another of those words that turn off many Christians who are seeking to be "with it." To them it spells "other-worldly." They associate it with pious looks, folded hands, and stained-glass voices.

But biblical holiness is a strong, manly word. It does not mean being so "heavenly minded that you are no earthly good." The opposite of holy is not material but sin! It is in the material world where spiritual reality is tested and where it works! As C. S. Lewis said, "God loves material things. He made them!" And he also pointed out that it is those who have believed most strongly in Heaven who have done the most for earth.

Holiness is not primarily commitment to a set of rules or to a program. For some Christians holiness means that you don't "dance, drink, smoke or chew, or run around with girls who do"! For others, it means being in church every time the doors are open. For others, it means to march on a picket line. Inevitably, that kind of "holiness" ends up in a rigid conformity. You are not in God's will unless you conform to my code of holiness.

Real holiness simply means the "Jesus style of life." It is not conformity to a code but to a Person. It means that God calls us out of the world to Jesus—to be different people, marching to the sound of another drum. And then God sends us back into the world for Jesus as his witnesses, to be the salt of the earth.

Christian holiness is more than a change of action, it springs from a change of attitude. The Christian is a man who is "repenting"; he is changing his mind; he is being "transformed by the renewing of his mind"; the "mind of Christ" is being formed in him; he is a

person in whom Jesus Christ is thinking his thoughts by the Holy Spirit.

Recently I heard Senator Mark Hatfield say that most resolutions church groups send to Washington rate with our elected officials about one step higher than the little old ladies in tennis shoes. He went on to say that the greatest thing the church can do is to mold our value systems.

Think of the savor Christianity could be in the moral wasteland of our society if the millions of professing Christians in America were "little Christs," making decisions not on the basis of what "I think" or what "my family thinks" or what "my class, or race says," but on the basis of "What does Jesus, my Lord, think?"

The Generation Gap is probably widest today at Morality Canyon! Older people think of "immorality" in terms of drugs, sex, and crime. The youth culture pegs immorality as militarism, materialism, racism. But the "mind of Christ" bridges that gap! As James wrote, "He who said, 'Do not commit adultery,' said also, 'Do not kill.'" The mind of Christ says adultery is wrong because you are made in God's image and that murder is wrong because your neighbor is made in God's image!

Senator Hatfield received a letter after the Kent State shootings which, I am sure, spoke for many people. "Dear Senator," it read, "they should have killed twice as many." And it was signed, "Sincerely in Christ." The "mind of Christ" does not think that way!

A soldier accused in the My Lai massacre said: "I didn't shoot people. I shot enemies." The "mind of Christ" does not think that way!

A student thinks that it is okay to sleep with any girl he wants as long as he is against racism. But the "mind of Christ" does not think that way!

Just as the Chinese Communists are impregnating young Chinese with the thoughts of Chairman Mao, we need to embark on a program of saturating believers with the Scriptures, exposing them to the mind of Christ until the Holy Spirit begins to program us with Christ's thoughts!

But the "Jesus style" does not stop with thinking "Jesus thoughts." As Dag Hammarskjöld said, "The path to holiness leads through action."

Think what a reconciling force Christians could be in the social and political agonies of our day if impelled to action by the Holy Spirit! We need the kind of revival that will produce a new version of the "Acts of the Holy Spirit"!

The *best* thing we can do for our world is to preach the gospel and live it. Woe to us if we do *not* preach the gospel! But it is not the *only* thing we can do! The same Paul who said in Romans 1 that he was not ashamed to be a minister of the gospel, also said in Romans 13 that the government official is a minister of God!

Christians live "between two worlds." We should have no illusions that we can bring in the kingdom by social and political action. Only God can create a new heaven and a new earth. And someday he will intervene in history to do just that! But meanwhile we *can* make some things better. And if we can, we should. As Christians in a democracy we have to ask: How do we render to Caesar what is Caesar's when we the people are Caesar? We are not to substitute the political clubhouse for the evangelistic meeting or the

worship service. But we can ask: "Lord, do you have a job for me to do, not only in my church but also in my precinct?"

I like the story of the great evangelist, Dwight L. Moody. One of his flock saw him hurrying down the street to vote one day and objected.

"Mr. Moody, I thought you told us we were citizens of Heaven. Why are you so concerned about an election here on earth?"

And Moody answered, "Yes, I'm a citizen of Heaven. But right now I'm paying taxes in Cook County, Illinois!"

In the spring of 1968, America was torn apart. Martin Luther King, Jr., had been shot down in Memphis. The Kerner report had warned of the country becoming two nations, one black and one white. The Civil Rights Bill of 1968 was then in the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. A controversial open housing title had been added and it seemed likely the bill would be killed in conference. But on the morning Martin Luther King was buried, the Rules Committee voted 8-7 to send the bill to the floor of the House and there it passed.

The decisive vote in the Rules Committee was cast by Congressman John Anderson of Illinois. It had been an agonizing decision for him to make. He had strong reservations about some aspects of the bill. Two years before he had voted against a similar provision. Many of his constituents wanted him to vote against the open housing provision. On the other hand, Anderson had come to see the bill as a symbol of national intent to the black community. He had talked to a black school teacher in his district who had answered one hundred ads looking for an apartment and had been turned away every time.

So the debate raged not only in Congress, but also in a Christian man's soul. Letters poured in. The telephone rang constantly. Finally, he wrote:

There came to bear in my thinking the realization that as a Christian—as one who believes that God created all men in his own image and of one blood; and as one who believes that the Son of God brought his message of salvation without regard to race, color or ethnic background—I had to be willing to give up age-old prejudices. . . . After many moments of prayer, meditation and careful consideration of my responsibility as a Christian, I concluded that I could do nothing less than cast my vote in support of legislation . . . which seemed justified not only by the urgency of the hour, but by even more basic considerations of human rights and human dignity.

I wonder how many political pundits, in analyzing the events that led to that decisive point in American history, ever realized that the roots of that decision were not to be found under the glare of the klieg lights in Washington. Instead, that vote went all the way back to a hot summer evening in Rockford, Illinois, when a 9-year-old boy named John Anderson went forward in a tent meeting to give his life to Jesus Christ.

I wonder how many people scoffed at Dr. Paul Reed, the evangelist who preached that night and said, "What a waste of time! It won't last! Preaching doesn't change anything!"

But it did! Gospel preaching changed a young boy's heart. It changed a crucial vote. And it changed the history of America.

There is an old gospel song that goes, "What a wonderful change in my life has been wrought, since Jesus came into my heart."

We need a great spiritual awakening that will bring men to sing, not only "I have light in my soul for which long I had sought, since Jesus came into my heart," but also, "I have concern for the poor that I didn't before, since Jesus came into my heart"; "I have love for the black man, or the white man, that I didn't before, since Jesus came into my heart"; "I have wept for our cities as I didn't before, since Jesus came into my heart"; "I am tutoring in our school as I didn't before, since Jesus came into my heart."

If by God's grace we could practice *that* kind of evangelism and experience *that* kind of revival, then we could truly begin to erect a new statue of liberty and national responsibility in the heart of America!

The Federal Budget and the Reordering of National Priorities

Arthur S. Flemming

I am certainly delighted to have this opportunity of participating in the Christian Life Commission seminar on "National Priorities and Christian Responsibility." It is my conviction that it is imperative for the church at all levels and especially at the level of the local church to provide its members with the opportunity of confronting the issues of our day within a Christian context and with a Christian spirit. In recent weeks in connection with my own reading I have been helped by a book by Father Quoist, a French Catholic priest, entitled *Christ Is Alive*, in which in his concluding chapter he says this: "There is a fire at the heart of the world. Life is there and it cannot die. That life is the life of the risen Christ."

Many men believe in God. Fewer believe in Christ. And fewer still believe in the Christ who is alive today. In order to be committed we must, indeed, love the world but we must also believe in Jesus Christ who is present in the world. It is this attitude of faith and the commitment which results from it that will save the modern world. The Christian will no longer be absent from the world. He will not be content to stand aside and let it be built without him. He will be present and he will join with Jesus to live with him and in him the demanding but exhilarating adventure of life, of that whole life, which is the Christian life; that is, the life of Christ. I am confident that it is this attitude of faith and the commitment which results from it that will characterize your approach in the hours that lie ahead to a consideration of establishing and working toward our national priorities. As followers of the living Christ we have a spiritual responsibility to be involved in the establishing of national priorities and in the development and execution of programs designed to achieve those priorities.

We have identified so often what we refer to as the necessity for reordering our national priorities that it has almost become a meaningless cliché. When we become interested as individuals in a particular pro-

gram and are confronted with the necessity of identifying a source of income in order to support that program, we find it very easy to deal with the issue by talking about—in a generalized way—the reordering of our national priorities. We say that if they were only reordered, then there would be enough money for the program in which we have a particular interest. When pressed as to what is to be given up or to be modified in order to obtain the resources that are needed for our program, we hastily identify another program—we usually say “by way of illustration”—without having any real understanding as to what would happen if our advice should be followed.

The National Urban Coalition, about eighteen months ago, decided to provide the nation with the opportunity of engaging in a meaningful and disciplined discussion of the reordering of national priorities as a substitute for the meaningless generalization which so often characterizes our discussions of this subject. I suppose that I could at this point assume that you know something about the National Urban Coalition. Possibly I should not indulge in that assumption as far as all members of the audience are concerned. Conceivably it would help in our future discussion if I just gave you a bird's-eye view of this new national organization.

Soon after the riots in our cities in 1967, I received a call one day from the late Walter Reuther. I had known him over a period of years, particularly in connection with the work of the church. He told me that there were some leaders in the life of our nation who were so concerned about the issue that had resulted in these riots that they felt the time had come to bring together representatives from all segments of our national life to take a look at the issues confronting us and see what could be done in the way of united action to resolve those issues in a satisfactory manner. He said that I would get a call to serve as a member of the constituting group, particularly in my capacity as President of the National Council of Churches. I did get that call. I did participate. I was thrilled to sit down around the table with leaders from the religious world—our Catholic brethren, our Jewish brethren—with leaders from the field of management, leaders from the field of labor, leaders from the field of education, from civil rights, from virtually every major segment of our society. There was agreement on the fact that there was a gap in our national life and that we should endeavor to close that gap by organizing as a National Urban Coalition. We did. We got underway in a reasonably satisfactory manner. We did not, however, have any full-time leader at the head of the organization. Within a few weeks John Gardner resigned as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. We invited him to become the full-time chairman of the National Urban Coalition. He accepted. From that time on the program moved forward in a very significant way. Some of you know that in many of our cities there are local chapters of Urban Coalition following the pattern of the National Coalition.

Soon after John Gardner came on the job, he said that in addition to an Urban Coalition we needed an Urban Coalition Council. It is all right to identify some of the solutions for the issues which confront us; we must, however, go further, he said, and endeavor to rally support back of those solutions. So, we organized

a new corporation—the same persons that were serving in the old corporation—this was an Urban Coalition Action Council. We claimed no tax exempt privileges. We made it clear that anybody who contributed money was contributing it for, if you want to use the term, lobbying purposes and that, therefore, he could not claim a deduction on his own personal income tax. The Urban Coalition was able to secure adequate funds. The Urban Coalition Action Council was not able to secure adequate funds. So, John Gardner recommended that we abolish the Urban Coalition Action Council and that in its place there be brought into existence a new organization to be known as Common Cause, an organization which would appeal to thousands of our citizens for support in the form of membership dues. Six months ago this recommendation was put into operation. I serve as a member of the Policy Council of Common Cause. When it came into being the experts said that it would take fifty-two weeks to obtain 100,000 members at \$15 per member. At the end of twenty-three weeks we have 104,000 members and new members are coming in at the rate of 1,000 a day. Common Cause is dedicated to organizing support for specific objectives designed to deal with the burning issues of our day in a constructive manner. So much by way of background.

Keep in mind that this National Urban Coalition—I am not now talking about Common Cause but about the Urban Coalition—decided to provide the nation with the opportunity of engaging in a meaningful and disciplined discussion of the reordering of national priorities. This decision gave birth to what the Coalition refers to as the “Counterbudget: A Blueprint for Changing National Priorities.” This project on the part of the National Urban Coalition grows out of the conviction that it is through our federal budget that the nation in fact, no matter what it says, sets its priorities. Kermit Gordon, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget under the Kennedy Administration and now the President of the Brookings Institution in Washington, D. C., says: “Even though the spotlight of public attention and concern is today sharply focused on the issue of priorities in American society, the public is neither well informed nor much concerned about the composition as opposed to the total size of the budget of the Federal Government. This,” says Dr. Gordon, “is a singular inconsistency, for the President's annual budget is the vehicle for the most important and comprehensive collection of priority decisions which our society makes in the course of a year.”

Now, it is my purpose this afternoon to take a look, a quick look obviously, at this Counterbudget project and then to consider briefly how it can play a role in the life of a church that is deeply concerned about our national priorities. The National Urban Coalition's publication entitled *Counterbudget*, which will be published on April 30 by Praeger Publishers, Incorporated, in both paperback- and hardback-cover editions, consists of two separate but related documents. The first document is entitled “Statement on National Priorities.” This document is the product of a consensus forged from the broad diversity of interest and perspective that is reflected on the Urban Coalition Steering Committee, its governing body. The heart of the statement consists of six national goals unanimously approved by

the Coalition governing body. That word "unanimously" in this case is significant. I think it would be especially significant to you if you recognized or could see sitting around the table at a meeting of the Steering Committee the persons who reflect such a wide diversity of background and perspective.

Now, the second document presents a blueprint for changing America's priorities in the form of a proposed federal budget for each of the next five years. This document is the result of almost eighteen months of work by a team of National Urban Coalition staff and consultants, supplemented by contributions from nearly a thousand members of the Coalition's various constituents. These budgets for five years, up to and including 1976, were neither formally reviewed nor approved by the members of the Steering Committee of the Urban Coalition. But the budgets are, however, consistent with the six national goals and represent one possible strategy for achieving these goals.

Mr. Sol Linowitz, formerly the head of the Xerox Corporation, is now the Chairman of the National Urban Coalition. He took Dr. Gardner's place when Dr. Gardner became Chairman of Common Cause. In a preface to this publication Mr. Linowitz said that the Counterbudget "is not offered in opposition or reaction to the current federal budget" but is offered in order "to stimulate a more informed public debate over how resources ought to be allocated to obtain the goals most Americans share." The staff who prepared this Counterbudget in their introduction put it this way: "We do not expect everyone to agree with all of our recommendations. This is as it should be. Because of the comprehensiveness of the federal budget, it is probably impossible for any two people to be in complete agreement on how public resources should be allocated." May I just break in and say parenthetically as a result of eighteen years of experience in the Federal Government that you would find it difficult to find any two people within the Executive Branch of the government who are in agreement as to just what should or should not be in the budget. Now I return to the quotation from the authors of this budget. "But persuading others to accept our priorities is not our primary purpose. Instead we wish to stimulate a vastly more informed public debate on what national priorities ought to be."

I first served in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government beginning in the year 1939, when I became a member of the U. S. Civil Service Commission. Since that time I have had the privilege of serving in various positions for a period of a little better than eighteen years. On the basis of that experience I would like to say this: in my judgment never before in our history has the nation been provided with as helpful a tool to provide meaningful and disciplined discussion on the reordering of national priorities as is provided by the National Urban Coalition's Counterbudget.

Now, let us take a quick look at the first document; namely, the "Statement on National Priorities."

The goals, as approved by the National Urban Coalition's Steering Committee by unanimous vote of those present, call upon the Federal Government to:

- achieve full employment with a high level of economic growth and reasonable price stability;
- provide all citizens with an equal opportunity to

participate in American society and in the shaping of governmental decisions affecting their lives;

- guarantee that no American will go without the basic necessities: food, shelter, health care, a healthy environment, personal safety, and an adequate income;
- rectify the imbalance in revenues between the federal government and state-and-local government;
- assure adequate national security against military threats from abroad;
- meet our obligations to assist in the economic development of the world's lesser developed nations.

The implications of these proposed goals must be faced realistically as we think about them, as we debate them. As citizens we must determine whether we as individuals are willing to make the sacrifices which must be made if such goals are to be realized. If we are not, these goals will be as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals, because they will not be accompanied by love. The Counterbudget makes it possible for us to make a realistic appraisal of the goals before we decide whether we are going to subscribe to them or not.

Now, let us turn to the second document and consider how the Counterbudget was put together by the staff and by the consultants as they became involved in the operation.

First of all, specific policies and programs designed to move the nation toward the six goals, which I have just identified, during 1972-1976, a five-year period, were selected by the staff and their consultants from among many alternatives.

In the second place, the staff and their consultants determined that the total of the preferred alternatives, that is, those programs that would move us toward these goals, far exceeded preliminary estimates of the revenue that would be available from '72 to '76, even after including additional revenue from reform designed to make the tax system more equitable. Confronted with this situation, a decision was made to recommend increasing taxes but not to the staggering level necessary to finance the policies and programs which had emerged from the original screen.

Then, a target level for budget outlays was identified for each year. Now, this level was based on the full employment-surplus concept; that is, outlays were set equal to slightly less than the amount of revenue the Federal Government could be expected to collect if the economy were operating at full employment. (You have heard a little about the full employment budget over a period of the last few weeks.) Then, the staff and consulting groups, still faced with a scarcity of resources, decided what set of desirable outlays, or what set of desirable policies and programs, was the most desirable. And in arriving at that decision, they endeavored to choose the set of budget outlays which in their judgment would move America the farthest toward the six broad goals we have already identified. They endeavored, also, to propose the allocation of funds for those programs which promised the largest benefits per dollar invested. Then, comparing the benefits to be gained from spending scarce resources for various purposes, they eventually arrived at their target

level of expenditures by eliminating those outlays which they expected would move the nation the least toward the goals.

I have emphasized the process that they went through. I have emphasized it because it is a tough-minded process, the kind of a process in which very few of us, up to now, have been willing to participate.

All right, what about the results of this process? It is obvious that in just a few minutes I cannot describe all of the recommendations which they have made and the reasons for them. I am just going to try to give you a feel of those recommendations.

This is a quote from the document. The authors say: "Our first priority should be to assure that every American possesses the basic necessities of life. . . . Therefore, it is in these human development programs that we recommended the largest absolute increases in budget outlays." Now, included in this grouping under the heading of Human Development are employment and manpower training, economic conversion—conversion from a war-time to a peace-time economy—social insurance, income support, health, and education. And if you will look at the budget, the estimated budget for 1971, then go all the way down the row and look at their proposed budget for 1976, you find that in this area of human development they are recommending an increase from \$88.5 billion in 1971 to \$221 billion in 1976.

Second, they say, our budget also recommends significant increases in spending for Social and Physical Development. Now, included in this grouping are fiscal relief for states and localities, metropolitan development, housing, transportation, environment and natural resources, family planning and population growth, rural development and agriculture, and research and development. Under this grouping they recommend an increase from \$27 billion in 1971 to \$49.5 billion in 1976.

Their next heading is Society Under Law. Included in this grouping are law enforcement and criminal justice, equal opportunity, and consumer protection. They recommend an increase from \$1.1 billion in 1971 to \$4.2 billion in 1976.

Now their last grouping is in the international field, International Affairs, and deals particularly in the area of national security. And here is what they have to say in the introduction to their report: "The largest recommended reduction in outlays is for national defense and military assistance—a cut of \$24 billion from the present level of \$74.5 billion to \$50.4 billion in 1976. This recommended cutback is based on a careful assessment of U.S. international interests and the potential military threats posed by other nations to our security. Assuring adequate national security against military threats from abroad is one of our six basic goals and second to none in terms of importance.

"The critical question," they go on to say, "is what level of expenditures is required to provide *adequate* national security. A close scrutiny of the present Pentagon budget reveals a number of programs that either contribute little to our national strength or actually reduce our safety by fueling a continuation of the arms race. The total strength and security of our society would be increased by reallocating the \$24 billion in military funds for such programs to domestic public uses where the American taxpayer will receive

more for his money."

These conclusions, not only in the national security area but in all of the other areas they discussed, are backed up by detailed justification in this Counterbudget and a very frank discussion of the factors that played a role in their arriving at specific conclusions.

As you might expect, up to this point I have paid particular attention to the section on Human Development. In my judgment this section provides excellent material for a consideration on the part of citizens of the basic issues which have been presented to the Congress by the President of the United States just in the past few weeks in the field of Health, Education, and Welfare. These are all issues on which too many of us react on the basis of sweeping generalizations. Here is an opportunity to look at the facts surrounding these issues within a Christian context and with a Christian spirit.

Now, how can the church use the Counterbudget? Hopefully, those of us in the life of the church will do everything possible to provide opportunity for the discussion of this document within our local churches. Hopefully, our specialists in the field of Christian education will develop study outlines which will enable our discussions of this Counterbudget and the pending Federal Budget to move forward within a Christian context and with a Christian spirit. And if this happens, we are not all going to arrive at the same conclusions but each one of us participating in such discussion will arrive at sounder conclusions than would be the case if we did not participate in such discussion. I believe in the power of the Spirit.

The Introduction to the Counterbudget contains this conclusion:

"Finally, a word about commitment. No one doubts that we possess the resources and knowledge to reach our goals. What we have lacked in the past has been the will. William James once defined courage as 'the capacity to will effectively.' This is the capacity," say these authors, "that we must summon. If we do, we can find again the reserves of vitality that can lead us to the attainment of our ideals as a nation—whether they be in this set of national priorities or in one that the reader may wish to devise for himself."

I believe that unless we have the will to come to grips with the reordering of our national priorities and all of the action required to bring about their reordering, we are guilty of sins of omission. We are guilty of an unwillingness to take full advantage of the opportunities which are presented to us to love our neighbors, to help our neighbors, to provide them with the opportunity of achieving their highest potential. I also believe that we will continue to lack this will, we will continue to be guilty of sins of omission unless we live each hour of each day in fellowship with the living Christ who alone can provide us with the insight, the vision, the courage, and the strength for the living of these days.

Saving God's Earth

Eric C. Rust

Our earth faces a crisis in which all of us are involved, whatever our nation, color, race, or creed.

Yet the crisis has a peculiar significance at the religious level for both Christians and Jews. We often forget that the first ecologists were the Hebrews. The Old Testament is full of references to man's relation to nature. The divine image in man in the story of Genesis 1 involves man being given control over the order of nature (Gen. 1:27). The Psalmist notes that God has given man dominion over the works of creation (Ps. 8:6ff.). The wise man warns that a man should respect the life of his beast (Prov. 12:10). The legal codes instruct that the land should be left fallow one year in seven (Lev. 25:1-7). Trees should not be stripped of their fruit for the first three years; in the fourth year it should be given to God, and only in the fifth years enjoyed by man (Lev. 19:23ff.). Indeed man and nature were in a covenant relation; so, when man went wrong, nature went wrong too. When man rejected God and chose to determine his own destiny apart from the divine will, the garden became a desert. The flora of the desert replaced the orderly cultivation that God intended (Gen. 3:18; Job 31:38-40).

This should not surprise us for the Christian faith is a world-affirming faith. The prophets declared that God's purpose is worked out in history. The center of the divine disclosure is the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. The humanity of Jesus is the humanity of God, and the historicity of Jesus is the historicity of God. We Christians affirm that God has poured his fullness into the contours of this human life, embodied himself in our history. Further, we affirm that this earth is the stage in which man decides his destiny. Eternal life, the very life of God, is something that men have here and now, in their "thrownness," through the Christ. But we have forgotten that the humanity of Jesus is not just a divine affirmation of our world. It points back to the insight of the writers of Genesis 1, when they saw God rejoicing in the work of creation and declaring it to be good. It points forward to Paul's vision of the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain together until now, waiting for its own redemption along with the final unveiling of the sons of God (Rom. 8:19-22). Paul Tillich has a tremendous sermon on this theme which he entitles "Nature, Also, Mourning for a Lost Good."

Yet the Christian Church has sadly erred. It has often been so concerned with getting people out of hell into heaven, that it has forgotten that the Christian life has to be lived out on earth. It has emphasized man's moral responsibility to his fellows, although even there it has often in practice accepted the discriminatory attitudes of its cultural environment. But it has forgotten that it also has an ethical obligation to its natural environment and all living things.

Today all of us face a crisis in which the Christian faith has much to contribute. If one of our highest priorities be the saving of our environment, then we need to join with all men of goodwill in a universal task. But such a task is God's challenge to us. As over the issue of race, humanists, naturalists, and atheists have shown a concern for the natural environment which the Church has so rarely manifested. We forget that such men are activated often by secularized values which the Judaeo-Christian faith originally gave to our Western culture. Furthermore, the very science which has been strangely misdirected in the techno-

logical exploitation of nature has also a strong rootage in our Christian understanding of the world. God created men to be scientists, to have dominion over the work of his hands. The affirmation of the world in our faith has given rise to our modern secularity. Christians of all people should be concerned to see that science is harnessed now to the saving of our environment and the fulfillment of the divine joy in the goodness of creation.

We evidently need a Christian theology of nature and a Christian ethic concerned with our environment. Let us, then, turn our attention to theological foundations of such an endeavor.

First of all, I would remind you of *the centrality of the incarnation in our Christian approach*.

So often our theological approach has begun with sin and moved to the incarnation and the cross as the divine remedy for man's sinful estate. Yet, the question needs to be faced whether the incarnation is not within the divine purpose, quite apart from man's alienation. Surely we need to regard it as the climax of the whole creative process, the disclosure of the divine purpose for man and his world and the promise of its ultimate fulfillment. There are passages in our New Testament which suggest this and which point to an incarnational theology. We may not separate the death and resurrection of our Lord from the life itself. A theology of the cross needs to be placed within the setting of a theology of the incarnation.

We have suggested already that the reality of the humanity of Jesus is an affirmation of the value of man's personal being before God and also of the value and significance of both his earthly life and its environmental setting. The incarnation affirms the world in affirming man. It comes to us as an historical disclosure in the midst of our human history, and thereby it reminds us that God's purpose is fulfilled in human history and its natural environment.

Hence we have John, in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, tracing the Christ who became flesh back to the creative origination of the whole process. The Christ, the Word, who assumed historical garb in Jesus, is God uttering himself in creative and redemptive activity. What is embodied in Jesus of Nazareth is the disclosure of the love and purpose that originated the universe. The Christ is he through whom all things were created. He is also the revelatory light which enlightens all men coming into the world. As Paul saw, he is before all things and all things were created in him. In him all things cohere, find their unifying center, and in him things will ultimately be summed up. The universe centers in the incarnation, not just man. The Christian is cosmic—the key to the whole creative process and its goal. The incarnation means the incarnate presence of God in our human story, but it also means the incarnate *eschaton*, the promise of the future. The incarnation begins the incarnation of God in his whole created order. The goal of the universe, as its origin, is centered in the reality of Jesus as "God with us."

In disclosing the divine purpose, the incarnation is also a disclosure that the ground of the universe is personal love. Whatever God may be above and beyond this, he is at least personal. This is the highest category that we know and in this form God comes to us. Bonhoeffer declared: ". . . God is God

in the man Jesus. In this Jesus Christ God is present." Yet the essence of the personal depth of this universe is love. Men, across the centuries, have come to know in Christ a love which forgives and reconciles, a love which sets them free to be their true selves. In all speculative attempts to reach deeper into the mystery of disclosure in Jesus, men have never escaped the reality of that love which reaches them out of its midst. The mystery of God is a mystery of love.

But Jesus as the incarnate presence discloses a God who accompanies his creation. However we understand the divine transcendence, it is an "otherness" which is also present in our midst. Bonhoeffer could write: "God is 'beyond' in the midst of our life." Whitehead's description of God as our fellow-traveller is a true insight. In his love God has been pleased to identify himself with our humanity, to presence himself in our midst, to make our humanity his and our historicity a part of his life. This the incarnation implies if we are committed to the incarnate presence.

Furthermore, it means that God both rejoices in and suffers with his creation. We are not dealing with an absentee God but with one who is present in our midst. For too long our Christian theism has been a kind of deism which almost ignores the divine immanence. Yet the biblical witnesses see the Spirit brooding over the chaotic deep in creation (Gen. 1:2), feel the Spirit agonizing with men and nature in the ongoing of the creative process (Rom. 8:18ff.), and declare that nowhere in the universe can men hide from the immanent presence (Ps. 139:7-12). Just as the Word is God issuing out of his personal depth in creative and revelatory activity, so the Spirit is God immanently active within his creation.

Our Lord celebrates nature and sees in it a manifestation of the divine activity. He calls on men to live in the world as in the Father's house. He rejoices in our human possibilities and seeks to evoke the divine image in his fellows.

But in the center of his ministry stands a gaunt symbol of suffering. If he be the incarnate presence, then we cannot dichotomize God and make the divine impossible. If the cross is a divine identification with an estranged and alienated humanity and if God be essentially self-giving love, then the cross means that God suffers with his creatures and bears the whole process of nature and history redemptively. This was in the vision of the prophets like Hosea and Jeremiah, and their disclosure is brought to a focus in Calvary.

Beyond the cross stands the resurrection, a sign that the divine love cannot ultimately be defeated, that the victim of Calvary is also the victory. The incarnation in its totality, with the cross and resurrection as its climax, brings to a focus in the actuality of history that redemptive suffering love with which the living God accompanies and guides the whole creative process and gathers it into his own life.

Surely this implies that God who is eternally love is himself enriched as his purpose is actualized in the movement of his creation. As he suffers with it and rejoices in it, his love is enriched as it finds actualization in a creative and redemptive world process. Much as the artist is enriched when he sees his vision actualized on canvas, so God adds the quality of actuality to his own life. Ever perfect, his love is yet a growing perfection, as he suffers and rejoices in a

world to which he has granted its own degree of independence. In the center he has set men to be his co-workers. This brings us to the creative process itself.

So, secondly, let us look at *the creative process and the natural order*.

Modern science is making us increasingly aware of four things about our world.

One insight is that the whole process is a developmental one. Not only man, but nature also has a history. Even men of the Bible associated creation with a temporal movement in the dynamic models of Genesis 1 and 2. Modern biology together with modern astrophysics have made us very aware of the long process of evolutionary movement which lies behind the present state of our universe. The creative process has covered billions of years, and the modern understanding of evolution is uncovering some of the creative mechanism.

A second insight is the mysterious interrelatedness of the world of nature. The oxygen/carbon dioxide, water, and nitrogen cycles remind us of how intimately life is tied up with the physical structure of our world. The ecological pyramid points to the intimate relationships by which life is sustained. The food chains from plants through herbivores to carnivores constitute basic structures for the continuance of life. Their delicate balance lies at the background of the whole process. The mysterious DNA molecule with its transmission of hereditary characteristics reminds us of how much physics and chemistry lie at the basis of every human personality. The more we study genetics, the more we men realize how much we also are a part of nature.

But this should not surprise Christians. The biblical writers include men with all living things in the category "all flesh." They emphasize man's covenant relationship with all nature. They point, indeed, to the fact that man is an amphibian. He is part of nature and yet transcends it, he is also spirit, self-transcendent personal being.

The third insight of science is an increasing awareness of the centrality of man in the whole process. Julian Huxley, naturalist though he be, can state "the primacy of human personality . . . is a *fact* of evolution." W. H. Thorpe, the biologist, can write that "with the coming of self-conscious life the evolutionary process can be said to have become conscious of itself." Even at the scientific level there seems indication of directiveness. Although we need to remember that purpose and teleological categories have no place in the scientific approach to nature. We can, however, understand why Teilhard de Chardin emphasizes the inner side of the natural process and argues that evolutionary development is not to be understood apart from man with his self-transcendent being. Science can have no place for the unobservable. It deals only with what can become an object, an entity—to be experimentally investigated. But man is more than the outward. He has an inner dimension of freedom and responsibility, a capacity for love and commitment, a conscience and a self-critical power of thinking. He is the outward process and something more; a microcosm of the macrocosm and yet he transcends it. So often this is what the naturalist ignores. Man does embody all that physics and chemistry say about matter, atoms, and molecules, all that biology says about DNA mol-

ecules and living cells and genetics, all that behavioristic psychology may say about mind. Yet he is above and beyond this. He is a scientist able to control the process, to aid or mar its structure and balance.

This in biblical language is one mark of the divine image. It reminds us that man is called to be a co-worker with God. He is responsible under God for the bringing to fulfillment of the whole creative process.

This brings us to the fourth insight of modern science—the unfinished nature of the universe. There is a random, or contingent, aspect of nature. The atomic scientist and the contemporary physicist speak of acausality and indeterminacy at the root of matter. They tell us that scientific regularities are statistical averages and that science is concerned with probabilities. The biologist sees the operation of random mutations within the developmental process of living things, even though there is an overall directiveness and a certain balance and structure within nature. So much of our natural evil, from earthquakes and tornadoes to cancers and heredity defects, springs from this contingent dimension of our world.

This unfinished nature of the universe can be understood theologically. If man is created with freedom and the gift of creativity, there must be an area in which such creative freedom can be exercised. Love is creative, and God who is love calls forth a responsive creative love in his creatures. A deterministic universe would leave no place for human freedom or creativity. A world in which warring systems and contingent elements are present is theologically intelligible.

Our science is one way in which we are learning to control this unfinished aspect and to direct it to better ends. Here is God's gift to us—not something to be scared of but something to accept with open hands from his gracious hands. In some sense science embodies an intuitive insight into, dare we say a revelation of, the divine mind and creative wisdom.

The tragedy is that we do not use it aright. Science cannot give us ethical direction, for moral categories do not fall within its scheme of things. And here we come to the crux of our ecological problem—man himself. Instead of cooperating with God, as the divine vice-gerent, he has harnessed nature to his own ends and exploited it.

So, in the third place, we come to *the alienated man and the divine redemption*.

We have suggested already that we should begin with the Christ and not with sin. If we would understand the depth of man's alienation, his estrangement from God and from his fellows, we must look at the cross. Calvary shows where our world is. On those gaunt beams of wood our human history is pilloried and our human bankruptcy is manifested. This is what we do to supreme goodness when it is lived in our midst. This is what we do to infinite love when it is poured into our human history in one human life.

But the cross here only brings to a focus one dimension of our humanity. The most profound analysis of it is contained in the dynamic model of Genesis 3. Here we see man ever trying to pass the buck and to shifting responsibility for his sin onto other shoulders—the woman, the snake, any but himself. Here too we see what the root of man's sin is—selfishness, pride, concern for oneself, regarding all others, including nature, as means to one's own selfish ends. It is sig-

nificant also that the temptation comes from the snake, a part of nature. It would seem that the symbolism of the story involves the suggestion that man is tempted by his delegated power over nature to take such dominion into his own hands. He will not be God's vice-gerent. He will be like God.

The roots of sin are partly creaturely arrogance and partly creaturely insecurity. Less sure of the invisible and mysterious presence than he is of his world, man chooses to find his security in his control of the latter and to make himself the center of his world. Nature and his fellows are there to be exploited. Man moves from a personal "Thou-attitude" toward his world to an "It-attitude." This is the tragic story of human history. It lies behind the social, national, political, and racial tensions of human history; behind our technological exploitation of nature and our ecological crises; behind our broken human relationships and meaningless, frustrated lives. Man is alienated. His existence is unauthentic. He has rejected the divine way of love and self-giving and enthroned himself, only to find that nature has turned against him and that his fellows are estranged.

Yet God has left man the gift of science and the voice of conscience. Man is still a thinking reed and still a responsible person. He is still human. We Christians need a new humanism in place of the frequent pictures of our wormlike condition. This does not avoid the fact that man cries out for redemption as does also the material order which provides his earthly setting. Man is the prisoner of his own self-centeredness, the victim of his frustrations and loss of vision. Separated from God, he finds himself an alien in this world. He needs to be set free, to realize his potential as a child of God, to see the world as his Father's house. He craves for authentic existence, real personhood. This cry runs through our novels, our plays, our pop music. What we often fail to see is that truly authentic existence carries with it a genuine concern for nature as well as for persons. Above all, it is to be reconciled to God.

Once more we find ourselves confronted by the incarnate presence of God in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth. If the cross is an exposure of our alienated condition, the resurrection is the promise of our redemption. Here we see love which so identifies with us that it bears our sin, suffers at our hands, endures our alienation to the very point of death, and triumphs over us in a resurrected life. When Hartshorne describes the universe as subject to the persuasive pressure of love, he is at the heart of the redemption released in Jesus Christ. The almightiness of the living God is the almightiness of love, not of irresistible force. It is the love that takes all that sinful man can do and still loves. It is the power of a restraint which gives man his freedom, lets man do his worst with that freedom, suffers, and still pursues in love. Francis Thompson saw it all in his poem "The Hound of Heaven." This is the atonement wrought on the cross and in the resurrection—a love that identifies, bears, and reconciles; a love that sets men free. But in redeeming man it also redeems the universe!!

What we have said is the theological explanation of our ecological problem. What we are doing to nature is a manifestation of our human predicament. We upset the cycles of nature, polluting our air and

our water. We denude the earth of vegetation and upset the balance of oxygen and carbon dioxide. We pour our noxious fumes into the atmosphere, turn Lake Erie into a chemical tank, poison our fish, destroy our bird life, contaminate our water table, kill our oceans—all for greed and selfish exploitation. We treat nature as an “It,” just as we treat our fellows—means to our technological ends and material enrichment. We need legal safeguards, the machinery of justice, the curbs on selfishness and unconcern that politics can impose. What more has Christianity to offer? The answer lies just in the redemptive love released in Jesus. He still sets men free, liberates men into authentic existence, teaches them how to love. But such love and concern involves more than our fellows, it involves nature too.

So, fourthly, we must examine *the call to be co-workers with God*.

There is a specifically humanist stance over the ecological issue and what might be called an ethical responsibility that has secular roots. Indeed, as we have already noted, initiative for this and other issues has often been taken over by the secularists and the humanists while the Church has lagged behind. Nor would we dispute that God is using such activity. From the Christian standpoint we have too long refused to see God in many places where genuine concern is being manifested and have limited the divine presence to the confines of an avowedly Christian commitment. We have forgotten the parabolic indication of our Lord that to give a cup of cold water, to relieve poverty, to visit the imprisoned, to show concern for others may also be serving him. If I adopt a Christian stance, I have no right to shrug off those who have a like concern but a different motivation.

What then is the Christian stance? Let us note that the Christian, as Bonhoeffer wrote, is one in whom the Christ is forming his form again. In some sense, with his frailty and creatureliness, he is the ongoing of the incarnation. The pattern of death and resurrection underlies his faith commitment. He too has taken, by the transforming love of Christ, the form of the servant and participates in the risen humanity of his Lord. This means that the center of his liberated personal being is love and concern—love for his fellows, yes, and concern for nature! The love of God manifested in Jesus is the central motivation of a Christian ethic.

For one thing this implies a reverence and respect for nature, a regard for its processes, a concern for its life. Albert Schweitzer is a controversial figure theologically, but none would deny his devotion to the Christ and his life of sacrificial service. He noted sadly the tendency of Western and Oriental philosophies alike to limit ethical concern to the human level. He makes the main premise of his ethical stance a “reverence for life.” He here reflects a quality of the teaching of Jesus which manifests a reverence for nature and a love for natural things. Although Schweitzer sometimes verged on a kind of mystical pantheism and was often oversentimental, his words of counsel make him a modern patron saint of ecology. “So far as he is a free man he (man) uses every opportunity of tasting the blessedness of being able to assist life and avert from it suffering and destruction.”

What Schweitzer says about reverence for life becomes more significant if we see nature itself as capable of and knit together by sensitivity and psychic

response. This was how the Hebrews regarded it, and we find this point of view reinforced in Whitehead’s philosophy of organism, the basis of contemporary process theology. Martin Buber refers to an “I-Thou” relationship to nature. This involves an acceptance of the creatures for what they are, a reverence for their particular type of being, a concern for their freedom from suffering and frustration within the limits that ecological balance permits, a recognition of their kinship with us. Self-transcendent though the human spirit be, man needs to recognize also his oneness with nature and to grasp its spiritual meaning.

A second note in the Christian stance is that of joy and celebration. We need the spirit of Francis of Assisi, another patron saint of ecology. In his great “Canticle of the Sun,” he celebrates his kinship with all living things—brother sun and sister moon, brother wind and sister wave, brother fire and mother earth. He sees them all praising his and their Creator for their role in the process of life. The canticle is full of rejoicing and wonder at these creatures which play their allotted part in the divine economy. But we have lost this sense of joy and wonder in our experience of nature. A naturalistic thinker like Julian Huxley can write: “Enjoyment as well as material resources are being threatened (by our rape of nature); as my brother Aldous said after reading Rachel Carson’s book, *Silent Spring*, we are exterminating half the basis of English poetry!” Science has taught us to treat nature and its constituent creatures as “Its,” objects that technology can control. We need to celebrate their “Thou-ness” under God, for we have forgotten that he rejoices in his creation.

A third note to remember is the sacramental dimension of nature. In and through nature, the Christian meets the Creator. His “Thou” relation with nature merges into a “Thou” relation to that personal Presence who journeys with his creatures and sustains their life. The whole universe can be sacramental in the sense that it mediates the presence of and points to its Creator. In the sacraments of the Church, this sacramental aspect of nature is brought to a focus. For we take bread and wine and water, elements symbolic of all nature, and make them the bearers of spiritual meaning. Nature participates in the process of redemption. It becomes united to God. The creatures of the old creation are elevated into creatures of the new creation. So nature attains its true and ultimate meaning. Bonhoeffer suggests that in the sacraments the creatures “are freed from their dumbness and proclaim directly to the believer the new creative Word of God. They no longer need man’s interpretation. Enslaved nature does not utter the word of creation directly to us. But the sacraments speak.” They are drawn up into the Christ’s risen humanity and prefigure that ultimate consummation when men and nature alike shall be gathered up in the Christ. So in worship, we in whom the Christ is pleased to create a new humanity become co-workers with him in the redemption of all things.

Paul Tillich would see a promise of this even in art. Painters and sculptors can creatively transform nature and make it bear spiritual meaning. He describes this as “nature elevated above itself, revealing its tragedy and, at the same time, its victory over its tragedy.” But there is a much more significant and practical

aspect than this. It is to use our scientific knowledge and technological skills as co-workers with God, respecting nature's balance, seeking to remove its imbalance and to remedy its tragedy and suffering.

So we come to the fourth note in the Christian stance. We are co-workers with God with a hope in view. All through this lecture I have referred to the eschatological note, the promise in the resurrection. What was begun in Jesus of Nazareth will be completed in the final consummation. Too often we have surrendered our hope to the cranks and forgotten that an eschatological tension is of the essence of the Christian faith and life. We live always between the "now" and the "then." But the final unveiling of sons of God—the new humanity begun in the incarnation, hidden in the Christian believer and the Church within the movement of history—will bring with it the final redemption and transformation of nature too. Our hope is cosmic and social, not just individual.

Yet we do not rest in the hope. The End is God's act but we are called to play our part in the coming. As co-workers with God we are called to what Moltmann calls a "creative discipleship." In Christ's name we are called to liberate the potencies and powers in men and in our world which hold the secret of God's Kingdom. At the level of nature we may be instruments of God's creative power as we liberate the warped and bound potencies of our world and restore the structures that we men have marred. There we play our part in hastening God's day. The implication is that to some degree God waits on his children for the final act in which the universe becomes filled with his glory.

Exactly what we mean by the final transformation of nature itself belongs to the realm of imagination. What energy is in itself the scientist cannot finally say. He knows the forms that it can take. He can study its behavior in this world order. That man can grasp this energy by his mind and manipulate it suggests that it has an ultimate kinship with spirit. All we can affirm is that values are being forged within the natural order which are of significance in the divine purpose and that such values and meanings will not be cast like rubbish on the void. T. E. Jessup, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Hull, speaks of "the vision of a consummation in which this material earth in general, and the living body of each of us in particular, is drenched with the ideal, and through this inner baptism all but loses its materiality." To this end we are co-workers and co-creators with God.

This brings us, fifthly, to *the practical application of our theological quest.*

What is the Christian dimension of ecotactics? The ethical motivation for our concern with nature should now have been clarified. We are concerned with nature because it is God's creation and because it, too, will participate in the ultimate redemption which the Christ has effected in his incarnate life, death, and resurrection. We must remove its frustration and prepare the way for God's final coming. But we have another dimension to our motivation. We are concerned for nature because we men have failed in our responsibility to it as sharing with us in God's creative act. We must, under God, right the wrong that men have done, restore the balance of nature, and, as Christ's

servants, heal its wounds. We have thus a deeper motivation than our humanist friends who are likewise concerned.

First, the Church needs to emphasize both this Christian motivation and its theological roots in its preaching and teaching. If the Church is truly to exercise its mission as the servant community, it will need to list among the urgent needs of men, not only the basic issues of personal and social redemption, but also their relation to and mishandling of their environment. If redemption means the end of alienation and estrangement and the discovery of the meaning of life as lived within the divine purpose, such a life has environmental as well as social dimensions. It is not much use being concerned with social injustice and economic inequity if we show no concern for the natural setting without which life in every aspect would be impossible. If our environment goes dead, then all our social concern will be of little avail, and we might as well concentrate on getting people out of hell into heaven. But, as we have seen, this is not anywhere near the full eschatological dimension of the gospel.

We need to organize church conferences in which the ecological issues are discussed, in which the biblical view of nature is made clear, in which the theological dimension of the environmental problem is considered, and in which the ethical dimension of our relation to nature is stressed. There can be no effective action without adequate understanding. This can be offered in preaching and occasional lectures, but it will be most effective in dialogue. Many excellent films and books are available at the secular level. The Church should be the conscience of the community. Too sadly that is what is has not been on many of the social and racial issues of our day. Perhaps we can exercise our Christian responsibility better when it applies to our natural environment! But to do this we shall have to be informed.

Secondly, Christians need to activate groups of people to translate Christian concern into action. Parts of the community which have been mishandled with trash, creeks in which garbage has been carelessly dumped, seashores where special emergencies arise from oil seepage and bird life is endangered—one could give a long list of projects, some arising out of immediate emergencies and some which deal with long-standing ecological problems. Student groups and groups of concerned citizens have often pointed the way here, and the Christian communities have often participated, individually and as church groups. It would be great if the Church here gave a lead. So often it is accused by secular man of dragging its feet and concentrating on the other worldly. Here is an opportunity to demonstrate our this-worldly concern at a new level and to convince our fellows that the Christian faith is world-affirming.

Thirdly, Christians should be encouraged to join conservation groups, to exert pressures on governmental bodies at all levels, and to voice strong opposition when evident industrial greed and the profit motive are behind efforts which will increase environmental pollution or destroy some natural setting and its wild life. Lawyers with Christian convictions need to devise ways to prevent big corporations from "getting by" with so much environmental pollution.

Politicians and legislators with Christian convictions need to be encouraged to attack this issue as zealously as their humanistic and secular colleagues. Christian convictions should mean a personal integrity that can withstand the lobbying tactics of industrial interests and the pressure of political expediency. Such men should have the support of the churches, irrespective of their political labels. By this I mean that the Church need not be accused of "going political" if it makes it clear to its members that the ecological issue is one on which all men of good will, irrespective of political party, should be united. In addition, letters to legislators and public officials should be encouraged when a particular and vital matter relating to the natural environment is under consideration.

Finally, the Christian is the conscience of society, the leaven in the lump. The anonymous author of *Ad Diognetum* could declare early in the second century A.D. that what the soul is to the body, the Christian is to the world. Let us close with a telling quotation from C. A. Coulson, himself a distinguished scientist: "Only those who know the inner nature of Man and the peculiar ways in which God transforms man's mind by the renewing power of His Spirit, and the status which God confers upon him that he may be called a child of God, are big enough to speak to the condition of today."

National Priorities: An Overview

Bill Moyers

I

In the beginning I want to admit that some things are right with America. Spiro Agnew, after all, has been reporting for two years now on the view from the country club. For supporting evidence we have the testimony of Bob Hope and our old friend, Billy Graham. There seems nothing wrong with America that a little more laughter, a little more reverence, and a little more fellowship on the "back nine" will not cure.

It has become bad form in some quarters to suggest that things are not working well in this country, to discuss in public the signs of decadence, to question ourselves aloud, to criticize, to cry out, to stand aghast before the gaping canyons of hypocrisy that separate our illusions from reality and our ideals from our performance. It has become almost unpatriotic to ask: "What has gone wrong with the continent of glories?" Authorities today no more want to acknowledge trouble in the land than did the leaders of ancient nations. The difference is that in America today a Jeremiah would not be hounded from the platform in manacles, he would be tagged a "radical lib" and sentenced to nine months listening to Martha Mitchell on the "Today Show." And Isaiah would not be put to death by some modern Manasseh, he would have the words "effete snob" painted on his forehead and sentenced to two years carrying Strom Thurmond's bar bells up and down the capitol steps.

Some things are working in America. Max Ways wrote in a recent issue of *Fortune Magazine* that the

underlying trends in American life, while fraught with risk, nevertheless point to hope. All the main disturbances and anxieties, he said, result from two accelerating supertrends. The first trend is toward a deepening individuality, a wider diversity, and more freedom. The second trend is toward the increasing interdependence of individuals, organizations, and nations. "The main direction of recent movement in the United States and in the world is an unfolding of the human potential, a thrusting forward to new levels of individual and communal responsibility and scope. By either Christian or humanist value systems," Max Ways concluded, "this direction may be deemed good," and the task of all of us "is to form and pursue specific goals as if they were seen against the moving background of the great trends."

I agree with that assessment—in the long run man may very well prevail. But as Lord Keynes said, in the long run we shall all be dead. At the moment we are left with the meantime, with today—"and sufficient unto the day are the troubles thereof." If you must huddle in the winter cold of a ghetto tonight, if your child is the prey of a pusher tonight, if all that is left of life tonight is a debt-ridden, bed-ridden parenthesis in a nursing home halfway between retirement and death, if you ride tonight bleeding and dazed and numbed with your life spilling out across the floor of a helicopter close to the treetops of Vietnam—there is small comfort in knowing that just possibly, maybe, hopefully, if somehow history lands on its feet, everything will turn out all right a thousand years from now (unless, of course, there is a catastrophe).

I hope the great trends do prove out, but I am sure they will not unless the decisions we make now, as individuals and as a society, are not more wise and humane than they have been in the last ten years. There is little chance of escaping in the future from the blunders of today. At another conference like this in another city, one of the speakers expressed the belief that in a world such as ours, the Christian must emulate the early Christians and be prepared to "flee to the mountains." Another member of the conference rose to say that he thought that to be a fine sentiment, but he wanted to ask a question "for information only. . . ." The question was: "Where are the mountains?"

Where *are* the mountains?

The twenty-first century—only 29 years away—will find our descendants living on a crowded planet. Not until the 1840's did the world's population reach a billion people. Today's population of 3.3 billion is expected to double in the next thirty years. By the end of the next century it will have reached 13.5 billion if the present rate of growth is sustained. There are 192,000 births every day or more than 60 million a year. You begin to see the implications of such growth when you drive in to Manhattan on the Long Island Expressway. Ahead of you and behind you stretch hundreds of cars and trucks—all driven by someone else's baby. If Keats had had to contemplate that Grecian urn while driving on the Long Island Expressway, neither he nor the urn would have made it.

Tonight, nearly half the world's population goes to bed hungry and many suffer from chronic malnutrition. Some observers have predicted local and regional fam-

ines in Asia, Africa, and Latin American during the next three decades. To feed everyone we will need to triple food production.

In such a world there are no mountains, although the privileged classes on every continent use their wealth to flee from the awful realities of humanity's plight. But nothing so damns the soul to rot as a turning away of mind and heart from the great concerns of mankind. We cannot hope to keep reason and moral imagination alert so long as we are willing to exist as a small wealthy elite in the vast poverty that is the society of man.

Though the United States represents only 6% of the world's population, we consume over 40% of the world's non-recurrable resources. We define the poverty level as \$3,000 a year—yet two-thirds of the world struggle to get their per capita income up to \$200 per year. Our life expectancy is now over 70 years of age, while 50% of the world's population may expect to die by the age of 40.

Thirty-four percent of the world's population living in more developed countries live on 87½% of the world's product, while 66% of the people living in the lesser developed world live on 12½% of the product. In four more years the dependent children alone in the lesser developed world will equal the total population of the more developed world. Twenty percent of the men in these countries will be out of work.

With this world spending over \$200 billion a year for military security—twenty-five times what it spends for economic and social development—where *are* the mountains?

II

Against this background we have come to consider the condition of the world's richest nation. We do not even have to accept the testimony of the New Left critics of America to know that some things are not working well at all. No less a lifelong Republican than Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, hardly a darling of the chic radical left, spoke last year of "a national sickness from which I pray we will recover."

And here is William Buckley, who is not a candidate for the chairmanship of the local SDS, in a column entitled "Just Do Something!"

"The Vietnam war is in the special sense a great villain; because it occupies the mind like a birthmark.

"The drug problem is a problem concerning which nobody, not one living soul, has suggested a program the result of which could guarantee a diminution of the curse, which is literally engulfing us.

"Anybody who has traveled the waters of Long Island Sound this summer knows that the pollution we have all read about as belonging to Lake Erie say, or the Lower Hudson, is finally here: sailing across the Sound is like canoeing down the Paris sewer.

"One hundred million words after the reformers ousted Carmine deSapio in New York City and . . . promised daffodils in the streets, the garbage, the refuse, the dirt thickens."

"Just do something!"

We do not even require the views of the politicians

or pundits to assess the priorities of America. To choose priorities means to give certain concerns precedence over others according to logic, importance, or value. Those are great words—logic, importance, value. They have about them the sound of authenticity. But where is logic being served in America today? What do we consider important? What are our values?

Here are summaries of news stories taken from daily newspapers of recent months which I culled from my files:

First Item:

The Senate voted 62 to 22 against an amendment to stop the Army from using herbicides in Vietnam. It voted 48 to 30 against an amendment to put restrictions on a 200 million dollar fund that the Pentagon wants to give the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation in connection with the controversial C-5A cargo jet.

Second Item:

The Nixon Administration will ask Congress to cut the Head Start program by 11 million dollars below last year's request. Cuts totalling \$336,420 in Nassau and Suffolk counties (that's where I live) were announced today, threatening a serious erosion of preschool programs for poor children on Long Island. The executive director of the Equal Opportunity Council, when informed of the announcement, said, "Oh, God! Lord, have mercy!" (As if He could do anything about it beyond whispering in someone's ear at one of those Sunday morning worship services in the White House.)

First Item:

President Nixon today vetoed a bill that would have limited the amount of money political candidates spend on television during a campaign.

Second Item:

Governor Rockefeller's final campaign statements filed this week showed expenses of nearly 6.9 million, with about 4.6 million of that coming from contributions from members of his family. A large portion of Mr. Rockefeller's campaign funds, about 2.3 million—or about \$600,000 more than the entire cost of the Goldberg campaign—was used for television advertising.

First Item:

President Nixon came to the Commerce Department yesterday to praise the American economy as the gross national product crossed the historic trillion dollar mark. "I am, of course, very honored to be here on this occasion in which we pass a milestone, the first trillion dollar economy for the United States and, of course, the first trillion dollar economy for any nation in the world."

Second Item:

One out of every four Americans 65 and over is forced to live on a poverty-level income, the Senate Special Committee on Aging reported yesterday. . . . There was an increase in both the number and the proportion of aged poor between 1968 and 1969. . . . Older persons are suffering heavily in the current economy, the report said. It asserted they were hard hit by employ-

ment in the economic slump and that soaring property taxes jeopardized their efforts to hold on to homes. . . .

(Here I would point out, as you may have noticed in the stories from Washington, that the trillion dollar economy extolled by the President is not altogether credible. Output of real goods and services is almost exactly the same now as 18 months ago. National production has climbed from \$925 million to slightly more than one trillion dollars today, but fast rising prices account for the entire \$75 billion increase. Put a little differently: we are getting the same number of cars, appliances, television sets, suits, dresses, shoes, and hamburgers now that we got then; but they are costing us \$75 billion a year more. No wonder the country looks as if it is passing not a milestone but a gallstone. You don't look that happy when you pass a gallstone!)

First Item:

(From the President's State of the World message): "South Vietnam now has an excellent opportunity not only to survive but to build a strong, free society."

Second Item:

Two Roman Catholic priests in South Vietnam were sentenced to prison for opposing the war in articles printed in a Saigon magazine. Some Vietnamese in publishing and in politics feel that the severity of the sentences is a signal that criticism of the Government will not be permitted now that the presidential election is approaching. In South Vietnam the government has almost total control over what is published in the press. (How is that for a strong, free society?)

First Item:

Vice President Agnew today called on young Americans to help build a better country through respect for law and order. . . .

Second Item:

Vice President Agnew, campaigning in northeast Florida, praised GOP Governor Claude Kirk for his opposition to a federal court order earlier this year, saying Kirk had brought the school busing issue into focus. (Or as Dante wrote in *Inferno*: "She made what pleased her lawful.")

Final Item:

Washington's transportation priorities, as revealed in the budget this year, include \$40,000,000 for inter-city railroads, \$290,000,000 for the super-sonic transport, and \$8,000,000,000 for interstate highways.

So much for the news.

So much for priorities, according to logic, importance, or value.

Contrast the kids:

"*Student Times* is a magazine published by third, fourth, seventh, and eighth grade kids. The students write the articles, draw the pictures, take the photos and are taught the mechanics of publication.

"Here's a sampling:

"Eleven-year-old Florence Watford's solution to the ecological crisis: 'I think that if the President

would stop putting money into making space rockets, there would be enough money to clean the streets and the air.'"

"Fenda Jones, 9, explains 'why I am a liberal': '. . . because animals are dying and people are dying. There are lot of things that are not fair. Why is this done? We have to help get things done. People are dying.'"

"And she displays a feminist streak: 'Some ladies try to get a job and they say this is a job for men and not for ladies. And this is the same for men. This has got to go.'"

"On race pride, Marianne Russell, 9, writes: 'I am black and proud to be black. Black is beautiful. . . . Some people are white and ugly. Others are white and beautiful. The United States should live in peace. I do not hate anyone.'"

"'I'm tired of dirty streets and bums, addicts and things like that,' laments another student. 'I don't know why around Times Square, Radio City and 34th St., it is so clean but in Harlem it is so dirty.'"

Our priorities are upside down, some people claim, because The System isn't working. To some extent this is true. When it comes to such things as getting rid of garbage, The System doesn't know what to do. Americans are dumping garbage at the rate of 360 million tons a year and that rate will double in the next nine years. Seventy percent of the 300 incinerators maintained by U.S. cities have no pollution controls and 94% of the country's landfills are still breeding grounds for rats and disease. Houston's garbage dump is the highest point on the Texas coastal plain, except for the San Jacinto Monument (where Sam Houston uttered these immortal words: "If you can't beat 'em, drown 'em.") New York City uses three stinking dumps that will be filled in five more years, leaving the city with 15,000 tons of trash every day and no place to put it (except, possibly, outer space, which man has discovered is a convenient, almost empty, dump; but we are starting to fill it up—more than 2000 pieces of space devices already orbit the earth and 64 objects now float in deep space).

Now, the sad fact is that this is not because man is evil. This is not because the mayor of New York and the mayor of Houston are abominable men who seek to sink their cities in garbage. It is because we don't know what to do with it. We have not yet created a NASA of garbage. We have not yet made it as exciting, as sexy, as important, and as venture-some to clean up the streets of our cities and empty the sewage basins of our cities as we have to go to the moon. And I can assure you that if the American people thought it was important enough to move the Rocky Mountains to Florida, they would move the Rocky Mountains to Florida if we and our descendants were willing to pay the price. And if we felt it was important enough to bring together enough scientists and engineers and specialists and experts and administrators and management to create a NASA of garbage, we would find a way to do something about the most important problem facing the health of 70% of the people who live in this country.

But people who charge that The System is not working are wrong. The System is working extraordinarily well for those people who can afford it or who have friends who can manipulate it for them.

The System worked very well for Paul Powell, the Democratic official in Illinois who somehow managed to accumulate more than a million dollars in cash which was discovered, after his recent death, in shoe boxes and other assorted places.

The System not working? That would be news to Gerald Ford, the House Republican Leader who failed to report \$11,500 in campaign contributions from stockbrokers, oilmen, bankers, doctors, and union officials. The checks given to Mr. Ford were detoured through Republican headquarters back into his district to pay off post-election debts. Although the Corrupt Practices Act requires full public disclosures of all campaign contributions received with a candidate's knowledge or consent, as these were, I advise against holding your breath until the Justice Department investigates.

You say The System isn't working? Tell that to those corporate executives who collectively from forty-nine companies donated more than a million dollars to the political campaigns in 1968. They just happen to work for companies ranked among the top 25 defense, space, and nuclear contracts in the country. For old times' sake some of them contribute to both parties!

And The System is working very well, thank you, for such recipients of its beneficence as the power companies. Last year, when the Federal Power Commission held its fiftieth birthday party, only representatives from the gas and power companies showed up; there were no consumers. Apparently the power executives were eager to express their gratitude to the chairman installed at the FPC by the President. Having declared upon his appointment that the price of natural gas is too low, he raised it. During the first nine months of his term the price of frying eggs and heating bath water and heating homes jumped at its fastest peak in ten years.

The System is even working well for the polluters. According to a survey in the *New York Times*, most of the state agencies responsible for cleaning up the nation's air and water are dominated by the industries which do the polluting. One Colorado state hearing on stream pollution by a brewery was presided over by an employee of the brewery. For years a board member dealing with the pollution of Los Angeles harbor has been an executive of an oil company that was a major harbor polluter. More than three years after the statutory deadlines, only 18 states have adopted water quality standards satisfactory to the Federal Government. Thirty-two states have extended various abatement dealings without approval of the Interior Secretary—technically a violation of Federal law. ("The law's made to take care of raskills," George Eliot wrote in *Mill on the Floss*, but what happens when rascals write the laws?)

You say that does not happen very often? Ninety-seven members of the House of Representatives—who are paid \$42,500 a year, plus allowances, perquisites, and generous pensions—hold an interest in banks, savings and loan associations, and other financial institutions. Twelve of the thirty-five members of the

House Banking and Currency Committee held banking interests in 1969. Thirty-seven percent of the Congressmen who are lawyers continue to practice law while holding office.

And yet in the nation's capital where The System protects such conflicts-of-interest among Congressmen, George Washington University has apparently been forced by political pressures to drop a legal aid program which was spreading the idea that the poor residents of the city should be receiving city services (garbage, police, fire) on an equal basis with the privileged classes.

In that same city last year one judge sent a penniless young mother of three to jail because she didn't have enough money for bail in connection with a parking ticket, while another judge dismissed bribery charges against a wealthy former United States Senator, Daniel Brewster of Maryland, on the grounds that the Constitution protects a member of Congress from prosecution for any legislative act he performs—even if he had accepted a bribe for it!

Oh, yes, The System is alive and well—if you know politicians to manipulate it and lawyers who can bypass it.

The System is only failing those people who cannot get adequate service from protected monopolies.

The System is only failing people who are the victims of crimes, consumers who have been cheated, and homeowners with garbage on their stoops.

The System is only failing persons awaiting trial in impossibly crowded courts.

The System is only failing students in schools that do not teach, pedestrians breathing air noxious with pollution, and drivers stalled in massive traffic jams.

The System is only failing people who live in dilapidated housing with no means of escaping to the suburbs.

I will be interested to hear what Secretary Romney has to say on this point tomorrow night. The 1968 Fair Housing Act bars racial discrimination in the sale of rental of housing, but so far it has had little impact on opening housing opportunities to poor minorities outside the central city. Job opportunities have followed the flight of the white middle class to the suburbs, where communities use zoning, building codes, and other means to block construction for low and moderate income families. In ten years Long Island has built less than 400 units of public housing. Secretary Romney courageously developed plans for building more federally subsidized housing in the suburbs, but his plans have been suspended by the White House. "I believe that forced integration in the suburbs is not in the national interest," President Nixon said, although he did not comment on how it is that economically forced segregation in Harlem is in the national interest. Speaking for the white suburbs, the President seemed to be saying: "If you've got the money, you've got a chance. If you haven't—tough.")

There is one point at which The System does treat rich and poor alike, and that is on their taxes. According to a recent and illuminating study by a high official of the Bureau of the Census, the poor and the rich pay taxes at about the same rate. A man earning between \$2000 and \$4000 pays about 33% in taxes. So does a man with income between \$25,000 and \$50,000. Of course the rich have a little more left over,

which explains this recent story in the *New York Daily News*, February 23:

"West Palm Beach: Everything is super here, with a breezy 75 degrees and sunshine spilling all over this stronghold of lavish living. After yesterday's hotly contested election, this elegant resort is now to be run by diplomats—the new mayor and a new councilman. Earl E. T. Smith, former ambassador to Cuba, is now mayor. Benjamin H. Oehlert, Jr., former ambassador to Pakistan, is a new councilman. . . . Their former 'excellencies' are pledged to maintain the 'climate' and the 'architecture' of the resort—that means preserving the long-time community atmosphere and the private villa way of life.

"Seen at a reception in the Palm Beach Galleries . . . another diplomat, Raymond Guest, of the fabled social clan, who is a former ambassador to Ireland, who said: 'People are saying they want to retire—to Portugal, Majorca, Rabat—well, what about this country? It's great and let's keep it that way. . . .'

"Mrs. Grace Kiser of New York and Southampton wasn't certain she agreed with Guest. She was robbed a fortnight ago while shopping in Madison Avenue in the 60's, but nothing was missing yesterday. She was wearing sable, jewels and chifons.

"Spending went on like wild yesterday at Vigoroux's party for (London painter) Julian Barrow and other artists. Mrs. Trink Wakeman laid out \$9,500 for a large silver statue of a bull with horns of 18-karat gold, on which the figure of a slender young maiden was doing a hand stand. . . ."

Or, as it is written, "They sat down to eat and then rose up to play."

And we are back to the question of priorities, to the matter of assigning precedence by logic, importance, or value to the problems, resources, and issues of modern life. At the moment we are dominated by the priorities of special interests, private greed, and political myopia; everybody writes and speaks about the priorities of mankind, about the Public Interest, but governments don't act on them.

And we wonder why?

For one thing, politics has itself become a vested interest, an end unto itself. And it has joined with the other powerful interests—the bureaucracies, the corporations, and the unions—in a self-serving cartel devoted to the perpetuation of its own privileges and interests. So powerful and entrenched are these plural interests that they have transcended, even suffocated, the greater claims of mankind—the Public Interest. The setting of priorities becomes a function of muscle, not reason. Offices that began as public trusts have become the private property of an individual or a party. Look at the chairmanships of influential Congressional committees and you see the contemporary model of medieval dukedoms. The end of politics, alas, is not government but politics. Not the solving of problems but the winning of elections becomes the priority of government, as already it was the priority of politics. And when joined through politics with the other interests of privilege, government becomes a broker between

them, dispensing patronage and spoils as popes once trafficked in dispensations.

A case study of how government becomes politics can be had right here in New York. In 1969, when John Lindsay was running for re-election, the White House decided to help. Vice President Agnew began by announcing that the Government would permit the City to purchase the Brooklyn Navy Yard at a favorable price. The Department of Commerce then announced grants for job training at the yard; the Defense Department announced the lease of the Brooklyn Army Terminal; the Interior Department announced a new Federal park; HEW announced new narcotic projects; and the Justice Department announced help for the Mayor's anti-crime crusade.

All of these programs may have been sound, but it was no coincidence that they came in an election year, suggesting that instead of government being the purpose of politics, politics is the purpose of government. "The name of the game." In a time when our public services are running down, I suggest we cannot afford the same old game. We need government!

A second reason our priorities are out of whack can be traced to the myopia of our leaders. Myopia is a condition of judgment revealed by the absence of foresight or discernment. It results in a constant tendency to sin against reality. Muller: "Rome illustrates the maxim that societies die at the top." "The selfishness and shortsightedness of the governors" ultimately brings a nation to its knees.

I don't want to leave it there that only presidents and governors are responsible because I think all of us are responsible. You have no idea what it is going to cost to clean up this country. It is more than rhetoric. Simply to slow down the present rate of pollution will cost \$20 billion a year; to turn it back will cost twice times twenty; and if we really want to clean up the mess that has been created by our ancestors and by us, it will cost \$60 billion to \$80 billion a year. And don't expect revenue sharing to help relieve you of your tax burden. If anything, you ought to be down praying that the government will find a way to raise your taxes because if the government only asks of us that kind of sacrifice, only if those of us who have escaped and are in the middle class are willing to pay and pay and pay will we ever be able to afford all of the necessary requirements of a program to clean up our environment.

The last point I would make, skipping over several others, is simply to leave with you the thought how important it is in this country now that we square our ideals with our means. We think that the rest of the world judges us by our ideals irrespective of the techniques we use to serve them. We used to think that the world applauded us because we set out to save the world in Southern Baptist life. We thought that because we expressed concern for the lost that the world would clap and the world would rise up and sing our hosannas, but all the time they were sending their missionaries over here. Their missionaries were attending Baylor, and North Texas, and the University of Texas, and Wake Forest, and attending all the schools that we sponsor—and yet on Sunday we turned them away from our churches when they tried to join. And we thought that somehow the world would forget the fact that we were not really practicing

what we preached. We thought that our ideals were so beautiful and our ends were so noble and our cause so just that what we were really doing back here on Sunday wouldn't really make a difference. Well, I want to tell you the world does not care about our ends! The world looks at our means. You go back and look up the definition of the word "democracy." A democracy is a means. A democracy is not a perfect state of achievement but the very name in Greek and in English means "the *means* by which you govern yourself." We are what we did in getting there.

And what's wrong with our mission program is that it is all catching up with us. The inconsistency, the contradiction, the difference between what we said and proclaimed and what we were.

In explaining his decision to commit American fighting forces to Cambodia, President Nixon said: "It is not our power but our will and character that are being tested." A White House assistant told reporters that the President had to show the world that "America hasn't lost its manhood." When I read that account I thought of Thucydides' description of Athens as a place where violence became the attribute of manliness. It was, after all, their "manhood" that Lee Oswald and Sirhan Sirhan and James Earl Ray were trying to affirm—and they did it in the best tried-and-true-apple-pie-American-way-of-life-John-Wayne fashion: they did it violently.

Our manhood?

Lt. Calley: "I saw Pfc. Dennis Conti molesting a female sexually."

Question: What did you do then?

Calley: "I told him to get his pants back up and get back where he was supposed to be."

Our manhood?

Calley: "I heard considerable firing to the north. I broke out into a clearing and my men had a number of people in a ditch and were firing at them. . . . Then I spoke to them."

Question: What did you do after you spoke to them?

Calley: "I fired into the ditch also, sir."

Our manhood?

Calley: "The next time I fired the helicopter had lifted off, and I fired at a head moving through the rice. . . . I just saw a head moving through the rice and I fired. One of my radio operators went over and checked it out. It turned out to be a small boy."

Our manhood?

Calley: "A man was brought up to me. I interrogated him. I butt-stroked him in the mouth (with a rifle). He fell down. Eventually, he got into the ditch."

Question: What propelled him into the ditch?

Calley: "Somebody's foot, sir."

Our manhood?

Question: Did anyone ask whether women and children should be killed?

Calley: "I believe someone asked if that meant women and children."

Question: Did Captain Medina respond to that question?

Calley: "Yes sir."

Question: What did he say?

Calley: "He said that meant everything. He said he meant *everything*."

In a way, Mr. President, you were right. It is not

our power that is being tested; we know our power to kill a small boy (an *it*). . . . We know our power to buttstroke a man and stomp him into a ditch. . . . We know our power to destroy (the term is "waste") women and children. . . . We know what our power can do. It is our will and our character that are being revealed over there: our *will* as self-righteous, omniscient Americans to use whatever means we want to use to accomplish our ends. And our character stands sharply outlined by the belief that to save a village we must destroy it.

James Baldwin wrote in *Fire Next Time*, "Whoever debases others is debasing himself." And Edmund Burke warned that "a conscientious man would be cautious how he dealt in other's blood."

What of a conscientious nation?

Hubert Muller described the Roman Empire at the height of its foreign influence: "They had not consciously set out to rule the world. They had emerged as the greatest power in the Mediterranean by defeating Carthage, in a terrific life-and-death struggle; then one conquest led to another almost in spite of them, and the rolling stone gathered an empire. Some of their senators even tried to circumvent the designs of Fortune, opposing further expansion as a threat to their rule at home. For Rome itself, in fact, the immediate result of the epoch-making triumph was corruption, class war, increasing chaos. Nevertheless the Roman Empire continued to expand, during a century of bloody civil war, until it finally destroyed the Roman Republic." And someone said, "First things first."

It is time to start all over again. A rational man acting in the real world, Walter Lippman once wrote, may be defined as one who decides where he will strike a balance between what he desires and what can be done. I suggest that a rational state will square its means with its objectives and assign to the claims of humanity the precedence they deserve according to logic, importance, and value.

Apart from the nation, I wish for each of you, as you go back to your places of redemptive mission and service, an epithet similar to that found on the church near London with a plaque that says:

In the year 1653, when all things sacred in
the kingdom
Were either profaned or demolished,
This church was built by Sir Richard Shirley,
Baronet,
Whose singular praise it was
To do the best things in the worst of times.

Student Commitment:

New Directions for Change

John Gaventa

"The crisis on American campuses has no parallel in the history of the nation. This crisis has roots in divisions of American society as deep as any since the Civil War." So read the opening words of the report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. Indeed, in May of last year, the Gallup poll revealed that the American public viewed student unrest as the number one national problem. The actions

and attitudes of over seven million students in colleges and universities across the country interact to develop such a sense of crisis. As one such student and, consequently, as one-seven-millionth of a national problem, I stand before you to speak of student commitment, national priorities, and new directions for change.

I would say first that I believe what we call campus unrest is actually rooted in and is a reflection of national unrest, and that it is only in the energy and idealism of the young and through the fragile institution of the university that this deeper unrest is manifested. Consequently, what I will call the student commitment is not exclusively a commitment of students but may be a commitment from which each of us might learn and with which each of us, to some degree, might identify.

There is, of course, no single student commitment. However, I would suggest that there was a common commitment among many students which manifested itself time and again in the 1960's—that was the commitment to a radical change in our priorities, our values, our processes, our way of life. Beginning with the civil rights movement in the early 1960's, continuing in the Free Speech Movement, growing in anti-war protest, the McCarthy Campaign, the Chicago Convention, spreading from Columbia to Berkeley, challenging every political, educational, religious, social institutions—indeed, our very social fabric; climaxing following Cambodia, Kent, and Jackson with the largest outburst of student protest in the nation's history, this student commitment has asserted itself again and again with spirit, with energy, with idealism, and sometimes with violence. At times identified as the New Left, or as the "Movement," this commitment upon which I wish to focus grows from deep disaffection with national priorities as they are and searches, somewhat haltingly, for something radically new.

Such a commitment for change is often attributed to a handful of "troublemakers." However, my experience suggests that the disaffection from which it springs is found among large proportions of the nation's young. Listen to the following statistics from a survey of college students taken last May: 48% of the students said that they had participated in May in anti-war protests; 76% believed that "basic changes in the system will be necessary to improve the quality of life in America"; 76% disagreed with the statement, "Except for a few radicals, most young Americans are satisfied with the direction in which America is heading"; 81% of the students agreed that "until the older generation comes to understand the new priorities and life-styles of the young, serious conflict is going to continue."

One senses that from the best of the young comes the worst of despair. Studies confirm the account written following Cambodia to President Nixon by the University of Minnesota's Regent Professors:

"A frightening picture is seen by those of us who work daily with college students. We find among our bright, hard-working, ambitious, well-read students a widespread distrust of their government, a growing despair about the political process, a mixture of fear and resentment toward America's leadership. These are not lazy, violent, irresponsible rebels—they are competent and con-

scientious young people, quietly pursuing their studies to become physicians, businessmen, lawyers, engineers, psychologists, and biologists."

Disturbed by the war, disturbed about racism, disturbed by unresponsiveness of institutions, by repression, by poverty, by irrelevance of education, concerned with a host of issues and human problems, the student commitment has asserted itself in increasing numbers and in growing intensity.

And this assertion of the student commitment has brought a variety of responses. To some, the students were bums, neurotics, "rotten-apples"; while to others they were idealists, courageous heroes, or hope for the future. Some sought to excuse the commitment as Communist inspired; others lauded it as a fulfillment of American ideals. Some viewed the commitment as profoundly Christian and highly moral; others viewed it as anti-Christ, immoral, and decadent. Because the core of our institutions, our priorities, our very way of life, were at stake, these responses were often abberational, insensitive, and defensive.

The fall of 1970, I think, has left shallow most of these conceptions. Unexplainable quietness has developed among students across the country. It has not been a return to contentment, for it is a deeper discontent characterized by a malaise, a despair, a highly personal turning inward or to sensitive others, a giving-up on many of our leaders as well as on our institutions. Indeed, the fall has been a time for deep re-examination of what the student commitment really was and what in the future it is to be.

I would like to take advantage of the quietness, the re-examination, to share with you what I hope will be some fresh thoughts on the nature of student commitment in the 60's and to suggest new possibilities for change in the 70's.

Recent research on the level of moral reasoning of students provides insight, I think, into the nature of student unrest. By moral reasoning is not meant conformity to a particular moral ideal or code, but is meant *how* one holds a particular value and the *process* of reasoning which leads to certain behavior. The psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg suggests that moral reasoning has three different levels. The first, the pre-moral stage, is basically hedonistic, motivated by desire for physical gratification, and possesses little concern for standards or for persons. The second stage, the conventional moral stage, finds moral value in performing the "right" or socially acceptable roles. It is characterized by a "goodboy" orientation, emphasis on law and order, and unquestioning obedience to established authorities such as family, church, or government. The third and highest stage, the post-conventional morality, finds moral values in highly developed personal principles. It is characterized by a dual recognition of a binding social contract among men, and of the values of individual choice, obedience to conscience, and empathy with others.

In applying these stages of moral reasoning to students, it has been found that a small minority are of the pre-conventional stage. Their motivation is highly selfish and ego-deficient. They are rebellious, but often for their own gratification. These pre-moralists think primarily of personal wants, are insensitive to others, and carry on personal power battles with

a society seen as unifying rather than as immoral. The conventional group, the middle and largest group, live their lives in expected ways. They value social acceptance and practicality. They model themselves after their parents, have adopted the traditional priorities of American society, and emphasize nonskeptical, harmonious relationships with social institutions and personal authorities. The post-conventional group places high value on ideology, creativity, personal sensitivity, empathy with others, and human fulfillment. Ego-syntonic, highly developed as autonomous individuals, they find their motivation not out of a need-deficiency but out of concern for a quality and depth of being. Their thought has the properties of consistency, universality, and concern for others unlike the pre-moralists. Their struggle is not that based primarily on power but on the realization, both personally and politically, of higher levels of human ethicality.

Now, what does this research suggest about the student commitment to change? The application of these stages of moral development to such student protests as the Free Speech Movement in California, revealed that the majority of the protestors were of a higher level of ethical development than were the non-protestors. As Kenneth Keniston, Yale psychologist, testified before the President's Commission on Campus Unrest: "Activism on our campuses, whether constructive or destructive, springs not primarily from psychopathology, the impersonality of the multiversity, parental permissiveness, poor education, hedonism, or many of the other negative reasons to which it has been ascribed. For the great majority of students, activism is first and foremost a morally based reaction against unjust practices, policies, and institutions in American society." And at the core of this student commitment for change has been a profoundly ethical concern for the realization of the ideals of our society, its institutions, and its persons. Indeed, in the context of the inadequacies and injustices of our national procedures and priorities, the higher the level of ethical development, the more likely and the more obliged were students to dissent, to cry out for change.

But to say the student commitment is for change is not to suggest that the student commitment leads automatically to participation in all protests, sit-ins, or disruptions. Nor is it to say that all who do protest are of the post-conventional, highest developed group. Also, among the protestors was found an inordinate representation (though still a small minority) of the pre-conventional group. Attracted not out of a moral concern but for reasons of ego-gratification, their commitment served to prostitute the ideas for which the post-conventional group had stood.

Let us look back at the 1960's. One could reasonably hypothesize that the original student commitment in the civil rights, in the free speech, and in the anti-war movements sprang primarily from the post-conventional, highly ethical groups. Over time, however, the politicized milieu attracted those of pre-conventional motivation. As student protest became more and more the thing to do, the commitment for which it stood became less and less authentic. With that "contamination" came contradictions of the original moral principles, such as trashing, violence, bombing, destruction. The climax came last May in the massive

response to Cambodia which, though grounded in profoundly human concern for human life, found those participating because, by now, it was the conventional thing to do or because, without getting caught, it provided convenient means for deficiency-gratification. In a supreme irony, the highly moral student protestors had appealed to the masses of students in order to be successful in the fight against injustice; yet in that attempt the contradictions, the lack of authentic commitment, inevitably defeated their cause from within. Because of its attraction to violence and its tremendous ebb and flow of energies, massive political protest by the fall of 1970 was no longer a viable outlet for the highly moral student commitment for change.

And so a silence developed on the campus. Torn between the need to do something and the recognition that the old modes would no longer work, the student commitment turned inward to personal development and re-examination.

Out of that feeling of "torn-ness," of despair, can come, I believe, greater understanding of new directions and priorities for change.

There are fresh possibilities facing our nation. Gabriel Marcel, French existentialist philosopher, writes that civilizations of men develop through three stages (analogous to those of Kohlberg): the first is the struggle for satisfaction of fundamental physical needs such as food, clothing, shelter; the second is the objectification of man over and against his environment —through the accumulation of wealth, the growth of technology, the drive for prestige and power; the third, and highest stage is that of human fulfillment through creativity, thought, development of human community and joy of a quality not to be found in function or in things. The much acclaimed Consciousness I, II, and III developed by Charles Reich in *The Greening of America* are similar to the stages suggested by Marcel.

At the core of the student commitment for change, springing from the post-conventional ethic, I would suggest, is a commitment to the realization of the third stage of civilization. It is the struggle to affirm the sacred values of human life, of human joy, and of human meaning. There are individuals such as Jesus Christ, Socrates, Martin Luther King, and others who have recognized and lived this highest ethic in the past. Yet, for the first time in history, I believe, we are able to talk realistically about a nation able to attain and to live this highest ethic as a people.

Why the new possibilities? A host of historical and social forces are at work. However, one force seems to stand out. In examining human motivation, Robert Maslow, an existential psychologist, presents a hierarchy of needs, ranging from satisfaction of basic physical wants, to acceptance by others, to self-fulfillment through the development of highly sensitive personal relationships, creativity and cognitive richness. Only when the basic needs are satisfied can the higher fulfillment of man be manifested. And only when the basic needs are filled can man move from motivation founded in ego-deficiency to motivation founded in a concern for the depth and quality of being. The increased affluence, education, and technology of post-industrial society has allowed, I believe, more widespread gratification of basic physical and personality needs, freeing man to these new sources of motivation, and to concern for higher ethical life, and

to greater possibilities of human meaning. New historical forces have given substance to what otherwise have been mere dreams of technocracy's children.

However, societies, powers, institutions seem not to be able to cope with such human development. Socrates, Christ, King were all overtly murdered. Each of us in our struggle for human fulfillment find a more subtle destruction day by day of our human spirit. Our structures, our culture, our priorities seem set on deterring rather than enhancing new affirmation of human life. We spend over half our national budget on a military death machine and on absurd, meaningless destruction of unknown proportions in Southeast Asia. We seem more concerned about material accumulation, prestige, profit, and function than the quality of our lives. Educational institutions pound blow after blow on individual creativity. Cultural and political repression threaten the freedom to be different from the conventional ethic. Competition and consumption for their own sake lead to rat-race ruts of human meaninglessness. There is little room for the human spirit in this world of massive, organized, coldly rational, technological objectification.

Yes, the fundamental problem facing our young is not simply institutional, or political, not just the war, nor racism, nor repression, but something more basic. If there is anything to be told us by the malaise of the campus, by over use of drugs, by the search for escape through drifting, by the counter culture, or by unauthentic experimentation with life-styles, it is that the challenge we face as students—as a nation—is how to find and enhance human meaning—that spark that makes existence worthwhile—within the cold-post-industrial, technological world. Old life-styles and institutions, our generation is saying, have simply grown hollow in the face of new values and higher ethicality. The student commitment for the 1970's needs to be, I think, to work for the radical adaptation of priorities and institutions toward the affirmation of human life and towards the transition to the third stage of human civilization.

This challenge carries with it another challenge: how to make that transition without destroying the very social fabric from which the new possibilities spring. We have all heard talk of revolution and witnessed acts of destruction. Somehow we must rise to the realization that what we are freed to become is firmly founded in what we have been in the past. However, at least two forces make this a difficult challenge.

The first force is a force of irony; the development of the higher level of ethicality leads often to the rejection of the very values, the very structures, which allowed its original development. For instance, many will argue that the value of American competition, though rooted primarily in deficiency motivation, created the post-industrial state. Yet, the post conventional ethic places low value on such competition, tending to undercut the very foundation of that post industrial state. Organization, hierarchy, and scientific rationality created the new; yet, in many ways, the new is anti-organizational, and anti-scientific. We must somehow find ways to enhance higher levels of ethicality without negating the foundations which originally allowed them to become.

The second force threatening the growth of the social fabric may be more dangerous. Manifested particularly in times of rapid social change through vio-

lence, polarization, and hatred, this is the force of cultural conflict. The examples are many. It is the force that murdered at Jackson State and at Kent State. Made real to me in rural Lawrence, Kansas, following the deaths of two youths this summer, it is the force described by the past student body president of the University of Kansas, who said: "If we did not have the power of our guns, the rednecks would be storming up and beating up the freaks. That power is really an illusion of power, because if it came down to it, they could still win. However, it is only through guns that we relate to the outside community." This is the crisis of misunderstanding described by the Commission on Campus Unrest: "If this crisis of understanding endures, the very survival of our nation will be threatened. A nation driven to use the weapons of war upon its youth is a nation on the edge of chaos. A nation that has lost the allegiance of part of its youth is a nation that has lost part of its future." In the struggle for social growth, we need desperately as a nation to realize, again with the Commission, that "despite the differences among us, powerful values and sympathies unit us. . . . Out of our divisions, we must now recreate understanding and respect for those different from ourselves."

To wish for social growth is not to attain it. With the student commitment for new priorities must come renewed efforts to work for change.

I must say that I am disillusioned with the possibilities of institutional transformation through traditional modes of action. A case can be made, I think, that despite the energies asserted throughout the 1960's, little fundamental alteration took place in our priorities, in who we are as a nation. Indeed, the liberal Corporate State easily accommodated and even thrived on our dissent. We opposed the war, and our imperialist involvement in Southeast Asia expanded. We cried out for recognition as persons, and the universities grew larger and more impersonal. We sought to end racism and found it grounded in our institutions. We wanted freedom; we found creeping facism, growing repression. In the American tradition of dissent, we expressed our moral indignation following Cambodia as best we knew how, and all our government seemed to learn was how to do the same thing in Laos—without getting caught. Our dissent became fuel for a politics of hatred. Our long hair, bell bottoms, peace symbols, were victims of commercialization. Over time, massive political dissent, no matter how sincere or true to our heritage, brought reactions similar to those of Pavlov's dogs which salivate mechanically and superficially and unknowingly in response to a given stimulus.

The fault is not entirely that of institutions. In dissenting against the old, the student commitment had been defined in negativity, in what it was against. It had resorted to tactics which, in contradicting its ideals, had denied the possibilities of authentically affirming the new. In the White House last summer, when we tried to make the case that at the root of student protest were positive human values, those in power could respond, "Where?" and there was little visible to which we could point.

But what are the new modes of social action? I would suggest a dual approach.

We need desperately in our society the authentic manifestation of human values, a manifestation not

possible, I think, within present institutions. We need something to which we can point, towards which we can transcend. Because of that need, I suggest, over the long run in the 1970's the best strategy for change by those interested in living a highly developed ethic is no longer a massive political protest but a strategy of stepping outside of the system, of disengagement from society, and of authentically affirming and living the higher human values. In a manner similar to the early Christian church in the Roman Empire, or to the Puritans, or to the Utopians, or the Amish, it is a strategy of non-participation, of resistance, of carving out of the environment genuine communities of people, bound to each other and uncompromisingly committed to higher manifestation of human possibilities. It is a strategy which suggests that cop-out from the system-as-it-is, is no longer a bad word—and that getting outside of the old is perhaps the best way to transform it to the new.

However, cop-out will not do it alone. We also need desperately those who are very committed and who will work "on the edge" of our institutions; that is, those who will stay in the system and continually work to adapt it to higher levels of ethicality. Their role is a crucial one—it is to understand and to protect what is going on outside and to interpret it to those within. It is to work with determination and political sophistication. It is to recognize that the sacrifice of personal compromise must be made in the process of social change but that, in that process, an eye must always be kept on those ideals toward which the struggle is being made.

Finally, and most importantly, we need to develop a trust between the two groups—those who are working on the outside and those who are working on the edge. Each must recognize the necessity of the other, for it is upon the other that the success of each depends. We must allow diversity of approach while joining together in purpose. The crucial thing for the student commitment in the 1970's is not the path my brother chooses. Rather, whatever the road, it is that it be travelled authentically and with a genuine affirmation of the human spirit. And perhaps, with this approach, we as students can transcend identity as a national problem and each become one-seven-millioneth of a national solution.

Let me close with a word about the church. One might easily draw parallels between what I have called the post-conventional ethic and what could be called the New Testament ethic, or between what I have called the human spirit and what could be called the Christian spirit. I have purposely not done so, for I find it significant that the overwhelming majority of those students who can be said to be of the highest stage of moral development are also the ones who indicate they find the least meaning in the institution of Christianity.

A more profitable parallel might be developed, I think, between the original student commitment and the Christian commitment of the early church. Both courageously called for the realization of new ideals and for the affirmation of human meaning. Yet, just as the student movement attracted those motivated out of ego-deficiency, so the church has been misused, by many, for selfish, hedonistic reasons. Just as the sign of the peace symbol became the "cool" thing to flash,

so the spirit of the cross has often been trapped in the ethic of conventionality, in the maintenance of order for the sake of order, and in the meaningless continuation of hollow routines. And, just as our entire social fabric needs to progress to higher manifestations of human development, so the church must be renewed by those who would get outside and build new Christian communities or by those who would work "on the edge" to transform the old. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, just as the student commitment must be for social evolutionary growth, so all of us, old and young, must recognize that the possibilities of what we might become are firmly rooted in what we have in the past been.

I summarize our challenge by a verse from T. S. Eliot's, "The Hollow Men":

"Between the conception
And the creation,
Between the emotion
And the response
Falls the Shadow."

Between the conception of the ideal and the creation of the real, between the human emotion and the institutional response, falls the Shadow, the hollow existence. The student commitment, indeed, the commitment of all of us will be, I hope, to continue our struggle to bring light to that Shadow. Many of us have tried before; many of us are discouraged. Yet, as we move from the fall of re-examination to the spring of affirmation, perhaps we can find value in the words of Dag Hammarskjöld, written in the midst of the Congo crisis:

Tired And lonely, So tired, The heart aches. Meltwater trickles Down the rocks, The fingers are numb, The knees tremble. It is now, Now that you must not give in.	On the path of the others Are resting places, Places in the sun Where they can meet. But this is your path, And it is now, Now, that you must not fail. Weep If you can, Weep, But do not complain. The way chose you— And you must be thankful.
--	---

Well?

Reaction to John Gaventa's Address on Student Commitment: New Directions for Change James Ralph Scales

I am reminded of a little story of the great Congregational minister, S. Parkes Cadman, who was confronted some years ago—during the depression, about forty years ago—by a very sanctimonious young man who said, "Tell me, Dr. Cadman, can a young man lead a good Christian life in New York on \$15 a week?" Dr. Cadman said, "That's all he can do!" We're finding out that you can't even do that in 1971.

John concluded his message with a poem, and I was

reminded of a poem which expresses my feelings at the moment. It's a poem that Robert Frost wrote on reaching fifty. He said:

When I was young my teachers were the old.
I gave up fire for form till I was cold.
I suffered like a metal being cast.
I went to school to age to learn the past.

Now I am old my teachers are the young.
What can't be molded must be cracked and sprung.
I strain at lessons fit to start a suture.
I go to school to youth to learn the future.

I've been going to school this morning and hearing a good many radical but profound interpretations of the meaning of society, the meaning of the church, the meaning of the university, and the meaning of human life by a man who is teaching the old.

The Scranton Commission was only one of a half dozen important national commissions to which we have not listened. The British Government has used this device a long time, the Royal Commission. The British probably are more honest in not sweeping under the rug painful social problems by this device of committee reference or shelving a controversial matter. And I can understand, I think, some of the frustrations of young people, black people in this country, all of the groups who have seen how the establishment has manhandled these perfectly sound, scholarly recommendations that have come from the Kerner Commission, and from the Milton Eisenhower Commission in areas of race and violence, from the Scranton Commission, from the Babcock Foundation Report on Campus Unrest—which anti-dated both the Scranton Commission and the Alexander Heard Report; the two on which John Gaventa worked. All of these have been largely ignored; and I think that the members have a feeling that they were used, but perhaps used in a secondary sense to a good purpose—quiet disorder and restore order in the country which is, of course, a value much to be cherished by a middle-class society.

In any case, the savage resentment that resulted on the part of the great silent majority of the middle class was exploited for political purposes. Now one of the by-products of this quiet fall of 1970 or quiet spring of 1971, John, is that some are crawling out of their bomb shelters and saying in effect: "See, we told you that this student resentment, this student revolt, didn't amount to anything." Mr. Buckley, the early and lesser Buckley, suggested in his column the other day that, as I recall, Mr. Scranton—not Mr. Heard—ought to be locked up as a public nuisance and all members of his Commission be prosecuted for graft. This is the kind of reaction that there is. It is only a conspiracy of a few disaffected, wild college professors who have somehow infected a few exhibitionist, self-asserted, violent-prone youths bringing about these campus troubles.

That, of course, is a great deception and I would hope that no civilized person, no reading man is deceived by that. John is exactly right; it was only a small minority, of course, involved in actual bombings, actual violent incidents. But, in all good colleges, 100 percent of the students have been affected by these

swirling issues. I think of the great issues of the 1960's, when in the first half of the decade that impact of student involvement certainly was very significant. We were on the way to the great reform, before the revolution, if that was what it was, was betrayed from within even as it was undermined from without. This great peaceful revolution was betrayed, partially at least, by the violence from within. The great issues of the 60's were race, poverty, reform of the university, and to some extent the reform of organized religion. But I would have to say that because of these delinquencies in the latter part of the 60's, there has been a reaction, a counter-revolution, which in the spring of 1971 appears to many of us to be triumphant. I am not sure that's so.

John is right about this libel on the professors of the country. I rise to their defense. The most moral people, the most truly moral people I know, I think, are young scientists on my faculty and on the faculties of great institutions of learning in this country who have been appalled at nuclear destruction, the unlocking of the secrets of the universe at Hiroshima, and the great cataclysm that awaits mankind. And so they do have a sense of desperate urgency and they have transmitted that to their students, and I'm very glad they have. We always have in all of our professions, as I recall, some nuts, some crazies, some people who are not responsible in their handling of issues.

You know, there's one thing that is reminiscent of the old-fashioned fundamentalist I knew in my youth, and still know, in the parallel between their methods of operation and the methods of the extreme, irresponsible militants on campus. They are self-righteous, terribly dogmatic, unethical to a high degree, and they will absolutely kill you if you don't agree with them. It is a fundamentalist tactic that is followed very often by this extreme group of students. While I am greatly concerned that we not be too complacent, it is pleasant for some of us who have had some difficulties on college campuses to be able to say that this is a quieter year. But let us not grow complacent in that fact and let us not misread the significance of this exhaustion, of this year of frustration and extreme quiet.

The students, of course, are inconsistent—terribly, terribly excited about the political activity after Cambodia, but I suppose in November of 1970 there was less political activity on the part of students of voting age in most of the campaigns around the country, including Mr. Gaventa's Tennessee. Suddenly that overwhelming compulsion to do something had vanished. The system had not disintegrated at all. The opportunity of challenging the system was encouraged. Well, of course, students are inconsistent, and you know some of us adults are also inconsistent in our devotion to principle, to the public sector and the private.

Consumer Rights and Corporate Responsibility

Kate Blackwell

It is a pleasure to be here today to speak to Baptist activists on the subject of consumer rights and corporate responsibility. My remarks are not designed simply to tell you about the consumer movement and the activities of Ralph Nader's organization in Wash-

ington for which I work. Quite frankly, I hope to elicit a response. You represent eleven million people in church members alone, not counting the students and professors in Baptist-supported colleges and universities. You also represent financial contributions of more than \$840 million a year. In short, Southern Baptists have the potential resources, both human and material, to make a significant contribution to an effort to restore fundamental rights to millions of Americans. In addition, I think that those of you here believe that the church has the responsibility to minister to social as well as to spiritual needs of citizens. In outlining the direction and purposes of the current consumer movement, I suggest that it offers a revolutionary and imperative challenge to the traditional social ministry of the church.

Consumer rights must be defined to include the right of safety from assault by dangerous machines and health-destroying foods; the right to fair and honest dealings in the marketplace; the right to a clean and livable environment; and the right to participate in allocating resources that belong to all. At the heart of the consumer movement is the necessity to challenge those who violate these rights and whose actions are detrimental to the lives of millions; whether they are makers of unsafe automobiles, processors of unclean meat, or producers of food contaminated by pesticides or dangerous chemicals; whether they are administrators of humiliating and ineffective welfare programs or perpetrators of inefficient and prohibitively expensive medical care; whether their abuses stem from private corporations that are unresponsive to public needs or from public agencies that are more concerned with protecting special interests than with protecting the public.

What makes the current movement different from previous attempts to insure the safety and health of consumers and honest business practices is a new ethical demand. Ralph Nader is the principal spokesman of a call for corporate responsibility which is, in my judgment, the revolutionary element in consumerism today. It may be significant that thus far it is primarily lawyers like Mr. Nader, rather than churchmen, who are articulating human and ethical values that hold corporations, as well as individuals, accountable for actions that adversely affect their neighbors and denounce policies that place profits before people. So long as the church fails to demand responsible behavior from institutions, or those who head them, so long as the church continues to condone violations of human rights by corporations and agencies, it destroys the basis of its demands for Christian behavior from individuals.

Today I shall touch briefly on certain areas of consumer abuse and outline what can be and is being done to correct these abuses. At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall propose a specific plan of action for the church and invite your response, both now and when you return to your churches, universities, and seminaries.

First, some background on what is happening. The consumer movement has grown out of a series of disclosures of hazards, sometimes fatal and always dangerous, that daily threaten the lives of many citizens. Through the reports of consumer advocates, through congressional hearings on consumer legislation and the press, we have become aware that individual health

and safety are low-priority commodities in the modern marketplace. Consumer abuses have been documented in various forms, including cold money figures. Senator Philip Hart has reported that currently 30% of all consumer spending in the U.S. is wasted—by improper auto repairs, monopolistic pricing, deceptive packaging, worthless drugs, dishonest credit practices, false advertising, and other consumer frauds. From \$174 to \$231 billion of U.S. consumer spending each year buys no product value. This means that reports of a rising Gross National Product have little meaning for the average consumer so long as these frauds are unchecked; and the poor, who can least afford it, are most at the mercy of a deceptive marketplace.

Such statistics do not begin to assess the losses in human suffering. How, for example, do we assess the slaughter of 56,000 Americans on the highways each year? There is no dollar figure for the pain of families of the dead, for the hopelessness of children whose parents are killed in crashes, or for the terrible human waste. How do we assess the fact reported by the National Commission on Product Safety that 20 million Americans are injured each year in the home as a result of incidents connected with consumer products? Of the total, 110,000 are permanently disabled and 30,000 are killed.

New technology, while offering new comforts and sometimes new opportunities for life, also present new hazards. The hazards are more threatening when those who stand to profit from them are not willing to use equal skill in making them safe. Ralph Nader has said that the auto manufacturers' favorite testing grounds are the U.S. Highways. The same might be said for electrical medical devices, which kill an estimated 1,200 Americans each year during routine diagnostic and therapeutic procedures; for drugs, like thalidomide, or food additives, like cyclamates, that remain on the market long after scientists have warned that they may be hazardous to humans; or atomic radiation which inflicts cancers, leukemias and genetic diseases on living and unborn Americans.

Contrary to the pronouncements of some industry spokesmen, most of these risks are not necessary to the development of beneficial technology or to continued economic growth. For example, many of the safety features now required on automobiles since passage of the Traffic Safety Act in 1966 have been known to automotive engineers for years. Ralph Nader has pointed out that certain safety features, such as seat belts and collapsible steering assemblies, could have been applied 35 years ago, when auto crashes were claiming the lives of 30,000 Americans and injuring several million.

Why has safety been so long ignored? One reason is that auto manufacturers were not willing to risk profits for the sake of the safety of the consumer, or to assume their legitimate responsibility for insuring his safety. Instead, the manufacturers actively promoted the concept that accidents were the result of bad or reckless driving. It is only recently that the public has become aware of what engineers have known all along, that many accidents are the result of defects—and therefore are not "accidents" at all, while in other cases injury and death in crashes could have been avoided by crash-proof features such as padded dashboards, safer windshields, and seat belts.

Another reason that safety has not received much attention from manufacturers is that employees are not willing to challenge their corporate bosses on issues of safety, or to inform the public of unsafe products. Physicians who treated victims of automobile crashes were in a position for years to point out features that were unnecessarily endangering the lives of consumers, but few did so. Unless the hazards are fully revealed by those who know about them, steps cannot be taken to eliminate them.

But even when an issue comes before the public and a law is passed to control the hazard, it takes constant, unremitting pressure from the private sector to insure that proper standards are set and the law enforced. Those who have sought protection from government have found that regulatory agencies charged with enforcing the laws are often no more than rubber stamps for the industries they are supposed to regulate. The path from government office to corporate office are well traveled, and paid lobbyists are always at hand to induce the agency official to take the industry point of view. Most often, government officials fail in their responsibility to the public not out of deliberate malice but out of misguided notions about duty and simple ignorance of the public side of the question. Department of Agriculture officials know intimately the needs of the large farmer, and their policies and programs are almost always fashioned to meet his needs. They are not acquainted with a great many sharecroppers. How many tenant farmers take them to dinner at a fancy Washington restaurant? How many migrant workers visit their offices to talk about the hazards of pesticides to the people who handle them? Not many. Consequently, USDA encourages the use of massive quantities of pesticides and administer programs that feed millions of public dollars to the large farm operator. Small farmers see very few of these public dollars or services.

Finally, the law supports an uneven ethic that allows corporations to violate the rights, property, and persons of consumers with virtual impunity while dealing out severe punishment to individuals who do the same. Environmental pollution is a blatant example of the way corporations may commit acts, often in direct violation of the law, for which an individual would be swiftly penalized. A person who breaks the windows of a factory risks large fines and imprisonment. The same factory may cause hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage to the property of people living nearby, and may cause outrageous injury to the health of its neighbors from air and water pollution. Most often this factory is charged nothing at all and in many cases may continue to repeat the crime again and again.

Another example. A major airplane manufacturer, Allison Company, discovered in 1967 that a number of Convair 580s it had sold to commercial airlines had defective engines. The company did not inform the operators of these planes, so that they could correct the defect, nor did it inform the Federal Aviation Agency. Then one of the Convair 580s crashed in Ohio, killing all 38 persons aboard. An investigation proved that the crash was caused by the engine defect. As a result, the FAA fined Allison the staggering sum of \$8,000—which works out to approximately \$200 per fatality. If someone had planted a bomb on that plane to kill a

relative and collect the insurance money, he would have been sentenced to death or life imprisonment for the murder of 38 people; Allison was fined \$8,000. It is difficult to justify the great outcry about crime in the streets while we allow this double standard in our criminal code to go uncorrected.

Solutions are being sought at several levels. In Washington there are now a number of public interest research groups and public interest law firms who seek to represent the public at the federal level. Let there be no mistake. Despite the increasing space given to "consumer" news in the press and talk of consumer pressures, the weight of the consumer in Washington is still very weak. First, consumer representatives do not compose a tenth of the phalanx of paid lobbyists and corporate lawyers who walk the halls of Congress and government agencies every day to plead their clients' cases. Second, consumer groups operate on shoe-string budgets and cannot depend on the large retainers available to spokesmen of industry. Consumer groups have been successful largely because they have been able to provide new information about serious public problems. In this area, one individual can sometimes achieve startling results. It was a graduate student at the University of Western Ontario who first alerted the nation to the hazards of mercury contamination. Since this student found mercury residues in fish caught in the Great Lakes, the alert has spread across the country and mercury has been found in the waters of 35 states. Even more recently a professor at the University of Buffalo, Professor Bruce MacDuffie, opened a can of tuna from his kitchen shelf, analyzed it, and found that it contained mercury. That led to investigations by the Food and Drug Administration and finally to the impounding of several million pounds of contaminated fish.

Students and professors on our college campuses are an enormous resource in providing information to government agencies and to consumer groups that can lead to important reforms.

Further, more and more people are taking the route of court action to challenge corporate abuses and government actions that fail to protect the public. Awards in product liability cases are beginning to reach levels that may make such cases deterrents. Lawyers and others are seeking ways to make current legal tools work better for the public and to create new tools of law. An 1899 law has been dusted off by environmentalists who have shown that literally hundreds of industries are in direct violation of this law that requires a permit before any discharges can be made into U.S. waterways. The law also provides an incentive for reporting violators by granting a reward in case of conviction. Several suits have now been filed under the 1899 Refuse Act.

Class action bills pending in Congress may make it possible for groups of citizens to file liability suits or environmental suits. Class action suits are very important consumer tools, first, because they make it feasible for consumers to seek legal redress for claims that singly are small and, second, because the large sums sought in class actions are deterrents to offending industries. Resort to court action is conceivably the most important development of the consumer movement, especially as it is beginning to seek judicial review of government actions that fail to protect con-

sumers. Formerly, citizens had little recourse from unfair or inadequate government actions. They are now challenging inadequate welfare programs, inadequate environmental protection policies, discriminatory farm policies, and inadequate social benefits. They are taking the Food and Drug Administration to court when it fails to remove unsafe toys from the stores. They are taking the Department of Agriculture to court when it continues to spread deadly pesticides across the country.

These examples are taken from the federal level but the same thing is beginning to happen at the state and local levels. Public interest organizations are being established in many cities; a number of state attorney generals have set up consumer protection divisions in their offices; students on several college campuses are taxing themselves to raise funds for public interest law and research organizations.

Recently the Presbytery of New York made a far-reaching commitment to extend its ministry to include an Advocate's office. The Presbytery has hired an attorney and a secretary to staff the office, for a total budget of \$35,000 a year, and has committed funds for a three-year period. The church Advocate's office will be directed toward social evils which may or may not arise from specific civil or criminal cases, but will emphasize "class actions" and "friend of the court" arguments.

Intense scrutiny of the church's role and the best means for fulfilling that role went into the decision to establish an advocacy arm of the church. I would like to quote from the proposal:

"There exists a desperate need to humanize and personalize the encounters of individuals with their impersonal and often oppressive social institutions, where persons are abused, powerless, ignored, or pushed around. Leverage and a balancing of human power against corporate omnipotence is a practical and crying need. One strong step in that direction is to provide representation for as large as possible a public who are without it, to advocate the public interest, namely an attorney as a Presbyterian legal officer. . . .

"The Office is intended to operate as leaven in a hardening lumped society, to bring about a balance of power between private citizens as a public with distinct and inalienable rights, and the prevailing overwhelming odds of corporations and institutions which established corporation law firms exist to protect and serve and profit accordingly. For the Advocate in the Presbytery of New York, the community is our client. . . .

"The Office may function as a specialized ministry focussing on particular areas and instances of injustice, according to priorities agreed upon between the Advocate and Presbytery, for fact-finding, to authenticate our public protests and avoid meaningless moralizing, to work at the causes of social disturbance and disorder rather than the symptoms, to investigate, to extend the weight of the Presbytery on behalf of the poor, the oppressed, the unorganized and unprotected people, to secure all possible moral mileage and social reform with recourse to legal action in the courts as its last resort, but prepared and funded

to pursue a cause, when considered necessary, by legal means."

Recently, the Advocate of the Presbytery of New York filed its first case in court, entering a friend of the court brief against General Motors, seeking to stop the discharge of caustics and deadly metals into the Hudson River from the GM plant in Tarrytown.

I would like to propose, in behalf of Ralph Nader, that the Southern Baptist Convention and the Christian Life Commission establish an Office of the Advocate as an arm of the Convention. Further, I propose that an advocate proposal be made to each of the state Baptist conventions. Finally, I propose that individual churches represented here today seek to hire attorneys, either singly or in conjunction with other churches in a city or area of the state, to extend the church's ministry beyond the victims to the causes of misery.

Let me give just a few examples of what such an advocacy ministry might do. Many churches provide food for the poor at certain times during the year or on a continuing basis. This is good but not enough. An Advocate should seek instead to challenge an inequitable, wasteful, entirely discriminatory Food Stamp Program which, if operated properly, could assure food to the very poor on a continuing basis. An Advocate might also challenge state governments that undercut and underfund welfare programs on the basis that ill-managed and discriminatory programs are against the public interest. From another approach, the church might help establish cooperative supermarkets in poor neighborhoods that don't have access to stores large enough to sell food at relative low cost. Studies have shown that lack of supermarkets accessible to the poor as well as inequitable marketing practices contribute to the fact that the poor pay between 35% and 100% of their income for food, while the average American spends 16.2% of his disposable income to buy food. An Advocate could help a neighborhood cooperative negotiate for a low-interest loan available through certain government programs to establish a cooperative supermarket that could do far more than charity to feed the poor.

In rural areas, a church Advocate could aid the poor in receiving their share of government services such as those of the USDA Farm Extension Service, which is guilty of gross neglect of blacks and other poor farmers throughout the South. In small towns where a single industry assumes enormous power because of its economic importance in the community the church Advocate can fill a void of countervailing forces in challenging unfair labor practices, unhealthy or unsafe working conditions, and an adverse impact upon the community environment. In the "company towns" that exist throughout the South, the church can provide a base for the kind of democratic interaction of interests that simply does not exist now in numerous communities.

I end, then, with this proposal in behalf of Mr. Nader, myself, and others working in the consumer movement. Mr. Nader did not grow up in a Southern Baptist church. I did. So perhaps I have, at the same time, greater despair and greater hope in the possibility of meaningful action from the church. I imagine that many of you feel the same. I hope that we all can

work together, wherever we are, to make this society a decent and livable one.

Developing Quality Education in Public Schools

James E. Allen

I have to start with a great protest, that I do not appreciate being placed on the program following such a lovely and capable speaker as we have just had. I did, however, not only appreciate the important things that Miss Blackwell was saying, but I understood in particular her last comment, "Sometimes people who criticize ought to be protected because they can't hold their jobs." I have a great deal of feeling for that!

It is always a great satisfaction to find a church group taking an active interest in education. The satisfaction is even greater on this occasion because of the size and the power and the influence of the church organizations which the Christian Life Commission represents. There is a natural alliance between the church and the school. Both have a concern for the lot of the human being. The force and the power of these two institutions have made them the center of much of man's hope for the improvement of his condition. But beset by the multitude of factions inherent in the human condition, one of the greatest difficulties of men's efforts as individuals and as groups is to attain. The greatest difficulties in attaining the noblest expression of humanity has always been the reconciliation of word and deed. The growing sensitivity to the ills of our world—war, poverty, hunger, environmental deterioration, illiteracy, social injustice, prejudice, crime, and hate—and a drive for action against them, spurred by an increasingly troubled national conscience, have shown how shockingly wide is the gap between what we say and what we do. An awareness of this disparity is beginning to have a significant influence upon the shaping of national priorities. Education has always been considered such a powerful force for correcting these ills that its role and its responsibilities are being reemphasized, and the need to close the gap between what we say and what we do is of particular importance and significance in the area of education.

The provision of equality of educational opportunity has been from the beginning of our nation a fundamental goal, a basic principle, and the motivation for our tremendous investment in the building of a system of public schools intended to serve the needs of all. Although our progress toward this aim has been substantial, the disparity between ideal and reality is all too evident. Much of what has been done in education in recent years and many of the plans being developed for the future, I am very pleased to say, are centered in efforts now to insure that equality of educational opportunity shall be in fact a reality for all.

Let me cite a few examples. Underlying the present approach to education today is a broadened concept of what education is, that sees education as something larger than schooling. We are beginning to recognize that, for many, much of education occurs outside of the school, and we have been noticing for some time that the public education system we have developed in this country—of which we are so proud—really has failed a large portion of our young people. As we be-

gin to think about the future, we are beginning now to think in terms of how we can restructure education so that it emphasizes ways of learning available to individuals and not simply the institution of the school itself. As everybody knows, young people learn now far more, oftentimes, outside of the traditional five hours, or four and one-half hours, in school five days a week, nine or ten months a year. So, one of the developments taking place in the educational system, to some extent generally, is the recognition of a broadened concept of what education is. We need to begin to think how we use our institutions and agencies and means outside of the school and the college campus as well as to provide a positive, constructive approach to the education of young people.

This broadened concept of education has played a part in producing an increasing interest in early childhood education. As the President of the United States pointed out in his first message on education, there is as much development of a child's intellect in the first five years of his life as in the next thirteen years. Yet, in our public school system we have ignored this fact and have made little provision for educational opportunities in the very early years of a child's life. We need to begin now to plan seriously for a large expansion of opportunities in the early childhood years. Indeed, I would hope that by 1980—and that isn't far off—we might have universal preschool or early childhood education in this country.

At the other end of the scale greater attention is being given to increasing opportunity for higher education. Enormous growth in this country has been the community college development, opening up all sorts of opportunities for young people and people who have been out of school for a while to get the advantages of post-secondary education. These schools are not only providing these opportunities but are serving many needs of society as society opens up new technological and scientific job opportunity developments. We need to continue to support this type of institution, watching that it develops in the way in which it is intended, proving that it is a community college, and serving a broad variety of needs.

We are beginning to open up admissions policies. There are now a number of institutions, such as City University right here in New York, that have opened up admissions policies and are making it possible for many young people, who have been denied the right, to get the advantages of post-secondary education in a public institution.

We are beginning to recognize that the funds for student aid too often have been dissipated; that is, the value has been dissipated to some extent by not focusing sufficiently on those who need them most. I think one of the things that I would support in the movement that the President tried to make in this direction is to focus more of the Federal funds on those who are least able to pay. The Carnegie study on higher education has suggested a number of reforms which are receiving serious consideration.

Basic to the improvement of education quality is the elimination of failures in certain basic skills. I speak especially of reading, about which I feel very strongly. According to a recent survey, eighteen and one-half million Americans cannot read well enough to survive in our paperwork society. The United States Office of

Education has pointed out that one out of four children leave school without having learned to read at the level of which he is capable. Little more than a year ago, as United States Commissioner of Education, I proposed that we establish as a target (as a sort of moon shot for the 1970's) a right-to-read goal. The goal stated that I believe the right to read is a right that a child should have just as much as the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Because without the ability to read, a person cannot take full advantage of other rights that he may have. So, we proclaimed, and the President endorsed it enthusiastically, a National Right-to-Read Campaign for the 1970's. We hope that by the end of the 1970's no child shall be leaving school without having acquired the skills and, hopefully, the desires to read to the full level of his capability. I would ask you to help support this because this is not a Federal program; it is a nationwide program and it can only be carried out in the communities of our country, in the schools of our country. If you do not know what your school is doing, how well it is succeeding in teaching this basic skill, you ought to inquire, find out, and insist upon the kind of effort in the early life of a child that eliminates this blight on our educational system. The President has appointed a National Reading Council whose function is to attempt to arouse the concern and interest of the American people to marshal the resources that are going to be needed to see that this target might be hit before this decade is out.

Another area requiring special attention is vocational education. For every one dollar that we spend in this country on vocational education at the school level, we spend four dollars for remedial manpower training out of school. And, indeed, the policy that we are following at the Federal level encourages the community to develop its manpower training programs outside of school for a short-term kind of training rather than to build up a kind of competence in vocational education that young people ought to be able to acquire while they are in school. We need to reverse this ratio.

But in the present period of our nation, the greatest single barrier to progress in achieving quality educational opportunity is the continuing existence of racially segregated schools. No one can deny that this is probably the most sensitive and serious problem ever faced in the development of American education. But undeniable, also, is the fact that despite the complex social and economic causes of segregation and the enormous difficulties involved in eliminating it, segregation in our schools simply makes a mockery of the concept of equal educational opportunity. When confronted with an issue which has such a deep emotional and social impact, it is natural to seek the easiest and least disruptive means of dealing with it. With the issues of desegregation and integration, it is inescapably evident, when considered in fundamental terms, that there is no argument as to means and no sophistry or evasion whereby the principle of equality of educational opportunities can be made to accommodate the continuing existence of segregated schools in a democratic society—no matter how difficult the problem involved in eliminating them may be. The social, economic, and humanitarian implications of integration are, of course, a part of the reason for the desegregation of our schools.

But the primary objection of integration is educational. We cannot have quality education in this country unless we provide it in a realistic setting in which the children of this country and this world are going to live in an integrated center. More and more research evidence, more reports are pointing out that not only is separation by race or class within a democracy inherently wrong but the health of our democracy cannot thrive as long as such separation continues. And this condition affects all elements of life in our society. The school, housing, employment, all levels of government, and all sectors of society bear responsibility for it. But education has, I believe, a particular responsibility because of its unique formative influence which comes into play so early in the life of the child.

Continued segregation can only weaken the fabric of our society. Our children must live in a multi-racial world and the school is a natural place for their introduction to that world. All of this seems so logical as to command unquestioned acceptance. But logic and reason do not predominate in the consideration of matters of race relations—in education or in society generally. The complexity and the deep-rooted emotional character of the problem demonstrated in the daily disruptions that are shaking the very foundations of our nation bring dismay and uncertainty and confusion. So large do race relations loom in the affairs today that they seem almost unmanageable, resulting in an overemphasis upon the complexities of the problem and a taint of despair as to the solution. Clearly, full integration in America is a goal still far ahead. The utmost perseverance and determination will be needed on the part of educators, churchmen, government officials, indeed on the part of all of us who bear a responsibility for concern for the attainment of this goal.

One of the greatest difficulties of the present efforts to deal with the problems of race is that so much of the effort has gone into studies, commission reports, and so on, that we are hung up on statistics and analyses, genetics—in other words, on the means—to such an extent that they tend to obscure the fact that what we are dealing with is really a matter of justice. Neither to a significant nor widespread degree is there an understanding of the most serious aspects of discrimination, of its destructive, demoralizing, dehumanizing effects on all people, whatever their color or ethnic background. Without such understanding the ideas and opinions about segregation and racism are appallingly superficial. It is frighteningly significant that often discussions about the problems of race end up with the condescending remark: "They are so much better off than they were." Such an attitude acts to obscure the vast wrong that still remains to be righted. It acts as a salve for the conscience of those whose voice of conscience is weak. It is a vicious and powerful weapon for those who are overtly or covertly against action in this field.

Building up very strongly and rapidly throughout the nation is the feeling that present efforts stand as justification, at best, for no acceleration and, at worst, for a slowing down. Urgently needed to counteract this kind of opinion is the creation of a nationwide sense of urgency. A major share of responsibility for the development of this sense of urgency, it seems to me, lies with educators. But, needed to reinforce their

efforts is national leadership, the full force and moral suasion of the highest office in the land. We need to hear policy statements from the President which go beyond legalistic concerns for compliance—statements that demonstrate unqualified commitment, that recognize the injustice branded as intolerable—and call upon all, black and white alike, to discard prejudice and to work together to right wrongs that diminish and shame us both as individuals and as a nation. Leadership which expresses or implies anything less than this kind of wholehearted commitment gives false comfort to the timid and the uncommitted. It forces the victims of racial injustice into a continuing despair and hopelessness that can only breed further violence and divisiveness. As I said earlier, complex and difficult though the task may be, the elimination of segregation in our schools, the elimination of racism in our society, is finally simply a matter of justice. To speak thus may seem to many merely idealistic and naive, a kind of oversimplified rhetoric that accomplishes nothing. But I believe it is only by keeping this simple but fundamental truth constantly before us that we can hold to the true perspective and to an analysis of the problem that can motivate and lead to the changes in action and attitude which must be taken.

Another development of recent years that gives promise of improving the quality of public education is the new emphasis in the educational community, being pressed upon the community in part by the public, on accountability. For too long the public education system generally has allowed the sacred attitude toward education to give it the feeling that it does not have to account for the success or failure of its activities, for performance in the educational system. Happily, this is beginning to change and the educators themselves are recognizing it. The time has come when methods of accountability need to be worked out, when techniques need to be developed that will enable not only the public but the educational system itself to be better able to account for its success or its failure.

This administration has proposed to help in regard to the creation of a National Institute of Education—one of the most important proposals, in my judgment, that has been made in the field of education in a long time. In this country we spend ten percent of the defense budget for research and development, finding new and better ways of doing things in the defense area. We spend five percent of our health budget for research and development in national institutes of health, in cancer and other things of that sort. We spend only three-tenths of one percent of the \$60 billion spent for education in this country for what might be called research and development, trying to find out what the answers ought to be, evaluating more effectively what we do in education, and in disseminating better practices through the country.

A bill has been proposed and is now before Congress to establish a National Institute of Education which would be somewhat outside of the bureaucratic operations in government—set aside at least somewhat as the National Science Foundation has been set aside, and with at least as much protection as the national institutes of health have—so that it might bring together the best brains in America with respect to education, the psychology of learning, and all the rest, and begin to plan and look down the road. We don't suddenly

start out doing new massive programs such as Head-start—good idea, we can move out fast on it. We don't know all the answers in regard to it. Two years later somebody comes and makes a survey of it and finds that it hasn't worked, and we are all disillusioned and pull back support from it. We need to get in a position where we can have continuing capability built into the educational system of this country that helps us to be able to renew the system as we move along, to find the answers to the problems, to know what happens when there is a policy change and what is likely to happen, and to develop alternatives for decision-makers in the field of education. I would urge your getting to understand what the National Institute of Education is, finding out about the legislation, and, if you have the opportunity to do so, appearing before a Congressional committee now that hearings are going on to lend support to this idea.

None of the improvements which we must make in education can be fully accomplished unless we update through a major overhaul the present patterns of financing the public school system in our country. Our pattern for financing public education was developed in the horse-and-buggy days and it is still a horse-and-buggy system, based largely on the property tax at the local level which, as everybody knows, is unevenly assessed and is no longer really capable of supplying the kind of funds that are necessary. Budgets based on state-aid plans that were set up by legislatures which were responsible mostly to rural areas and which are now unable to make the changes in finance plans to recognize the special problems of the cities. This system is full of anachronistic constitutional and legal provisions that are so rigid that it is very difficult, even when we want to make changes in the educational system and to open up new and creative approaches, to do so under the system which we now have.

It is my feeling, I know it is a controversial one, that we ought to move toward the state government's assuming the cost of local education; and that the state, which has the responsibility in this country constitutionally to provide for education, should then begin to set the conditions within the state that will allow for the flexibility which is so important. I believe, also, that while the Federal Government's role has been recently announced as being principally one of reform in helping the schools and colleges, it has to be more than this. The time has come when, maybe, the base of support should no longer simply be the local property tax but some sort of generally distributed aid on the Federal level, taking into account equalization among the states and building a strong base on which the states can then build a good and strong educational system. This indefensible situation which we have now of such a great variety and disparity in ability to support schools ought to be eliminated or greatly reduced. The child's education in America depends upon where he is born. It is just that simple! *It depends upon where he is born.* If he is born in some parts of this country, what he can get in education is very limited because of the economic base which supports his education, or even because of the attitude of the community where he lives. If he happens to be born in a wealthy suburb, the whole world in a sense may be open to him because of the power of that suburb to produce a good school and of the

interest that takes place there.

It is certainly time that a major overhaul is made of this system and I hope that during this decade a major overhaul can take place. The President has established, as you know, a presidential commission on school finance, headed by Mr. Neil McElroy, that is looking into these questions. I am hoping that we are going to be working closely with the states to help us get a better system that will facilitate the wide approaches to education and facilitate the meeting of some of the serious problems, such as the elimination of reading failures.

Well, there are more developments and trends that I could speak of and I am sure some are on your minds, but time will not permit. It is encouraging to have the kind of emphasis, plans, and programs that seem to be now on the way. We have been going through a very difficult period not only in our society generally but in education particularly, determining what its values should be, what its emphasis should be, and where it should go. I think all of this is healthy. As I look now at these discussions and debates that are going on and confrontations that are taking place, I think that good will come from it. But I am sure that, when measured against the dimensions of the task in education that what we are doing and even planning, it is not enough.

The missing ingredient, in particular, it seems to me, is a kind of catalyst that is needed to move from the word to the deed. We are so immobilized in this country when it comes to solving some of these problems, we can't seem to get going. I think there is not a sense of urgency. As a matter of fact, I am appalled as I go about the country to find that there is really no sense of urgency about education. On the part of some groups, some individuals, some of the professionals, and some citizens' groups, there is a sense of urgency, but not on the part of the nation as a whole. Maybe it is partly because so much of our education system has been so successful that we don't see a sense of urgency to get on to some of the problems. This sense of urgency is missing both within the profession itself and within the public-at-large, and missing at the national level with an administration, it seems to me, that has failed to give leadership in these social areas. It is not enough simply to call for reform. You can't put children in deep freeze while you go about to reform the system; you have to, at the same time, keep the system going while you reform it. Within the profession, too, many educators are unwilling to acknowledge the need for reform. Such attitudes make it very difficult to move the mountain of apathy and tradition which has been developed. The sense of urgency must be encouraged by all citizens interested in education.

The very real nature of the church and the Christian commitment implies an obligation to be involved in the support of constructive programs that will lead to the goal of equality of educational opportunities throughout our land. Certainly education is one of society's most important concerns. A church that is not actively involved in all the concerns of mankind cannot serve today's needs. The church must be a goad to conscience, a vitalizing source of action, a leader in the united attack of all social institutions on the conditions that betray the spirit and deny the hopes of so

many of the world's peoples. Wherever there is poverty, there the church should be. Wherever there is injustice, prejudice, discrimination, hunger, disease, there the church should be. Wherever there is need for better schools, there the church should be. Whatever the problem that stands in the way of human betterment, there the church should be. It is only by reaching out that the church can achieve that "coming unto" which will make the church the spiritual and moral reality it should be in the lives of us all.

Our Responsibility to the Rule of Law

Leon Jaworski

When the French statesman, Alexis De Tocqueville, sojourned in our country in the first half of the nineteenth century, he studied the workings of a democracy to determine what made it tick. When he returned to his country, he wrote, among other things, about America's greatness in these words:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there.

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her fertile fields and boundless forests, and it was not there.

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her rich mines and her vast world commerce, and it was there.

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her public school system and her institutions of learning, and it was not there.

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her democratic congress and her matchless constitution, and it was not there.

"Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power.

"America is great because America is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

In contemplating De Tocqueville's observations, there crossed my mind a panorama of the great contributions religious institutions have made in the shaping of the spirit of America. From the time the pilgrims first knelt on American soil to give thanks to God for His guidance and to invoke His blessings in their new adventure, the Church has played an integral part in directing this nation's destiny. As an instrumentality of spiritual sustenance and guidance, it has served as a constant reminder of the glory of God and our trust in Him. In our darkest hours, it has been the beacon of hope and faith. It has undergirded our society in time of war and peace, in time of plenty and in time of need.

Today, the Church faces a new and different challenge for our nation is in the throes of a crisis unlike any in its history. It is not because of war, although we are at war. It is not because of threats to our economy, although there are problems of an economic nature. It is not because of racial divisiveness, although it is an issue so far unresolved. It is not because of the increase per se in what we term traditional crime—

murder, robbery, burglary and other crimes condemned since the beginning of civilization—although the trend is shocking and frightening, to be sure. Rather, it is a crisis stemming from an attitude formed in recent years among both young and old, of all races, that it is unnecessary in our society to be unwaveringly respectful of law; it is critical because, from this attitude, ever-increasing disobediences of laws have been spawned, so as to strain the rule of law as never before. It is grave because a substitute of disobediences as a means of redress in lieu of the democratic processes that have sustained us for almost 200 years plainly would spell the end to our form of government.

I have the strongest faith in our religious institutions and I would like to believe that they will offer leadership to meet this dire challenge. But I hear it said that little can be expected from the Church because its influence is waning. To illustrate, a well-known contemporary writer, James J. Kilpatrick, in pointing to the disintegration of the community referred to “the steady erosion of forces that once were powerful.” The first force he named was the Church. Still worse, it is said by some that the Church winks at the means employed by militants in seeking social changes and therefore should not be counted on as a likely force to join in condemning lawless dissent. The most devastating charge of all made by respectable critics is that some segments of the Church even encourage such acts of lawlessness.

Without debating the pros and cons of these charges, suffice it to say that so far our religious institutions have not responded noticeably to our country’s desperate need for leadership in a recommitment to compliance—voluntary compliance—with the rule of law. I view with similar concern the failure of other institutions and groups, as well as my own profession’s remissiveness, to offer vigorous leadership in support of a national commitment to obey the laws of our land. But today, I am talking to churchmen and churchwomen and I want to examine their role in the challenge our free society faces.

Civil disobediences and other forms of lawlessness used as a method of political protest have been resorted to so much in recent years that many of us are inclined to accept them as just another irritant a democratic society has to bear. Seldom do we pause to examine the jeopardy in which our form of government is placed when lawless means are used to achieve even the noblest of gains.

Do you doubt the warrant of my concern? Then let me examine with you this modern practice of disobedience. What, in fact, do they entail and what is the aftermath? Where do they leave our democratic society? Where do they leave the Church?

The National Commission on the Causes and Preventive of Violence, on which I had the honor of serving, was established by President Johnson and its life extended by President Nixon. One of its primary responsibilities was to investigate and make recommendations with respect to “the causes and prevention of disrespect for law and order, of disrespect for public officials, and of violent disruptions of public order by individuals and groups.” In discussing civil disobediences, a majority of the Commission noted:

“Our concern with civil disobediences is not

that they may involve acts of violence per se. Most of them do not. Rather, our concern is that erosion of the law is an inevitable consequence of widespread civil disobedience.”

At another point, a majority of the Commission noted:

“In our democratic society, lawlessness cannot be justified on the grounds of individual belief. . . . If personal or group selectivity of laws to be obeyed is to be the yardstick, we shall face nationwide disobedience of many laws and thus anarchy.”

I have spoken of what a majority of the Commission had to say on this subject. Now let me quote to you what the entire Commission said by unanimous action—a Commission composed of Republicans and Democrats, of whites and blacks, of lawyers and laymen:

“There is every reason to believe that the lesson taught by much of the current disobedience to law is disastrous from the standpoint of the maintenance of a democratic society.”

Finally, this Commission unanimously warned: “We believe, however, that candid examination of what is occurring in the United States today will lead to the conclusion that disobedience to valid law as a tactic of protest by discontented groups is *not* contributing to the emergence of a more liberal and humane society, but is, on the contrary, producing an opposite tendency.”

Dean Erwin Griswold, now Solicitor General of the United States, warned us in these words:

“The virus of disregard for law has been planted deeply in American thought and customs, and we should not be surprised that it breaks out in a fever in unexpected ways in unexpected places.”

A brief recapitulation of a few events of recent times—some quite recent—bear out Dean Griswold’s prophecy. The process of deterioration of obedience to law was accelerated by flagrant violations of court decrees by leaders on both sides of civil rights issues. Disobediences and disorders on college and university campuses followed. Federal employees of two separate departments of our government under legal duty not to strike, flagrantly disobeyed court orders to desist. One of their leaders in a television interview acknowledged that he was legally wrong but thought that he was “morally right.” Leaders of teachers’ strikes have been flouting court orders. City employees, in large numbers, have broken state laws, violated their oaths and defied court orders in protest of what may have been just grievances. But these are tragic examples of adult leadership for our young people to behold when we seek to teach them observance of the rule of law. Of little surprise are reports that at some of the high schools, even junior high schools, disruptions and disobediences are breaking out under the guise of protest.

There are many who profess to have grievances. Some are real and some imaginary. The farmer has his, the teacher has hers, the blue collar worker his, the wage-earner his and the wage-payers theirs, the white collar pensioner his and groups of taxpayers theirs—and if we are all going to defy laws to get

our complaints redressed, anarchy would sweep our country.

With an avalanche of disobediences descending upon us, I had hoped for indications that the Church and its organizations would take a leading role in re-establishing throughout our land a dedication to the acceptance of the rule of law and firmly denounce the concept that the individual has a right to choose which law to obey and which to defy. It seems that I have hoped in vain.

While I conceive the Church's place to be in the vanguard of urging a strict compliance with our laws, whether of legislative or judicial creation, this is not to say that the Church should be blind to injustices that exist. Let the Church lend appropriate efforts to correct these failures, yet insist that remedial programs be within the framework of our laws and constitutional processes.

Recently, I read of the decision of a former pastor of a church adjacent to the campus of a large university to resign his ministry and enter into a program aimed at joining young people and older people in endeavoring to bring about desirable social changes. He termed it practicing secular Christianity. He believes it essential that the youth of today must be shown that change is possible by working through our institutions rather than working against them. One pauses to wonder why so few of our Churches and their representatives have not undertaken similar efforts.

The simple truth is that there is not a single worthy social or political gain that an interested citizenry cannot gain by resort to democratic processes. This is the first commandment of citizenship the Church should teach. If churchmen believe a needed reform should be instituted, why not put the Church's full resources to work to accomplish it in a manner consistent with democratic processes? Why are not the pulpits "afire with righteousness" and why don't Christian soldiers call on public officials or march to the ballot box to achieve the needed gains? Or is it that the Church has become so impotent that it sits indolently by while youths are taught by the example of elders to take the shortcut of lawlessness to achieve quick gains and in the process trample on our institutions of government?

I confess that I was disturbed no little when in July of 1968 there appeared in the *Presbyterian Survey*, the official organ of the Church of my denomination, an effort to explain and justify the General Assembly's attitude toward civil disobediences. It presented a theologian's explanation that "Civil disobedience as described by the General Assembly is always an effort to obey a higher law, the law of God."

To the question "Did not the General Assembly encourage anarchy by extending 'sympathy and understanding' to those who practice civil disobedience?", the theologian replied: "No, I do not think so. The Assembly did not encourage anarchy anymore than our colonial forefathers did when they approved the American Declaration of Independence. That Declaration was the ultimate act of civil disobedience."

That purported explanation left me cold.

Of course, the duty to obey God's laws is the very foundation of our Christian faith and all of us would

acknowledge as much. But how empty is the logic that undertakes to jump from that premise to the justification of disobediences because an individual *asserts* the civil law to be in conflict with God's law. What is God's law as to each of the multi-faceted problems existent in our complex society today may be open to dispute by different groups of people, all equally conscientious. And if we are to let one's conscience serve as a test in obeying or disregarding laws, we are in real trouble, especially when confronted with all of the elastic consciences that operate in our society today. It would not surprise me at all if among the protesters who have invaded Church sanctuaries are those whose consciences told them Churches should not be holding religious services while their grievances were unresolved. And in some cases, Church services could be resumed only after injunctive relief was obtained from civil courts.

Now, as to the theologian's second argument—that the Declaration of Independence was the ultimate act of civil disobedience—there is no way of logically equating the American revolutionary with the civil disobedier of today. The American revolutionary was the subject of a tyrannical power and his objective was to overthrow the government and to establish one of his own. That revolutionary was without the right of petition, he had no ballot to vote and no voice in the government that ruled him. The civil disobedier of today has available to him the processes of a democracy—just as much as his neighbor who is respectful of the laws under which he lives. Under the protection of Article I of the Bill of Rights, he is given full opportunity to register grievances, to protest, to petition to seek change and to express his views at the ballot box. The distinction is clear—the colonial revolutionary's goal was to overthrow a despotic government; the civil disobedier of today wants to choose which laws to obey and which to flout under a democratic form of government.

From the founding of our nation, the Church has enjoyed a freedom unsurpassed in any other country on the globe. It was granted this expanse of freedom by the Constitution itself. Ever since, the religious liberties that have been the Church's to have and to hold and to fully enjoy have remained uninterrupted and unimpeded. The rights and prerogatives of the Church have ever remained sacred and untrammled and no attempted encroachment has succeeded. The reason? Because there have been courts to protect and preserve the constitutional guaranties of freedom of worship and to suppress by their judgments and decrees all efforts to infringe upon them. And why has the protecting hand of the courts been so effective? Because a court order had the effect of law, because it gave meaning to our Constitution and our laws and because, above all else, once the order was issued, it was obeyed.

Today's American scene reveals a threat to the efficacy of court orders and a disrespect of constituted authority that should alarm every minister of the gospel, every worshipper of God, every devotee of religious freedom. It takes no depth of wisdom to realize that once the bonds of law are frayed and weak, court orders and other legal restraints correspondingly will lose their weight and force.

In contemporary times, there is no assurance that

the Church will not suffer disruptions and attacks of an intensity sustained by other institutions. Some efforts to destroy the work of the Church have already occurred. To hold itself immune from an escalation of such attacks or any other type of attack impinging on its work, the Church must depend upon the strong arm of the court. It is ever so clear that if the judicial process becomes weak and impotent, the Church will suffer correspondingly and soon its sanctuaries of worship will become mere structures of brick and mortar. The point is that wholly apart from its responsibility to society, it is to the Church's self-interest to keep the rule of law strong and unimpaired; to emphasize its indispensable nature to the life of our society; to bring home to every liberty-loving man and woman that their freedoms are in peril once the rule of law is weakened to the point of losing its effectiveness.

I am not trying to prescribe the Church's agenda, but of this I am sure. The Church cannot fail to take note of the modern day forms of disobediences rampant about us. Neither can it fail to do something about it and still retain its prestige as a force that contributes to the stability of the community. A nation in crisis can scarcely afford its undergirding institutions to be timid or hesitant.

If we are not boldly to speak out and condemn the disrespects, the disobediences, the lawlessness now plaguing us, what will be the alternative?

To find the answer in history, we need be no more retrospective than to review the disastrous experience of Nazi Germany. There we saw as the consequence of people's silence, timidity, and indifference the tragic deterioration of a proud nation that had given so richly to the culture of the western world. It retrograded to uncontrollable lawlessness and with anarchy as the threat, a dictatorship arose. In the end, we saw the shambles—with concentration camps, barbarities, and depravities as the remaining monuments of what was once a nation toasted for achievement in art and literature and science.

The despicable ideology of Nazism did not grip Germany overnight. It came as a cancerous growth which by easy stages substituted wrong and evil for freedom and right and human dignity. As Edmund Burke warned: "All that is needed for the forces of evil to win is for enough good men to do nothing." And, in fact, to paraphrase Burke's admonition, there were enough good men and enough good women in Germany who, during the growth of Nazism, did nothing. They disapproved of what they saw, but as they did nothing about it, the wrongs escalated from day to day. Once the stranglehold of Nazism was applied to the free institutions of Germany and the schools were poisoned, the churches silenced, and the courts prostituted, the freedoms of protest and resistance were annihilated and the voices of good men and women were lastingly stilled.

What good flows from the warnings of the President's Crime Commission of the perilous rise in the crime rate, from the National Violence Commission's deploring of the appalling trend of youth violence and the Campus Unrest Commission's lamentations of the crisis we are sure to face, if enough good men and good women are to read and listen, yet do nothing?

When a distinguished rabbi, Levi A. Olan, discussed the status of law in a free society, he said:

"The most serious threat to a free society under law is when men assume the right to defy the judgment of the court. . . . Today, we may defy this decision, tomorrow others will defy another decision, soon we arrive at that anarchy where each man is his own judge. Then there is no law and the way is open for some form of tyranny. To stand by while the law is being thwarted is the most dangerous act of our time."

By and large the Church has stood by while the law is being thwarted thereby, according to Rabbi Olan, unwittingly committing the most dangerous act of our time.

In a recent publication of *Freedom at Issue*, the editors posed the question "Who is responsible for our national sickness?" The answer they suggested was "All of us are." By way of elaboration, they said the responsibility rested with those of us who did not properly defend the vital processes of freedom, adding, "We fail twice over by avoiding hard decisions in the name of temporary expediency (when, for example, many blinked at violence committed in a good cause) and by failing to inspire full use of the democratic process in fashioning orderly change. Is the Church entirely free of blame? There are groups of individuals engaged in lawless disobediences—some of them with religious affiliations—who perforce the word "non-violent" in their official names regard themselves as entitled to immunity from condemnation. I grant them no special halo, for in my view, their practices of lawless dissent create environments that by easy stages could lead, and have led to violence.

The answer to whatever injustices, failures, and shortcomings that exist in the functioning of our system is not a violently wrecking of the entire structure, with all of its guaranties and freedoms. Rather, redress lies in a strengthening and straightening of the parts that have weakened and thus in the preserving of a body of government which basically is unexcelled in the world.

The phrase "law and order" is a time-honored one, having been embraced by every generation since the founding of our nation. It seems—after all of these years—to require change, the addition of the word "justice." While seeing no real reason for the change, I gladly accept the addition. We should never cease aspiring to reach the ends of justice in all of our endeavors but I would remind you that justice must come as the result of law and it alone because it is undeniably true that where there is no law there is no freedom.

It has been well said (and I don't recall by whom) that democracy is the outgrowth of the religious conviction of the sacredness of every human life. On the religious side, its highest embodiment is the Bible; on the political, the Constitution. It would be interesting to know how long it has been since the Constitution and its meaning to Christians have been discussed from the pulpit by many of America's Churches.

The preface to the booklet, *Politics: A Guidebook for Christians*, edited by James M. Dunn, points out that "Christian citizenship is imperative today. Christians must be a part of our government and of the po-

litical life of our day if we would make our Christian witness and experience count." I subscribe to that statement and it was most heartening to learn that the Southern Baptist Convention is joining in the observance of Law Day in May of this year, the theme of which is "Channel Change Through Law and Reason." This great rule of conduct—this preachment must not be for just a day—it must be sounded time and again so that it will become a guiding force in every social or political movement advocated by the Church.

I have taken note of the interest Church bodies of some denominations recently have evinced in the managerial policies of our larger corporations and of their determination to become active in formulating policies of corporate management. Assuming for a moment the existence of both propriety and just cause for Church groups to be directing their efforts along these lines, I consider them inferior and quite secondary to the major problem the Church has so far not joined in resolving—that of deterring lawlessness and disobediences as a means of seeking gains. For Church groups to be skirting this challenge to our society and instead to be taking on brush fires is but another indication of the failure of some Church segments properly to assess their present-day responsibilities.

Since the founding of our nation, groups who felt aggrieved or oppressed resorted to the democratic channels available to us. Some have succeeded, some have failed. Revolutionary change over night is not to be expected in a democracy, where the change is slow and often long-considered. But when the change does come, it comes without an overthrow of government and with the retention of freedoms more precious than the redresses for which even the best-intentioned of revolutionaries are reaching.

The complainants who demand changes overnight should know that the quickest way to end all inequities and inequalities, actual and purported, is for the government to assume complete control over our lives and to govern our rights by daily edict. With this course, all individual freedoms would be buried, including the right to assemble and to dissent and to worship freely.

That the defiance of laws as a form of protest to achieve gain is self-defeating was ably discussed by Dallin H. Oaks, when Professor of Law at the University of Chicago and who served as Law Clerk to former Chief Justice Earl Warren. He put it this way:

"No group has a greater stake in lawful behavior and public devotion to law and order than a minority. No group has greater need for the rule of law than a minority. Law is the minority's assurance of protection from the tyranny of the majority. Whenever a minority takes any action in defiance of law it is sowing the seeds of its own destruction, since the evasion of any law weakens the authority of all law. The United States Supreme Court gave impressive expression to this thought in its opinion affirming contempt convictions and jail sentences for distinguished demonstrators who had violated court injunctions against a street demonstration:

"One may sympathize with petitioners' impatient commitment to their cause. But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom."

There was a time when the home played a most significant role in the attuning of the minds of our youths to the virtue of responsible citizenship through an unswerving reverence for law and an undiluted respect for the law's enforcers. But in more and more homes, these teachings are now absent. In some schools, efforts along this line are undertaken but they are far from sufficient and may never fill the void. Why should not the Church with its many organizations concentrate its manpower and its youthpower toward this end? I see impelling reasons why it should and no good reason why it should not.

Abraham Lincoln, in urging the upholding of law and the renouncing of violations by others, put it this way:

"Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls and enforced in courts of justice. In short, let it become the political religion of the nation, and, in particular, a reverence for the Constitution."

As the Ten Commandments have served as the regulative guide of Jewish and Christian morality and legislation for thousands of years, so has the principle of government by law served as our nation's guide from the time of its birth. The God-given Commandments, plus the freedom to introduce them to the lives of all, have brought blessings to our country, not paralleled in any other land. Won by patriots of the founding days and preserved by succeeding generations, these blessings have been handed to us not to dissipate but to protect so that not only we, but future generations as well, may embrace and enjoy them.

From what has been said, it is easy to perceive that I am critical of the Church's role of leadership today and that I feel that it has not discharged its responsibility to the rule of law. Were the Church not dear to my heart, I would not speak of it so. It has been a meaningful part of my life from the time of my birth in a parsonage to the present day. I want it to fulfill its mission to God and country so that every Christian can point to it with justifiable pride.

I conclude by paraphrasing the words of a gentleman named Burris A. Jenkins: "With all its faults, I love the Church because it is the chief dwelling place on earth of my Master and my Saviour."

Black Fulfillment and Christian Responsibility Gardner Taylor

The 352 years which lie between 1971 and 1619, the year the first black slaves were brought to America, are laden with an anguish and an anger on the part of

a minority perhaps unmatched in history in length and in intensity. If someone would cite the Israelite slavery in Egypt as a refutation of this, he needs to be reminded that the Israelite experience in Egypt in its ugly cruelties apparently spanned a generation, not three centuries. Blacks have never known a time when they were trusted and honored in the land of their slavery.

I shall not spend a great deal of time in dealing with the background of the loud and clear scream of defiance now being made by black Americans nor their cry for fulfillment, at any price, including death. One black author said recently the American black community has been examined, investigated, studied, researched, observed and analyzed to nausea.

However, if we are to appreciate the present angry cry for fulfillment, we must understand something of what lies behind it. It is almost impossible to conceive of the total shattering and splintering of all sense of identity and community suffered by the American slave. Lerone Bennett, the articulate and perceptive senior editor of *Ebony* magazine, writes in the February issue of that most prestigious of black periodicals that the American slave was stripped of all sense of space and time. He had endured the unspeakably horrible middle-passage from Africa. He literally did not know where he was in his new and strange and hostile setting. He heard, likely, of a place called "Canada" and faint rumors were blown in upon the evening air in the slave quarters of somewhere called the "North." The slave-masters would be sure to keep all such information away from his ears, by spelling names and places about which he did not want the bondsman to hear. As to where these places of hope were located, the slave had not the slightest idea. He was stripped of all sense of location and space.

Likewise, the slave had no sense of time. Frederick Douglas, whose grave lies in a Rochester cemetery, commented concerning the first eighteen years of his life which were spent as a slave that he never met a slave who knew how old he was. Life for the slave was an endless procession of monotony, sun-up to sun-down, broken now and again by festive occasions, usually echoes of events in the family of the slave owners.

In the midst of this almost total negation of the space-time dimensions of his personality, the black American began his long quest for fulfillment. In this most degrading estate, the slave Lerone Bennett concludes, constructed a world, part European, part African and part "X." In so doing he said something endlessly precious about the vitality and aspirations of the human spirit in his Spirituals and his comments about life. This drive toward fulfillment of the slave in creating the ethos of the black American community, the thing now called "soul," represents one of the greatest flights of the human spirit in all of history.

I have tried in this connection to say elsewhere what Bennett strikes at in a telling manner. The basis of the struggle for black fulfillment lies in the shattered sense of community which the slave suffered. Wrenched loose from his roots on the African heath, he had to find some new basis of community not only for his fulfillment but for survival. I have made elsewhere

the calculated guess that in the interest of security the slave owner preferred to have slaves of varying languages and customs or he may not have figured at all that these people whom he scarcely conceived to be human had any patterns of culture and personhood-imparting rituals whatsoever.

Thus, the slave reached out for fulfillment in the Christian faith about which he heard in the slave galleries of his master's church. The slave saw in Jesus Christ a basis upon which he might, however painfully, reconstruct and rearrange his splintered sense of community. Zora Neale Hurston has said of the early Black that "the ante-bellum Negro was not converted to the Christian's God; he converted God to himself." I prefer to think that the slave found in the God of Christian faith an accommodation to his own needs and yearning.

Thus, the quest for fulfillment is not new, though its recent expressions have been more determined and inflexible than ever before in American history. Following the nation's Civil Conflict, the Freedmen's Bureau was established and there was wide talk, Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania being its most eloquent and inspired spokesman, of forty acres and a mule which were to be given to each Freedman. What a difference might have been made in the history of this land if this had been done! The black American saw this avenue of fulfillment pass when the nation soon after emancipation became weary in well doing. He saw the nation sell its soul at the counter of expediency in the disgraceful Hayes-Tilden compromise of 1877 which refashioned in gentler terms the old system of slavery.

The background of today's anger and disillusionment and determination, at whatever cost, to control their own communities lies in the invariably broken promises, stated or implied, which the black American heard, or thought he heard, from the white American majority. One of the most incredible sagas of faith, I think, to be found anywhere was the persisting faith about America's good intentions among blacks from the year of emancipation in 1863 to the assassinations of John Kennedy, Martin King, Jr., and Robert Kennedy, almost exactly one hundred years later. Blacks believed that Americans meant to do right by them as far as full participation in the society is concerned, if only this or that test was met and if only the plight of the black community and the black goal of acceptance were understood by white Americans.

I remember the days of my own childhood in Louisiana at a time when some who were born in slavery still lived and when there were many more blacks still alive who had been born while, as my father used to put it, "the echo could still be heard of the hounds baying on the trail of runaway slaves." I recall well the almost pathetic faith so many of these blacks possessed. They believed that there was only some external, objective standard which they had to discover and meet before they would be admitted to full partnership in the democracy. It is heart-sickening now, looking back, to see their determination to be Americans, to learn to read and to master the tools of the society or to purchase a piece of property and become tax-payers. It was a cruel hoax. The society, racist to the core and wedded to

the idolatry of color, had no such intention.

Staring at the emptiness where once Kennedy and King and another Kennedy had stood, frustrated by the white majority's determination to keep them deprived and abased, some young blacks seeing faintly what it was all about began to echo a cry which had first been heard on a Mississippi road, "Black Power." It was the slogan of renunciation of the idea of one America without regard to color, since those who stood at the levers of power did not intend to make it one America.

By the way, portions of these reflections were fashioned beneath West Indian skies and the evidence may be that the incurable endemic disease of white people is racism. The editorial page of the *Kingston Daily Gleaner* of February 18, 1971, carried two lead features, each from a separate part of the world and each dealing with the feelings of blacks that they must withdraw from any pact of confidence and mutuality with whites because such arrangements are always counterfeit. One article, written by Thomas Wright, dealt with West Indian feelings about whites in Jamaica and in England. The other article, written by Stanley Vys, dealt with the formation of the South Africans' Student Organization which is composed of black South Africans who no longer wish to work with the National Union of South African Students composed of so-called liberal whites and, until recently, of blacks in a limited sense. I was in South Africa two years ago and could see even then that blacks, with insuperable and indescribable odds set against them, were moving toward the decision to go it alone.

In America almost all blacks have now chosen some form of severance from the majority society because patience with and faith in whites have both run out. Many blacks feel that their fulfillment lies in some form of separation. For some, this means geographical withdrawal and the formal establishment of independent structures of life. To others, fulfillment means self-determination, actual control within the ghettos which white America created, of all economic, educational, political, and religious aspects of life. One of the great struggles going on in New York schools today is over the right of people to control their own community institutions. There are still others, perhaps the great bulk of the black American community, who wish to claim freely the economic and cultural benefits of the society as their birthright, but who do not crave the goodwill, interest, friendship or favor of the white community.

There are perils in this mood of black America, but this is not the time or circumstance in which to ventilate them. Suffice it to say that this cultural withdrawal while participating in the society has been the path of most other great American minorities as they have sought their own role and security in the American scene.

In all of this, black Christians have a grave responsibility, for if current black, psychic withdrawal is not to be sinful, it must be seen as preparation for redemptive service. White Christians bear a far heavier load in dealing with this old specter of race which has haunted and bedeviled the Republic for so long, for they stand at the levers of power and influence.

It may well be that the role and destiny of the black American community is to test the honesty and

integrity of white America in its pronouncements, political and religious. Largely because of black presence, America has not been able to convince the world that it is a democracy. Because of the black presence, Christians in America have not yet been able to prove that they are Christian or that Jesus Christ can really change people in their basic and ultimate life-styles. This is the challenge of blackness to white Christian America, the price white Christians and white Americans must pay for being the occupants of the places of power in the society.

It seems to me that the Christian responsibility of those who are white in this country and who claim Jesus Christ as Lord is to confess openly that a great wrong has been done and to renounce as failure the notion which one still hears that all that is needed is to win men to Jesus Christ and then saved men will save society. Indeed, to say this is to make a terrible indictment of generations of "Bible-believing, born-again" Christians. The truth is that where evangelical Christians, even Baptists, have been strongest, the fiercest patterns of racism have prevailed most openly. Now, I am not prepared to call generations of Baptist people unregenerated and yet generations of such people tolerated and even extolled a harshly oppressive, racist order in this country. No, Christians must be taught what it means to be a Christian, an identification with those who are broken and disallowed. White Christians need to recognize that the great ills of drugs, slum-housing, poor schools, shattered aspiration, poor public services, grinding poverty, marginal employment, and an unimaginative welfare system are the agents of death and destruction in the great, teeming ghettos of the cities of America.

As a start, white Christians might well stop the narcotics traffic which is strangling every black community in this country. How strange that Christian people do not see with judging anger that some huge lie is being told about the problem of the dope traffic in this country!

In Washington there is a long-time Icon of what we have come to call middle America. This mythic hero has in his hands the most sophisticated police apparatus ever assembled in the history of the world. He was able to divine that a man considered by millions to be a modern saint was "the most notorious liar in America." This mythic hero has been able to uncover a horrendous plot led by Roman Catholic priests to kidnap people highly placed in government. The police apparatus presided over by this national monument is glorified weekly on national television. And yet, with all of this olympian splendor, this elite detective agency cannot cutoff the dope traffic in this country at its source, a traffic which imperils us all, but mostly those whose hopes are ground in the dust by poverty and whose dwelling places make them candidates for any kind of escape—even the euphoria of the "Fix." Indeed, this elaborate surveillance agency cannot even identify the people at the top who are responsible for this monstrous evil.

When will Christian people stop disgracing the faith and shaming our Lord by trivial considerations of righteousness and goodness such as dancing at denominational schools? One can hear a word out of the long ago which touches vitally our own time. "Let judgment run down as waters and righteousness as a

mighty stream." An infinitely greater voice and a dearer Presence cries with judgment thunder, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees (leaders of the religious life), hypocrites, for ye pay tithes of mint, anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." One seems to see that gentle and yet gallant Presence, the breath of life and hope for the Sons of men, nailed again to a new Calvary by those who call him Lord. And does one hear from that contemporary gallows a strange and chilling question, addressed this time not to God but to those whom he has loved and loosed, "My People, My People, why have you forsaken me?"

I cannot suggest what you ought to do about these things in those places to which it has pleased God to call you. I dare not even hint what extent of risk you ought to take in those areas of our common life in which men still hate and where they will not endure sound doctrine. I know my heart and eyes wept but a few weeks ago as I shared a pulpit in Birmingham with a man who has laid down a high price for his faith. I carry on my heart, also, the memory of a morning in Richmond but a few days ago and a concluding address among Southern Baptists of that state. When I had finished speaking about our old and peculiar problem in this country, a thin man with the lines of age writ clearly in his face, said to me, "I preach in a section of the state where any word about racial justice is unwelcome among my people." Then with tears in his eyes he said in a voice I'll carry to the end of my days, "But I love the Lord and I want to be faithful to him. Pray for me."

I cannot suggest what steep, red way you ought to take for I never took a steep red way for you, but I know One who did. Therefore, each of us, in the sanctuary of his inmost self where his soul and the Lord of his soul confront each other in dread and blessed fellowship, must choose which way His King would have him walk and to what destiny.

A Brotherhood of Belief

John V. Lindsay

Welcome to New York.

A city with more Italians than Venice—more Jews than Tel Aviv—more Irishmen than Galway—and more Southern Baptists than St. Augustine, Florida.

Our town reflects America. Like the country, New York was born and bred in diversity. Here we work, day after day, for a union of purpose and spirit. We know the central place of that union in our municipal life. And we know, as Americans, its central place in our national life. For better or worse, we are one.

So, when a failing war takes lives, the loss of sons is felt among all sections, every race, and every class. A failing economy deprives workers of work and pushes prices out of sight, South and North, West and East. When discord undermines the American dream no one is immune: city and suburbs, long hair and hard hat, Wall Street and Main Street all share a sense of doubt and the beginnings of despair.

Our grievances are common to us all—and they can

only be met by the common action of all. Our future will be found, not in a Southern strategy or a Northern strategy, but in an American strategy for peace abroad and progress at home. We cannot resolve our problems regionally and we certainly cannot resolve them locally.

For a generation, New York has struggled to pay the escalating costs of welfare. From 1959 to 1970, our expenditures for public assistance climbed from \$77 million to half a billion dollars. Now, in 1971, the burden threatens to overwhelm the city. With a deficit of \$300 million in our expense budget, we can no longer afford welfare.

The remedy we seek is simple justice—a united national response to the national shame of poverty. Seventy-eight percent of the mothers on welfare in New York City were born in another state or town. The roots of their poverty are in the rural shacks and urban slums of a thousand different American places. Only Federal action can relieve the local financial disaster inflicted by their tragic migration to another part of the same country.

Hard and bitter experience with welfare has taught the cities a vital truth. We cannot make urban life more livable until we make national life everywhere more worth living. We must set priorities for a decent society.

A half decade of debate about the American future has invested the word "priorities" with a particular meaning. When we hear it, we think of the practical, nuts and bolts financial choices the Congress and the President make for the rest of us each year.

Too often, Washington has chosen weapons over people. In the last five years, Federal funding for urban programs has declined from 85 percent to 65 percent of the authorized level. Strip away the technical terms: more money went for war in Indochina—and less for life in our own country.

Too often, Washington has chosen profits over people. Corporations are given a 2.5 billion dollar tax break for equipment and plant expansion. But a bill to provide tens of thousands of jobs in public service is vetoed.

These choices and a host of others like them defeat the hope for decent priorities—the hope of our cities and of our workingmen who want jobs, not relief. We cannot accept this—and we will not. Across the country, mayors and local officials have organized to convince their congressmen and senators that America must move in a new direction. This year, governors are talking like mayors. Citizens are voicing their own urgent concern.

Turning this vision of a new domestic budget into a working reality will require energy and commitment and time.

But money is not the only issue. America could end up a prosperous nation, but still poor in spirit. We must make fundamental choices about the soul of America—about race, about liberty, about youth, and about ourselves.

We must choose reconciliation among our races. There are some who still try to exploit prejudice to divide people. It is time to stop that.

And there are signs of hope, especially in the South. In Georgia, Governor Jimmy Carter spoke eloquently in his inaugural address about equality and dignity and the common rights of all races. In South Carolina,

Governor John West has issued a similar public appeal. And he has visited black sharecroppers—for generations, the forgotten Americans of the South—and talked with them about hunger and the way it destroys their children.

Things will not change overnight in the South—or in the North. But ultimately, I believe, we can reconcile our people—with leadership from every government and the goodwill of every citizen. And Washington should lead, not follow.

We must also reject repression and choose liberty.

The level of crime in America is intolerable. Political violence and political terror are detestable. But this nation cannot prevent crime or insure tranquility by undermining basic constitutional guarantees that will not work. It will merely leave every citizen exposed to the dangers this country was meant to end. You do not stop crime by destroying the right of people to privacy in their own homes—by turning telephone calls into a moment for caution—or by letting the bureaucrats compile lists of dissenters so extensive and so broadly drawn that they may include Senators and Congressmen with war decorations, and anyone in this room.

Effective domestic security requires better law enforcement within the law, prisons that rehabilitate men rather than graduate professional criminals, and narcotics control that cuts the flow of heroin from overseas. We can only live together if we respect the liberty of each other. So we must make law and order the Rule of Law that works—instead of a code word that doesn't work.

Finally, we must choose ourselves and our children.

Incredibly, we are living in an era when some Americans are literally afraid of their own sons and daughters. Too many people in our society have given up on communication with their children—have given up on the fourteen-year-old who has turned to the disaster of drugs—have given up on the twenty-year-old who comes home from college with bell bottoms, long hair, and new ideas.

There is a slogan among the kids—"Don't trust anyone over thirty." But the fact is that the overwhelming majority of our children *have* kept their faith with us. Their protests are not attempts to smash the society we have built, but a challenge to make our society whole. Surely, we can repay their faith with more than our mistrust. Surely, we can learn from them and choose our children and ourselves over our fears.

The choices we face are national in scope, but also deeply personal in nature. They will determine whether we live in the unity of free men—or in the solitude of houses isolated each from each by suspicion and despair.

And we can choose wisely only if we believe in our country and our traditions.

A brotherhood of belief among Americans will not lead to a new revolution, but it can revitalize the old one.

A brotherhood of belief will not find a new faith, but it can live up to the old one.

Each individual and every region, each congregation and every church has an obligation to live for others. We must try.

Communicating Across Barriers

William M. Dyal, Jr.

One of my favorite Washington stories concerns a speech writer for a Senator. It seems that after years of fueling the Senator's verbal machine, the speech writer began to feel used and unappreciated. Finally, he made his move. The Senator arrived to speak at a conference on national priorities, moved to the speaker's stand, opened his manuscript, and began to read. As was his custom, he had *not* reviewed the manuscript in advance. And so he read: "There are those who say you cannot deflate inflation without also escalating unemployment. I say it can be done, and I will tell you how. There are those who say you cannot contain communist expansion, and still have peace. I say it can be done, and I will tell you how. There are those who say you cannot control riots without also creating repression. I say it can be done, and I will tell you how." Then, the Senator flipped to the next page and saw in the familiar scrawl of the speech writer: "Okay, you blankety-blank, you're on your own. I've resigned!"

With this audience, I'm tempted to play the last line of the speech writer right from the first. Hot and fast rhetoric and packaged solutions we have in abundance. But in reality, the answers are not so simple. The questions are not even simple. But I won't abandon you on your own. We are in it together.

The barriers to solid and honest communication between men, groups, and nations have never been so many nor so overwhelming. To inventory the barriers is to invite a crushing cynicism—but inventory we must if we are to understand the breadth and scope of the problem.

Apathy is a passive barrier. But I am jerked awake occasionally in my commuter's daydream to see a bumper sticker ahead of me: "Get off your apathy!" Apathy seems related to orthodoxy, which can be defined as not related to think, since orthodoxy can be unconscious. You are lulled into acceptance of a semi-comfortable haze. Even the indignant and angry shouts of the uncomfortable can begin to lull you after so long. But I like Dylan Thomas' lines:

"Do not go gentle into that good night,
Rage, rage against the dying of the light."

The media have inevitably contributed to our apathy by their instantaneous, indiscriminate, and repetitious coverage of events. How many nights can you observe via satellite, Indochina combat in color on your den television before violence becomes commonplace and boredom sets in? Even the moon walks have begun to produce a "ho-hum" response. A recording company's advertisement describes our plight with its pitch: "I can hear it now—the Sixties, ten years of horror, shame, insanity, music, sorrow, fear, prejudice, innovation, hate, pride, guilt, rage, joy, humor, love, and you—on 3 records." Mind-boggling, yes. Also, mind-numbing.

Closely related, then, to the barrier of apathy may be the barrage of rhetoric in our time. We are bombarded verbally—speeches, conferences, sermons, lectures, programs, hearings, reports, articles, books—

in unending stream, so much so that we are in danger of thinking that because we have heard something or said something about an issue we have also done something about it. The most eloquent civil rights resolutions have often only masked deep-seated, unchanged racial prejudice. Delegates to international peace talks have too often returned to their homelands to continue waging wars with the same neighbors.

Rhetoric without relevance is a barrier to communication because it produces a gap in credibility. It inspires monologue instead of dialogue. It leads to cynicism instead of creative action. Did you see the cartoon of the robed doomsday sign carrier holding aloft against a polluted, exploding sky the sign lettered: "The meek don't want it!"? We are increasingly revulsed by the conditions of our world—but beginning to be revulsed even more by the sloganeers. The problems are too complex to enable us to buy the simplistic jargon of some solutions.

Marshall McLuhan describes three verbal umpires. The first says, "I call them as they are." The second vacillates, "I call them as I see them." The third expounds, "Until I call them, they ain't!" The communications ball park has too many of the second and third variety. But the pressures are too immense to water down, exaggerate, embellish, deceive or just plain lie. Consequently, "verbal umpires" in very high places, and in low, feed us what they want us to believe, or think we ought to believe, or what they think we can tolerate, or what we will buy, or what will get them by, or bring votes, or pacify anger, or postpone judgment. Who can forget the statement in the 1964 Nobel Prize acceptance speech: "I believe that unarmed truth and unconditional love will have the final word in reality." The speaker—Martin Luther King, Jr. Those final words speak to the reality of the rhetoric barrier. Unarmed truth does not come through easily in communications. In the media world, Marse Henry Watterson of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* once defined the necessary possessions of a successful editor as "great wisdom, great courage, great energy, and 51% of the newspaper's stock." Such independence is increasingly a rarity.

But on with that inventory. The barriers to communication are more than apathy and irrelevant rhetoric. Add duplicity, or if you prefer, schizophrenic purpose. The youth culture violently distrusts the establishment. The suspicions and charges center in hoarding of power; remoteness from the people most affected by the decisions made; attitudes shaped by pressure groups, lobbies, and vested interest; and the facelessness of bureaucracy. Yet the youth culture itself often seems to portray these same ills in varying degrees and colorings.

Elsewhere, influential Americans, unable to withdraw from Vietnam, are determined to withdraw from the rest of our foreign policy instead. But the problems still exist. Science and technology keep producing more power to be internationally contained, more pollution to be internationally controlled, more ethically neutral instruments of change (from atomic energy and contraceptives to weather control) which have become the stuff of international politics. We are baffled and paralyzed by the immense gaps which seem unbridgeable. Barbara Ward describes it so eloquently:

"The difficulties and disproportion between various parts of our world community are so great that agreed policies of cooperation run into reefs of hostility and envy. The gaps in power, the gaps in wealth, the gaps in ideology which hold the nations apart also make up the abyss into which mankind can fall to annihilation. It is on these disproportions that world policy has to concentrate—restoring a reasonable balance of power between continents, a reasonable balance of wealth between the Planet's developed North and underdeveloped South, a reasonable balance of understanding and tolerance between the world's rival creeds. Then, when the grosser inequalities have been remedied, there can be more hope of building the common institutions, policies and beliefs which the crew of Spaceship Earth must acquire if they are to have any sure hope of survival."

The issue is *not* whether it can be done, but how.

The task is close to home, in responsible citizenship. As John Gardner stated in building the new citizens' lobby, Common Cause: "It is essential that we bring about a renaissance of politics in this country. We must open up clogged channels. We must bring a vitality to political life that will attract good men and women. We must repair rusty and outworn machinery. We must renew the system."

But also, Bill Moyers did well to remind us in his hard-hitting *Saturday Review* editorial of February 13, 1971: "Nations cannot abandon civility abroad and remain civilized at home." Our purpose and our actions in Vietnam, and every other place in the world, must jibe with our purpose and actions at home. Integrity and credibility are at stake, and integrity and credibility are the stuff of genuine communications between men and between nations.

One other related, major barrier to communications I must lay before you. It may be described as polarized extremism. Ultra-right or ultra-left, it has the heel-clicking, shrill sound of fascism in the land. At times it is public sound and fury; at times, underground sinister action. Its spokesmen are young *and* old, rich *and* poor, influential *and* marginal. Its slogans run the gamut of "love it or leave it," to "kill the pigs!" Obviously, Newton's physical discovery that every action has an equal and opposite reaction applies to social dynamics as well. But the end can be barbarizing, since both extremes take the evils of the other as the pretext for insults, atrocities, and loathing. And each feels that its own severities are not vicious at all, but simply punitive acts and laudable measures of judgment. Thus, both extremes bomb and burn, vilify and scream hate.

What a fantastic communications hangup polarization is creating in this land today. The extremists repudiate the democratic process by denying the legitimacy of political pluralism and the open competition of diverse views. They would confine the marketplace of ideas and interests only to those who share *their* truth. And *their* truth is rigid and absolute. The crowd of true believers in any case defies belief.

The inventory could go on for the barriers to communication are exhaustive. But diagnosis of ills is tiresome, repetitive, and frustrating unless there is remedy and therapy.

I would like briefly to summarize two forces for communicating across the barriers of apathy, irrelevant rhetoric, and polarization. The first is, simply, the power of ideas to communicate across barriers. In spite of despair that tempts human beings toward cynicism or inaction, there is still the capacity for a flowering of the human spirit, what Charles Reich calls "the Greening of America." Men of goodwill still run for office, still vote, still pay taxes, still volunteer for domestic and international service because they believe the system is redeemable. For all its distorted general image, the peace movement has brought forth great involvement by many people from all sectors and served as a conscience and consistent moment of truth for the nation. Ralph Nader's Consumers' Rights Lobby has captured the imagination of the nation and confronted the public and private corporate world with every man's rights.

Local issues concerning legal rights for the disenfranchised, individual tutoring for the educationally deprived, indiscriminate and quality housing for lower economic classes, and public exposure of corruption in political office still find spokesmen, volunteers, indefatigable workers, and sponsoring money.

The powerful article of Christian faith, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," has sensitized men to seek truth. Dostoevski's dictum, "Man is man and not the keys of a piano," spotlights the attempts of some to manipulate the lives of others, or to treat them as objects. The American founding fathers' basic approach, "We hold these truths to be self-evident. . .," focuses even yet the concerns of lawmakers and judges.

To communicate these eternal and powerful ideas summons us to a code of commitment. May I express it straight-on:

(1) We shall express a philosophy of justice and development commensurate with today's staggering problems.

(2) We shall actively seek understanding of and dedication to this philosophy of concern on the part of men on all sides of all boundaries and barriers.

(3) We shall pay the price in reordered priorities, domestically and internationally.

(4) We shall seek to elect responsible representatives, at all levels of government, who will seek world solutions to problems, not just national ones, and who will study man's dilemma, not as misers nor as prisoners of special interest forces, but as statesmen.

(5) We shall seek to stab awake the conscience of the "haves," here and abroad.

(6) We shall train and capacitate men to be healers, teachers, engineers, ministers, and developers for and with the "have-nots" of this and other lands.

(7) We shall teach and stimulate the human skills and attitudes necessary for self-determination, including dignity, self-respect, and a capacity for work and problem solving.

Therein lies the second force for communicating across barriers: the power of persons. Each man wears all mankind as his skin. As the Nigerian proverb goes, "When the right hand washes the left, the right hand becomes clean also." Ideas are never so powerful as when embodied in and lived out by a man, or a group of men. At the now nearly forgotten 1964 Pacem in Terris Conference in New York, Linus Pauling said:

"I am a man, like other men: I am fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer; when I am pricked, I bleed, as do other men; when I am tickled, I laugh; when I am poisoned, I die. I cannot contend that it is the result of anything but chance that I am I, that this consciousness of mine is present in this body; I cannot in good faith argue that I deserve a better fate than other men; and I am forced by this logic to accept as the fundamental ethical principle—as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise."

God forbid that the power of persons to reach across every known barrier ever be lost! One of those contemporary communicators is Barkley Moore, a Kentucky man of the hills, who has just completed six years as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Iran. Eloquent by word and deed, Barkley turns you on to the power of ideas, expressed in his own person, to communicate love and justice, across cultural, national, social, and economic barriers. In an article entitled "The Beautiful American," *The National Observer* quotes him:

"It's an investment in people. It will produce a lot more than some stocks and bonds on Wall Street." Barkley's colleague, John Newton, says of him, "When you meet a guy like Barkley, it makes you realize that there really is a supreme Being, a force for good in the world. There's got to be something that could create a person like him. You can't just believe in nothing when you're around Barkley!"

Dietrich Bonhoeffer summed it up in his testament: "How can success make us arrogant, or failure lead us astray, when we participate in the sufferings of God by living in this world?"

The Power of the People: Personal Responsibility

George W. Romney

I didn't know until just before I arrived in New York City that I had been given a particular subject, and the result is that my thoughts have been going to what I thought was my subject. In the letter I read coming here, I read a theme, "National Priorities and Christian Responsibility," and if I don't say as much about housing as you expect me to it is because I am really more inclined to discuss the broader subject and, I think, more fundamental subject than *just* the subject of housing, although that is a favorite subject and I think it should have a better priority. In any event, as background for what I want to say, I would remind you of what has made America the great nation it is.

When I was with the Secretary of State last Friday night, he said we really don't realize what a tremendous nation this is in relationship to other nations. We don't realize how overwhelming we are as a nation—our tremendous capacity, economically particularly, and the tremendous impact we have on the world. He said that we tend to underestimate the magnitude of our nation. This is a great nation and we do need

to know what made it a great nation. This is a great nation because of what the people have done for themselves not because of what the government has done for the people. We tend to forget that in this particular period. We tend to forget the fact that the men who founded this nation did something unique in history to make it tremendous. These men did not just establish another nation; they established a process in establishing that nation. They established a process that calls for change and provides for change. They recognized that what they were doing, if soundly conceived, would permit us to change as the circumstances change. So, they created a society that was premised fundamentally not on what government would do but on what the people would do. Acting on the basis of religious principles, because the Declaration of Independence is a religious document with a religious foundation, they created a society premised on the fact that we are children of a common Creator and endowed by him with the same inalienable rights and responsibilities. This was the cornerstone. The uniqueness was that they created a society whose progress would depend primarily on what the people do rather than on what the government does.

As the nation evolved on this basic premise, the leadership of government historically adopted policies to encourage the maximum private effort, to encourage the people themselves to undertake the maximum amount of effort, the maximum degree of participation and involvement. Two evidences of this are the Homestead Act which encouraged people to go out and settle this continent, and the building of railroads which, though not undertaken primarily by the government, was undertaken by policies which encouraged private organizations to build railroads. The reliance has continued importantly until recent years, in my opinion.

In the course of our history we have had two important eras in terms of government concept since the writing of the Constitution of the United States. We had a period during which we lacked the sufficient central government following the Articles of Confederation and the nation was saved by the writing of the Constitution. Then we led into a period during which there was uncertainty as to the responsibility of the Federal Government as compared to the states, and the period of states sovereignty and states rights which contributed to the great division that resulted in the Civil War. The nation was preserved as a united nation but since then we have seen the opposite trend. We have seen a constantly increasing concentration of responsibility in the Federal Government—before then the problem was state sovereignty and since then the problem has been the decline in state responsibility, state rights, and local responsibility.

Now, interestingly, we have had a tremendous contrast between our achieving private success as a society and our approaching public problems. One of the unique institutions resulting from our unique concepts of the nation is our economic system. Our economic system is quite different from any other. The American economy is not capitalism, as known in Europe and other parts of the world. We took a different road in developing our nation industrially. In the last century we have adopted a unique set of economic principles very much in line with the basic concepts

on which our nation was founded; namely, the concept of individual responsibility and stimulation of maximum private effort. We adopted some anti-trust laws and we premised the economic development of this nation on the idea that individuals and organizations should be free to produce products and render services that free customers could buy in a free market. But the people would have to operate in competition with each other. Organizations would have to operate in competition with each other. We would rely on competition as the principle means of stimulating economic progress and disciplining economic activity. This resulted in the creation of an economy where the decisions that people make in the marketplace, the daily plebiscite in the marketplace, that basically punishes or rewards those competing to render different services and to sell different products, and, at the same time, disciplines the economy.

The first individual in American economic history who recognized the significance of this distinct economic approach and applied it in a most dramatic way was Henry Ford. Henry Ford recognized that in sharing the progress he made with customers in the form of a better product at lower prices—and even price rebates—and with workers to make customers out of workers, that he would prosper and succeed as he could not do if he pursued a narrow approach. So, despite the fact that his competitors in the automotive industry undertook to throttle him and to control him, he fought off their efforts and proceeded to apply his policy. The result was that he ultimately was producing 60 percent of the automobiles in this country. He dominated the automobile market and successfully demonstrated his philosophy. Some of these inordinate stockholders took him to court as recently as 1922 in Detroit. They said, “You can’t take the profits of an enterprise and share them with anyone but the stockholders.” However, he insisted that if you shared your progress with customers and workers and make customers out of workers, you would be more prosperous than if you did not share your progress. He lost the court suit, but he demonstrated a principle. Now, he was very successful and the Ford Motor Company was growing until it reached the point where a one-man centralized control was no longer successful in running a vast private enterprise. I don’t care what type of organization there is, at some point it hits a stage where the very magnitude of what it is trying to do goes beyond the capacity of a man or a centralized organization to conduct successfully. That is exactly what happened to Ford.

At that point, two men, Alfred P. Sloan and Donaldson Brown of General Motors, recognized, among other things, that one way to be more successful in the automobile business was a decentralized management. So, that is exactly what they did. These two men, Sloan and Brown, who are more responsible than any others for making GM—probably the greatest industrial corporation in the world—what it is today, made the great contribution of the concept of decentralized management. Without this concept, General Motors, IBM, Standard Oil, and other major American companies couldn’t possibly have done what they have been able to do in contributing to the economic miracle of this nation in spite of the many problems in this area.

During this very period of developing decentralized operation of giant economic organizations, we were moving at an increasing speed in the opposite way governmentally. We were constantly shifting the base from the local government to the state government and from the state government to the Federal Government. This process was accelerated by the unfortunate fact that for the past several decades—as a result of the Federal Government's preemption of the bulk of the revenues of this name through the progressive income tax—the bulk of the money has been in Washington. At the same time, the human and social problems which we face today were multiplying at the state and local levels. So, we have more of the problems here and more of the money there. This contributed to the centralization.

Between 1960 and 1968, in the effort to get some of the money in Washington back to the state and local levels, the number of complicated grant-in-aid programs increased from about 35 to somewhere between 500 to 150. It depends on how you define the programs. You can define urban renewal as one program, or you can define it as eight programs—code enforcement, demolition, and quite a few others. In any event, depending on how you define them, there are somewhere between 500 and 1500 of these specific, categorical grant-in-aid programs that state, local, or private organizations have to make application for in order to secure funds for various purposes—all in an effort to filter some money from Washington back to the state and local governments.

Despite the fact that the filtering back of money has increased from \$3 billion in 1960 to \$27 billion in 1970 to \$30 billion in 1971, the problems have multiplied. I am convinced that one of the reasons is that we have continually increased the concentration of the responsibility of dealing with our problems at the Federal level.

Let me give you a personal experience in this respect. I became involved in doing something about Detroit's school needs back in 1956. They asked me to head up a study of the school needs there and they asked the others who participated to do this on the basis of our citizenship responsibility—not as Republicans or Democrats or businessmen or labor leaders. If you stop to think about it, there are only two greater responsibilities that we have as individuals: one, to our Creator, and the other, to our families. Our citizenship responsibility is really thinking in terms of the welfare of others. This nation is founded on the principle of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of all men. There were eight regional committees as well as the central committee; there were 230 of us altogether.

After two years' study, beginning in 1956, we citizens had agreed upon 182 recommendations, two of which represented important financial increases. All of those recommendations were adopted. While in the process of studying how we could meet the financial requirements of education in the city of Detroit, we became convinced that we could not do it *just* in Detroit since Detroit is only one community in a great metropolitan area. There are more people who live outside of Detroit than in the city proper. We decided we would at least need to go to an areawide basis and possibly to a statewide basis to meet those

school needs.

About that time the state was in great difficulty—deadlocked between the governor and the legislature, in part because of the influence of big business in the Republican Party and big labor in the Democratic Party in Michigan. They dominated the two parties and it was just an extension of the bargaining table at the state capitol. Some of us who were concerned about this decided on the basis of our exercise of the ultimate power in this free society—the power of free citizens. And the power of a free citizen is still the most potent influence in this nation, if it is properly used. Look at Ralph Nader as a good example. I don't agree with everything Nader has done, but he has had more influence in terms of improving conditions for the consumer than anybody you can point out in public life. He has done it on the basis of exercising his expertise as a free citizen, doing it in a very intelligent way within the framework of the laws and procedures that we have.

Well, seven of us said, "If citizen power can do something about school needs, why can't we do something about the state's problems? Why can't we solve this deadlock?" So, we organized a bipartisan organization, Citizens for Michigan, and citizens from all walks of life participated. We concluded as the result of extensive study that we needed two things: a new constitution and tax reform. Having gotten started in this, naturally I had to keep working at it and finally found myself in a position where I had to run for governor to get these things done; so, I ran for governor. We did get constitutional revision. We got a modernized constitution. We got tax reform. But I found still that when I reached that level and had the opportunity of influencing state policy that we still couldn't meet the educational requirements of the state effectively because of this excessive concentration of money in Washington and the difficulty of overcoming local resistance to tax action because of the resistance that was building up to the level of taxation.

It was following this clear realization that I attended the National Governors' Conference meeting in Minneapolis in 1965. There, Walter Heller, who was then a member of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers and is now at the University of Minnesota, and Dr. Peckham of Brookings Institute made a presentation about revenue sharing. As I listened I became convinced that this was, as far as I could see, the best way to do something about this imbalance between where the money is and where the problems are. The reason I ran for state office first was because I was concerned about strengthening state and local government. So, at that National Governors' Conference I joined with Warren Hearnes, then governor of Missouri and now chairman of the National Governors' Conference. We introduced a resolution called revenue sharing.

For three years I was chairman of the National Governors' Committee to study this question of revenue sharing. Then, subsequently, I was asked to serve in the Cabinet and then I found myself at the head of one of these Federal departments and I decided that one of the first things I would do was to have some of my associates take a look at these complicated grant-in-aid programs (we have 73 of them in

our department), and to develop a flow chart showing the steps involved in approval of applications for these various programs. I thought they would be back in a matter of a few weeks; they didn't come back for several months. When they came back I realized the list of steps involved in an urban renewal application was twice as long as this table. It took 36 months on the average to approve an urban renewal application! Now, I used to say that these categorical grant-in-aid systems were as complicated as Rube Goldberg's contraptions. Rube Goldberg never conceived of anything as complicated as an application like that! It took a lot of people to do that over a long period of time!

That was only part of it. Through the Model Cities experience which we administer in our department, we made some checks to see how much influence the mayor has over the Federal programs that come into his city. We made a careful study of Oakland, California. You know what percentage of the Federal funds that come into a city like Oakland or New York that a mayor can influence? It's about 15 percent. The rest of it comes in and goes to autonomous, independent agencies like a local housing authority that the mayor doesn't run, or an urban renewal agency that he doesn't run, and in various other ways. I just want to say to you against the background of this private and public experience that I think the President of the United States has proposed exactly what he said he proposed, a revolutionary program—a revolutionary program to return power to the people of the United States. That program consists of revenue sharing.

There are two aspects to the revenue sharing program. One is general revenue sharing. The President has said that instead of going through all this complicated process of trickling a little money back to the state and local units of government, why don't we just send a fixed percentage of the personal income tax back to the state governments and the local governments on the basis of a fixed formula with nobody doing anything other than just figuring out how to divide it up equitably and send it back and let the state and local leaders use it as they think it can be best used? Just use two factors: population and tax effort. That is how the President proposes to send \$5 billion back to state and local units of government—using 1.3 percent of personal income tax collection for that purpose, by 1980 the amount will probably be increased to \$10 billion because of the constant increase in taxes being paid and the economic growth that produces it.

The second thing he said was: Why don't we take about thirty percent (30 percent, using a 500 figure, would be 132) of these categorical assistance programs and consolidate them into six big areas? As far as our department is concerned, urban community development; Health, Education, and Welfare Department, education; the Department of Agriculture, rural community development; Department of Labor, manpower training and development; Department of Commerce, economic development; and the Department of Justice, law enforcement. So, the President said: Let's take \$10 billion now going through these various categorical assistance programs and consolidate them into these six areas. Then, let's send the bulk of that money

back on a fixed percentage basis. In the case of our department, 80 percent of the \$2 billion for urban community development would go back to the cities and communities on the basis of four factors: population, density (overcrowding), substandard housing, and poverty. Those four things would decide how that 80 percent would be distributed on a fixed basis. Let the mayors and city councils decide how this money is going to be used.

If there is anything I have learned as the result of working in Washington twice (once as an aide to a U.S. senator in the fall of 1929 and again as a part of the Nixon administration), I am certain of this: there is no special wisdom in Washington. People are just as smart at your state capitol and in your city as they are in Washington. Your state and city leaders have one great advantage in dealing with problems we face in this nation, they know the problems of your community and your state better than the people in Washington know them. These problems vary all over the land. They are not the same. The people are not the same. No two individuals are alike. From working with individuals you know that you help one individual one way and another, another way. You don't help them all the same way. Cities and states are the same in their diversity.

In addition to the \$10 billion from the categorical assistance, the President said: Let's add \$1 billion. Incidentally in total, what the President is proposing in these two revenue sharing programs, together with the remaining categorical assistance programs, is that in 1972, instead of giving the states and local units of government \$30 billion as in 1971, give them \$38 billion to assist them in dealing with state and local problems. Also give them the freedom to decide how this money is going to be used; that is, the \$16 billion that would be in general revenue sharing and in special revenue sharing. I am convinced that with freedom to use the money in the best way it can be used, we will get a lot more done with a given amount of money.

The President's national priorities are in keeping with this program. One priority is *peace*—to end our involvement in the tragic war in Vietnam. As a result of the steps he has already taken with respect to our foreign policy for the first time in over twenty years we are spending a larger percentage of our Federal budget for domestic human purposes than for military purposes. When this administration took office, 42 percent of the Federal budget was going for military purposes and only 36 percent for domestic purposes. This year that is now reversed—41 percent for domestic purposes and 37 percent for military purposes. This revision of the national priorities has already commenced in terms of how we are using the money in the Federal budget. Now, the second is to *curb inflation*. Let me remind you that both the Vietnam conflict and inflation were inherited. They were there when this administration took office. And three is to *return the power to the people*. This process goes beyond just getting the money back to state and local governments, because this administration recognizes that if we are really going to solve these problems we face in this nation today, we have got again to stimulate the people of this nation to recognize that the progress of the nation depends primarily on what we do individually

and cooperatively with each other.

Woodrow Wilson said that the most powerful force on earth is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people. There is no power on earth superior to the willingness of free citizens to join together to do something that really needs to be done in the interest of fellow human beings. When you take a look at the attitudes in this nation today, one of the things that disturbs me most is that in my lifetime I have seen the basic attitude of the reaction of this people shift fundamentally. In my early manhood as problems were identified within a neighborhood or within a home or within a community or within a state, the first reaction was: What can we do about it? That is no longer the case in this nation. Today the predominant attitude in this nation when some problem is identified is: What is the government going to do about it? And as sure as we are here, if we don't reverse that attitude and get back to the question of what can we do about it, we are going to lose our freedom. As John Kennedy said, "Every time we shift the responsibility from a private area to a government area, freedom shrinks that much." And it does! This concept of decentralization of the governmental responsibility is in order that people can have more influence at the state level. People can reach their governors and state legislators easier than they can reach their people in Washington. People can reach their mayors and city councils. People know more about what is taking place at those levels and they can do something about it easier than they can in Washington. This decentralization of government gives more people an opportunity to do something.

But then, beyond that, we need to recognize again that the basic American ethic is that of personal responsibility. The thing that made this nation was that ultimate power was vested in the hands of the people. Jefferson voiced it well when he said that the only safe depository of the ultimate power of society is the people themselves. If we consider them not sufficiently enlightened to exercise that power with due discretion, the answer is not to take it away from them but to enlighten them. In this age, our principal problems are human and social. Surely, we have some tremendous physical problems. We have a tremendous housing problem. I'm well aware of this! We have some very difficult problems both from the human standpoint and from the social standpoint with great inequities, but, despite that fact, the major problems of this nation are not physical. In his inaugural address, the President referred back to Franklin Delano Roosevelt's inaugural address. (I happened to be standing in front of the capitol and heard Roosevelt's first inaugural address when he said, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself.") When President Nixon took the oath of office, he quoted from Roosevelt's inaugural address made in the midst of the great depression. Roosevelt said that fortunately at that time our problems were not the problems of the spirit but material problems. President Nixon said, "Unfortunately, our problems of today are not material problems, they are problems of the spirit. And a problem of the spirit requires an answer of the spirit."

Now, I have had something to do with trying to deal with mental problems, and educational problems,

and health—and others. I submit that there is no substitute in dealing with the human and social problems we face today superior to the willingness of a person who is able to help someone care enough to help another person help himself. There is no cure superior to that cure! That is an answer of the spirit! That is going the second mile! That is what we have got to have in this country if we are going to deal with the problems! And we have got to accept the decentralization of governmental power—the money and the authority and the responsibility—because it was that division of power that made it possible for the people to be the primary source of progress. And then we have got to reawaken in this country the willingness to involve ourselves and to assume our personal responsibility.

How to Help Shape and Meet National Priorities: The Role of the Minister in the Local Church

J. Herbert Gilmore, Jr.

I have been asked to address myself to "the role of the minister, as he works *within* his own church to help shape and meet national priorities." Within the short time allotted to me, I want to suggest two basic principles. I can do no more than sketch them.

First, the minister must help his people to understand the essential nature and mission of the church. This is the crux of our problem, as I can see it. Much of the ineffectiveness of the church is due to a fundamental misunderstanding of its nature. Moreover, I am persuaded that most of the conflict which rages in church after church is due to an erroneous understanding of the mission of the church.

In 1937, the World Council of Church, under the guidance of Dr. John Mackay, chose as its motto: "Let the Church Be the Church." But what does this mean? There are two biblical descriptions of the Church which help us here. The Apostle Paul refers to the Church as "the Body of Christ" (Eph. 1:22-23; I Cor. 12:27). Some of our finest theologians, taking their cue from this metaphor, have spoken of the Church as "the extension of the Incarnation." How bold is such a figure! The Church is *to be* the life of Christ in the world. Indeed, this is the only place to expect it. The second biblical description of the Church is just as significant. St. Paul speaks of the Church as being the reconciling fellowship (II Cor. 5:19). Some theologians suggest, therefore, that the Church is not only "the extension of the Incarnation," but that it is also "the extension of the Atonement." That is, the Church is *to do* the work of Christ in the world. This is the only society where we may expect a concern to get Christ's work done in the world.

Unless our Church people have such an understanding of the Church, all talk about helping to shape national priorities is comical. Our concept of the Church is too small, too narrow, too restricted. It is the task of the Church to relate Christ to every area of life. Its mission is cosmic redemption. All of life is to be claimed for Christ the Lord. As William Temple puts it in *The Hope of a New World*: "It is a great mistake

to suppose that God is only, or even chiefly, concerned with religion." As the Apostle Paul says so grandly in Ephesians 1:10, the task of the Church "is to sum up all things in Him, things in heaven and things on earth."

Such an understanding prevents the development of a mentality that sets evangelism and social action over against the other. There is one Lord and the Christian is one person. Therefore, evangelism and social action are not at variance, but integral aspects of a Christian whole. While Christian faith is intensely personal, it is never private; it is not "a private affair between a man and his maker." As redeemed persons, who have had a saving experience of Jesus Christ, Christians must be active and diligent as redemptive agents of Christ in the world. They are to be, indeed, salt, and light, and leaven.

To teach our people that the Church is *to be* the life of Christ and *to do* the work of Christ in the world, provides the foundation on which the Church can address itself to the grievous social ills which afflict our nation. It makes possible the attitude necessary to innovate in meeting the needs of people in a given community. Such ministry addresses itself to *the whole man* in the name of Christ. This kind of ministry is limited only by the imagination and vision of those who would serve. Human need, whatever its nature—physical, mental, emotional, racial, or cultural—is recognized as being within the concern of Christ's Church.

If the Church is to help shape and meet national priorities, it is imperative that our people have an adequate theological grounding in the nature and mission of the church. The social action of the Church must spring from authentic Christian theological motivation, not merely from societal needs or humanistic philanthropy.

In the second place, the minister must have a new image of himself and his role if he is to help his church shape and meet national priorities. The ministry is "the perplexed profession." An identity crisis haunts us. An "uncertain sound" marks much of our preaching. While the witness of the Church is the responsibility of every member, it is axiomatic that the Church is not likely to rise above the level of its pastoral leadership. I want to call attention to two fundamental assumptions which the minister must hold, as I understand it, if he is to be effective as a church leader helping to shape and meet national priorities.

1. *The Minister Must Believe in the Priority and Relevance of Preaching.*

It is imperative that the minister recover his prophetic role. It is dismaying, and bodes ill for the future of the Church, to note that many ministers do not really believe in preaching. They are not sure of its efficacy. It is relegated to a secondary place. It is my conviction, however, that it is our greatest need. I would make a plea that we recover the exalted role of the pulpit as described by Herman Melville. In his great classic, *Moby Dick*, he writes:

What could be more full of meaning?

—for the pulpit is ever this earth's foremost part:
all the rest comes in its rear;
the pulpit leads the world.

From thence it is the storm of God's quick wrath
is first described,

and the bow must bear the earliest brunt.

From thence it is the God of breezes fair or foul
is invoked for favorable winds.

Yes, the world's a ship on its passage out,
and not a voyage complete;
and the pulpit is its prow!

This is an accurate account of what authentic preaching should be. Such an understanding has burning relevance for shaping and meeting our national priorities. Such preaching sees the pitfalls and dangers before others see them, and sounds the note of danger in time. It has a mandate to keep the ship of life on a straight course. The preacher is to be in the prow exposed to the dangers, not safely removed from the crises that threaten the ship of life.

2. *He Must Be a Man of Utter Integrity.*

John Ruskin, in *Unto This Last*, speaks of "five great intellectual professions relating to daily life."

—The soldier's profession is to defend it.

—The pastor's profession is to teach it.

—The physician's profession is to keep it in health.

—The lawyer's profession is to enforce justice in it.

—The merchant's profession is to provide for it.

He goes on to say that "on due occasion each man must be willing to die for his profession."

—The soldier, rather than leave his post in battle.

—The physician, rather than leave his post in plague.

—The pastor, rather than teach falsehood.

—The lawyer, rather than countenance injustice.

—The merchant—what is his due occasion of death?

Ruskin is saying that the minister has an ultimate obligation to truth, and will die rather than violate it, stifle it, or deny it. He must speak the truth or die. To do otherwise is to sell his soul and violate his integrity. No man has a right to preach the Gospel of Christ unless he is willing to die for it.

He ought to have the reputation, not only within his congregation, but in the community, that he is honest and will speak the truth without fear or favor. The evil interests should view him apprehensively. Selfish exploiters should fear him. The City Council should say: "What will he think about this ordinance?"

The church, inspired and taught by the minister, should be the conscience of the community and the nation. It is a moral and spiritual pressure group, but expects no rewards or favors.

Integrity saves a minister from automatically associating himself with radical movements. He recognizes that just because something is new does not necessarily mean that it is good. It may be only a fad. The Athenians are still with us. On the other hand, such integrity saves a minister from identifying with reactionary movements. He understands that just because something is *old*, it does not prove it is *good*.

There are times when the minister will appear radical, because he challenges established customs and prejudices in the name of Christ. And there are times when he will appear conservative, because he is unwilling to throw aside vital principles.

The Christian minister's task is to preach the truth of Christ, compassionately, intelligently, and redemptively, up to the limit of his vision, and let God do

with it what he wills. For when the preacher withholds the truth, he knows he is a false prophet. He is not given light to hide, but to illumine. Only as we are ministers of utter integrity and truth is there any hope for the divine invasion of Christ's Spirit in the Church and in the nation. True to his high calling, the minister can have a significant role in helping to shape and meet national priorities—through his Church.

The summary of the matter is this: the minister who helps to enlarge his people's understanding of the nature and task of the Church, by every means at his disposal, by word and deed, and by his prophetic and compassionate preaching makes them aware of the real issues to be confronted, will make it possible for his Church to make a real contribution in shaping and meeting national priorities. The Church at the local level then will be mobilized to grapple with the real issues in the light of commitment to Christ.

How to Help Shape and Meet National Priorities: The Role of Christian Education

Robert L. Yates

A "sleeping giant" exists in most of our churches today, a giant which has the potential to come alive in an exciting, stimulating, and even troubling way. The giant is the ministry of Christian education. It exists as a potential—and real—force for growth and change and good.

The supreme object of Christian education is to enable persons to become aware of God as his seeking love is revealed in Jesus Christ, to respond to God in a personal faith commitment, to strive to follow him in the full meaning of Christian discipleship, and to live in conscious recognition of the guidance and power of the Holy Spirit, in order that they might grow to Christian maturity as children of God, live in accordance with the will of God and sustain a vital relationship both to the Christian community and to the world community in which they live. In brief, the task of Christian education implies change and growth, not only in one's spiritual life and relationships, but in every relationship and in all of life.

The time is long past to awaken the giant. In isolated and encouraging situations around our land, churches are engaged in creative ventures in Christian education. But in the majority of cases, we are still toying and tinkering with teaching and training while the world spins wildly on its way to hell! The times cry out for honest confrontation through learning experiences. Too often we are content with meeting to share "Sunday School answers" about inconsequential problems.

I want to share some general ideas and suggest specific practical applications concerning the topics we have considered during this seminar. The temptation here is to speak ideally about what ought to be. We all know that back home things are not ideal. I cannot say that I've tried everything which I am about to suggest. We've done some things in our church which have been significant; we've had some colossal flops. We may never involve ourselves as a church in some ventures which I, personally, feel would be

helpful, but we're trying to be a ministering, worshipping, growing congregation.

The educational ministry of the local church should be developed in such a way as to present life as a whole, a totality. Through such an approach, people ought to become aware that the religion-secular dichotomy is, in fact, an erroneous concept. A valid educational ministry would approach all of God's creation from the vantage point of Christian love and concern.

Christian education must concern itself far beyond the idea of meeting to discuss, to talk, to learn. Education, to be meaningful, must include some degree of task orientation. What we learn in groups will be carried out in life and in our response to life or else, in fact, we have not learned. All forms of education have made us aware that the ultimate change must take place "where the water hits the wheel." Thus, our learning, growing groups cannot become ends in themselves. They should be structured in such a way as to be means to greater ends—to meet the multifaceted needs of persons in every arena of life.

A major goal in Christian education should be that our learning shall seek expression in at least two ways. There are some things which we ought to do as a church, or as a church group. At the same time, Christian education must prepare and continuously revitalize people to live responsible lives as individuals. Sometimes, the group must act as a group. At other times, it will be more important to respond on a personal basis as a lawyer, a physician, a student, a merchant, a laborer, a housewife, a farmer, an educator, a scientist.

What has been said certainly implies the fact that we must make maximum use of the best possible resources available. If our learning is to be effective we must seek the assistance of qualified resource persons, both in and out of the church. The books, the materials, the curriculum plans we use should be second to none. We must develop the maturity and the ability to cooperate in educational opportunities in a spirit of true ecumenicity, realizing the value of corporate growth and ministry with fellow Christians.

The small group approach to learning—as, indeed, to virtually every aspect of a church's life—has proven its own worth. Indeed, it may not be an overstatement to say that the salvation of a congregation is dependent upon small groups as much as upon a corporate life.

One means of dealing with questions such as those we have considered here is through study groups, limited in time and in scope. Such groups, for example, might meet on consecutive Sunday evenings, on each evening for a week, or in retreat settings. A curriculum should be developed for such specialized groups. This should be a fundamental task of the minister of education in cooperation with capable church members, possibly with an education committee or council. Since most of our churches do not have a minister of education, the pastor or a concerned lay person may have to originate and direct such an approach.

Learning groups can be developed to provide opportunities to hear and communicate with other persons and groups. Such groups should involve persons across lines of race, age, sex, social status, ethnic groups, etc. This could be done, with creative initiative, all the way from Sunday School and Vacation

Bible School to specially structured groups of any age. In such groups the leader may assign individual study and research, with reports being made back to the group. The assignments will take those persons into direct confrontation with local, state, and national problems.

One valuable contribution would be for the local church to develop and provide ways and means—including monetary funding—to involve more than just staff personnel in learning opportunities beyond the local church level. Churches could benefit, also, from cooperative endeavors involving people and resources from two or more churches in a common project of study and action. This same approach might be accomplished on certain occasions through the district associations. Workshops and seminars might prove much more beneficial than some of our traditional associational meetings.

Since preaching and teaching are so inseparably linked, we should consider a greater use of creative approaches to worship which involve the worshipers more in dialogue with the preacher-teacher. This could be especially helpful in areas such as those considered in this seminar.

To turn our attention briefly to the persons we call ministers of education, suffice it to say that we ought to give to them the opportunity to be, in fact, educators. All too often the minister of education becomes the church "flunky," involved in so many other responsibilities that he cannot give real, creative guidance to the educational ministry. This, however, is a two-way street. Often the church is at fault. Too often, however, the minister of education is content to be placed in such a role since it saves him from the exacting task of being an educator. Too many are satisfied with, or are capable of nothing beyond, mediocrity in the educational life of their churches. The church and its minister of education should have a clear, mutual understanding of his role, and foremost in that role should be his responsibility to the educational ministry of the church.

In conclusion, the church must be willing to risk its very existence for the sake of bringing the gospel into honest confrontation with the needs of humanity. We have to recognize, realistically, the reluctance of most people to change. The old and tried and true is comfortable, even if it doesn't get the job done. And we must cope with that reluctance. At the same time, we cannot drag our feet except at the cost of being left in the dust by those who are willing to risk much or all for the sake of meaningful growth and change. The temptation is really to seek other avenues of expression since the church moves so slowly. The church can be a powerful change agent. It is our responsibility, along with our fellow Christians in thousands of churches, to maintain communion with the Lord of the church and to sustain the sort of forgiving, accepting fellowship which makes growth possible.

How to Help Shape and Meet National Priorities:

A Layman's View

Walker Knight

Whenever I am conscious of worry over national

priorities, I frame my worry in the context of problems. Let me share these with you today.

Problem number 1: How to be effective in the tension between identification with society as it now is and the initiation of change toward needed priorities?

I want to discuss this from the standpoint of those of us who see ourselves in some leadership role, for it is basically the dilemma of every leader—that of maintaining an effective tension between acceptance and change.

Too many of us hold rather naive views of power and authority and chafe under the necessities which realism imposes. We want to be the flaming prophets pointing out the sins of society and the sins of the people of God, but at the same time we demand and need love and acceptance by these people and their institutions. Or we have need for martyrdom and somehow force an unneeded crucifixion.

In a recent student conference, a gifted educator was asked what he would do if he were pastor of a Baptist church. His answer was, "The first thing I would do would be to get another job so I could speak with freedom." I submit that this is a naive layman's view of power and authority within any institution, and how a person is financed speaks only to that person's insecurity, not to his effectiveness or his freedom to speak.

A leader's power to change people depends almost equally upon the correctness of his position and his acceptance by the people he seeks to change. As we gain acceptance and trust from the people, we increase our ability to change them. As we exercise this power (as we seek to change them), we lose some measure of acceptance, especially from those unwilling to change.

The reason many groups never make significant change is that (1) acceptance is withheld from the leader, (2) the leader does not initiate change in order to keep the acceptance he has, or (3) some other subgroup within the group has a greater authority or acceptance.

The tragedy is that most of us spend our lives seeking to gain the acceptance or authority, then we never exercise it, but strive only for larger and larger areas of acceptance. Maybe there is a reverse side to this, that some of us have fashioned our theology of failure so well that we can justify our unloving and critical spirits, and we can justify closing our own minds to the contribution that the other position might make to us. John Stuart Mills makes the point that even a wrong opinion may contain a grain of truth necessary for finding the whole truth.

Problem number 2: How do we enable the laity to understand and to articulate the assumptions under which they live?

Many of us actually think we believe one thing but in practice we operate under a different assumption altogether. For example, CBS took a representative sample of Americans as to their support of the basic freedoms of the Bill of Rights, and a majority would not support them if stated in terms of current problems. Such as freedom of the press: "Except in time of war, do you think newspapers, radio, and television should have the right to report any story, even if the govern-

ment feels its harmful to our national interest?" "No," said 55 percent.

Baptists are the same. We have institutionalized our hypocrisies and taught our children when they should practice what we preach, and when they should not. However, we are not unique. This is the way with all societies. Such hypocrisies are seldom challenged in the slow moving society, but rapid change strips away the veneer and we stand exposed.

I firmly believe that we must create peer group association where the individual undertakes a quest for the truth, begins to articulate his basic assumptions without polarization, and where he is challenged by someone to whom he gives some measure of acceptance. We have much to learn of the role of groups in attitude formation and change. Most of us fail because we place more weight upon the power of our preaching and writing than they can bear. We must create forums for an exchange of comment and criticism, while at the same time we participate in presenting and clarifying the goals and values we hold as Christians.

Especially do we have a need to include the future—the youth—into the decision-making and executive processes of our institutions: churches, denominations, and nation. Today's youth have been both cursed and blessed by being the recipients of what Kenniston calls an extended period of adolescence, where youth are disengaged from society to as late as 25 years for education. This is the unique creation of today's developed society. In the process, we have encouraged them to internalize the highest of our values. They have become not less moral but have reached toward an idealism we never thought anyone in their right mind would accept. They have become our severest critics, and here we stand, our hypocrisies exposed, crying peace while we wage war, calling for love while we reject the poor, calling for economic justice while we count our offerings.

We need to give them a position of engagement, not to blunt their idealism by reality, but to make their participation more meaningful and more understanding, less the unloving critic and more the critical lover.

Problem number 3: *How can we devise a system in which the people are given a sense of participating in the future?*

Everyone is future conscious. Books roll off the press writing of future shock, the technological society, the new world view, the year 2000. We are told that we can now actually design our future, we can live with intentionality. And we need to. As Robert Merton says, we are presently cursed with a civilization committed to the quest for continually improved means to carelessly examined ends.

Somehow a breakthrough is needed. George Schweitzer recently overwhelmed an audience with a detailed probing into the problems of power, population, poverty, pollution, and politics. It was a depressing, realistic picture. He then said he was a wild, naive optimist, and that maybe the definition of the Christian in the future is one who believes in the possibility of breakthrough. What if, he said, the pollution of streams with mercury and the increased production of plastic cups which would not deteriorate became intolerable. Then it was found that the cups would absorb the mercury: a breakthrough.

I have found that most people give of themselves in almost the same degree to which they feel that they have a voice in shaping their institutions, and to the degree that their institutions are oriented to their basic assumptions.

I want to endorse a concept tossed out by Allan Toffler in *Future Shock*.

We have heard much of participatory democracy, and Toffler carries it one step further to anticipatory democracy, calling for more advanced—and more democratic—feedback mechanisms. We have our priorities, goals, and values set by an elite few (they assume the right to set goals but are unable to gain commitment to them).

"As interdependency grows, smaller and smaller groups within society achieve greater and greater power for critical disruption. Moreover, as the rate of change speeds up, the length of time in which they can be ignored shrinks to near nothingness."

Toffler says we need to open the system up, bringing them in as partners—a breakthrough in popular democracy, and a reassessment not by politicians, sociologists, clergy, or technicians, but by the people.

Let us convene "social future assemblies" with cross sections of society in each neighborhood and city, called into being at regular intervals to be town halls of the future, where millions help shape their own distant destinies.

My first reaction was that Toffler cries with an idealism impossible to implement. But when I read his proposal for the input of technical staff, and coherent statements of priorities, he proposes not glorified "talkfests" but the development of games which aid in the clarification of values.

How to Shape and Meet National Priorities:

Perspective—The Pastor in the Community and Denomination

Jimmy R. Allen

The great American philosopher, Pogo, has said, "The only trouble with America is that we are surrounded by insurmountable opportunities." I have the trapped feeling in this conference as we have listened and grappled with the avalanche of needs, critiques, and injustices that the probing question is "What is to be done and where are the handles with which to do it?" I want to concentrate with you, not on the "what is to be done" aspect, but about "how we can do it, what kind of thing we can do to find our own 'thing,' our own handle."

When the Peace Corps was first started, it was kind of a fresh dream. There was a 52-year-old Detroit school teacher named Madge Shipp who volunteered. She was sent to a little, tiny island where she was the only American. Somebody asked her why she left her place of security to give herself in this kind of ministry. And she said, "When I look at the big, complicated problems of our world, I find myself unable to understand them, much less to solve them. I want to break them down into little tiny fragments and find a piece that I can hold in my own two hands. And I want to work on that."

I want to talk to you about the fragment I have been holding in my hands these days, of the kind of shaping of priorities, the kind of problems we have been grappling with, and share a few of the insights that I have discovered in these past three years. Three years ago I faced the decision that led me to move to what, to me, constituted the front line of the struggle to shape priorities—the local church in the heart of the city. It was not an easy decision because the tasks of the Texas Christian Life Commission were exciting and rewarding. The creation of tension in the area of relevant and practical Christianity and in social actions provided a platform for contributing to shaping priorities among Southern Baptists. I enjoyed it—even the tumultuous days of conflict which inevitably found me with my adrenalin pumping and I really enjoyed this kind of thing. But there were a combination of factors, including a pragmatic bent toward action, a growing conviction that the ultimate battle for the gospel will be won or lost for our kind of culture in the cities, and a profound belief that God was guiding me to the pastorate of a downtown church in the nation's poorest and thirteenth largest city. This caused me to shift and pick up another fragment in my own hands.

In order to examine some of the challenges of becoming an opinion-maker and a priority-shaper in a community or in a denomination, I want to start where we have to start—with the congregation-pastor relationship. It seems to me that while no two congregations are alike and no two cultures are alike, some basic conditions must exist for a pastor to meet the challenge of being a priority-shaper in the milieu outside his congregation.

In the first place, there must be a conviction that Jesus is alive and at work in lives. He is at work creating aliveness in churches, even in the acculturated churches that we have allowed to develop. The meeting of the needs of the human spirit through the preaching of the Bible as authoritative and the warm fellowship of evangelistic concern are essential to the task of priority-shaping. *The reason is that the deepest and most pressing priority in American life lies rooted in a sickness of the human spirit . . . a sickness that can only be met by the Spirit of God.* It is out of this kind of atmosphere that confidence can be created and the freedom to act out convictions can be guaranteed. Contrary to many opinions, I believe that the minister of the gospel of Jesus Christ is the freest man in America. He doesn't work for a church. He works for God and because he does that he finds himself with a sense of inner security which allows him to be as free-wheeling as he decides he is called to be. He can do whatever he decides is important to him, whatever his conscience drives him to do. He builds his own prison cells out of the apprehension of the possible reactions of people.

The second thing is that there must be a high profile of concern for human need. There must be a genuineness of caring for "hurting" people demonstrated in actions of service to bring credibility to our claims as well as to open doors for community impact. The primary purpose of a medical clinic, or a tutoring program, or a day-care ministry, or a literacy program (such as we have been involved in in the last two or three years) should center in the showing of the love of Christ. However, a by-product of that concern

is the opening of doors of opportunity for community leadership and for priority shaping.

In our case, for instance, when we tried to map out the grand design of what the First Baptist Church, San Antonio, ought to be doing in meeting human needs, we interviewed fifty-five social agencies and asked them: Where are the gaps? Where are the places where a group of volunteers motivated by the love of Christ, unapologetically doing their "thing" in his name, can move in and not duplicate what is being done? Well, in the first place, it gave us the information with which to do our praying and to set our priorities. But in the second place, it gave the realization to the community leaders that these people are going to be at the task of doing the kinds of things that are deeply related to human need. And as a result, we found ourselves with doors open all around us for shaping priorities in our community. We also found a couple of other things: (1) That social ministries which expose Christians to the raw human need in which they get their own hands dirty create a climate, an atmosphere of questioning and concern which drives them to concerns for social action. This ministry is direct help at the foot of the cliff. It is not just one option. You find yourself, when you get there, wanting to find some way to build the fences at the top of the cliff. And so this type of interaction is one of the creative ways in which we can help shape priorities within a congregation. (2) When people discover that you really care, they beat a path to your door and they give you the opportunity to serve in your community.

Strategy for Shaping Community Priorities

First, I would like to just jump into two or three of those and then into two or three about the denomination, and then we will be ready for our discussion period.

In the first place, I think *every man must find his own "thing" in the way of community leadership.* Every good cause is eager for working hands and service, so, a pastor should discover what is going on in his community, in those things in which he believes, and then he will want to give some priority and energy to those things. In my own instance, the Community Welfare Council of our city, a kind of planning agency, was in the midst of a priority study of the social ministries of the total city of San Antonio. Getting into that study by spending time with it for a year, I found myself becoming aware of what was going on in the city of San Antonio. It was an educational process for me. I also found myself ending up as the chairman of the Implementation Committee which allowed me to set up and put into motion the citizen's task forces to work on such things as illiteracy problems, on recreation, on financial assistance and all this sort of thing. It puts you right where the action is because here is an open door through which, if you are ready to do your homework, you will find an entrance to do plenty in the community as a shaper of priorities. By participating in this kind of thing, we find our place and then we do what we feel is important if we are willing to get on the line for it.

Another strategy is to utilize the mass communication media. The mass media provide a tremendous opportunity for pastors who don't hesitate to take a stand on an issue. Newspapers often are open for a religious

column. Why not, instead of writing just a devotional column, attack the issues of the day with a moral conscience, with a religious input. Speak to what is going on in a way that says from a Christian's perspective that this is the kind of thing that ought to be thought of and said. The interesting thing, as I've found in my own situation, is that not only was this the kind of thing that caused more than forty newspapers to pick up a column but it also provided an excellent platform back in my congregation. As they read in the daily newspaper what their pastor was saying on a particular crucial and controversial issue, they found themselves in a position to talk about it and to talk with me about it. You have a constant informal education program going which doesn't have any kind of meeting place or meeting room, it's just the atmosphere in which it's socially approved within the congregation to talk about a controversial thing. Cuss the pastor if you want to, but you are talking about the right kind of issues.

Now, it seems to me that this kind of thing is one strategy that ought to be used by many of us who find ourselves looking for some opportunity to examine the issues of our day. The television ministry is the same kind of thing. With a group of teen-agers, we work through issues every week in a thirty-minute television program. Actually, the show is at the wrong time of day for teen-agers to watch it, you know. So (don't tell anybody), we really are trying to educate the adults of our city and of our church. All the adults want to know what the teen-agers think. So by taping these kinds of programs on current issues, the adults listen, talk about them, learn. The kids are still asleep at that time of morning; so, you have to get to them some other way.

Now, it also seems to me that a *cause-oriented political action* is a part of this whole picture. Pastors, both historically and biblically, are charged with responsibility to participate in and to speak on political actions. Caution has to be exercised concerning partisan politics, but it should be clearly communicated that men of religious convictions cannot remain uninvolved in the issues affecting human life. A pastor has to work out his own judgments on his priorities and his techniques and his timing. But he can spread himself too thin in this kind of involvement. However, he should create communication with elected public officials which will open the way for him to speak to their conscience and to support moral principles as they fashion political decisions.

Strategy for Shaping Denominational Priorities

A searing indictment has to be made here concerning pastors who are unwilling to pay the price to become involved in denominational politics while sitting around cynically indicting the ecclesiastical system for its lack of sensitivity to the real issues of our world. All pastors are busy. The so-called priestly functions of ministering to the needs of individuals in congregations are absorbing enough to provide ample reason for rejecting involvement in denominational power struggles over programs. The drainage of leadership of spiritually sensitive, alert, and able pastors from the arena of denominational affairs because they are unwilling to do their political homework and to pay the price to be heard often leaves a vacuum filled with crony poli-

ticians maneuvering a system largely insensitive to the real issues of our world.

Pay the price of going to the meetings. Pay the price of meeting and knowing the people. People do not follow folks they do not know. Pay the price of fulfilling responsibilities. Committee assignments and other responsibilities may be gallingly detailed but the fact is that these things open the door for priority-shaping and for decision-making down the road. Pay the price of learning the system. All groups have a system. Doing our homework is essential if good and thoughtful men are to go ahead to fill the places of priority-shaping. If we are too busy to learn how the system works and to earn our way to a place of responsibility, we have no grounds for complaint when the system fails to shape priorities which our conscience demands.

Speak to the issues in the denominational media. Thoughtful articles for publication in denominational press, messages from denominational platforms, and so forth, create an atmosphere of concern for the priorities that we are trying to shape. For instance, in our particular state convention, we examined the urban challenge and authorized a committee to study the total urban strategy to reorder priorities among Texas Baptists to get to these pressing urban needs. I don't know what is going to come out of it, but it is one of the most exciting kinds of developments we have had happen recently and it came out of the messages brought to the state convention by people of great compassion and skill. The fact is that we are a feeling kind of people. Baptists especially are a feeling kind of people and if we are going to sit around thinking that we are going to philosophize our way through to priorities, we have missed it. You really get Baptists to move when you get a gut-level response to the real needs of people for whom Jesus died. It seems to me that when we get to the realization that we really create this with a farm fellowship of worship of our Lord Jesus and then put that into the rational input of where the needs are, we have the finest kind of combination with which to work. It seems to me, also, that whatever the fragment is in our hand, we need to check our priorities from time to time to see what we are doing with it in our own personal lives as well as within our congregation and our denomination.

Down in San Antonio we just had an epidemic of diptheria. It truly was a kind of frightening thing because our little medical clinic was to have innoculated people against diptheria months ago. And then we had an epidemic. It took us two weeks to decide that we had an epidemic because the county health officer was out of town on vacation and he was the only one who could tell us we had one. He was interviewed to find out. They said, "Look, didn't you have any idea that there might be an epidemic of diptheria break loose in the city of San Antonio?" He said, "Well, the fact is we did. In fact, last spring," he said, "we worked out a whole plan for innoculating all of the people of San Antonio for diptheria. But then we got so busy filling out our budget requests that we never did get around to the innoculation campaign."

When I read the thing, I found myself just as indignant as I could be. I found myself all uptight and then I got to thinking about Baptists . . . !

National Priorities and International Responsibility

George Bush

First, let me tell you how very pleased I am to be here and I mean this in more ways than one. When I got off the elevator and was hustled into that typically busy area known as "the coffee break place," I heard many familiar Texas accents for the very first time in my two days in New York in this awesome new job; so, there was a certainly feeling of "at home" that emanated from the coffee bar just by one's presence there. And secondly, if there is ever a job that from time to time will call for some spiritual reinforcement, it is the job I have just undertaken as the Ambassador to the United Nations.

I look around and see some very eminent leaders here, not only in theology but in helping people to be reinforced by something other than their own accomplishments, or lack thereof. I think it will be very useful to me and to the other 125 ambassadors to the United Nations if we could stick around and have some of your dedication rub off on each of us—dedication not to yourselves but to something of higher value. So, I am very pleased, indeed, to be here.

People say to me, "Well, what's your new job like? Do you like it? Is it going to be challenging?" It's kind of like the two monkeys who were fired off in the rocket in the early days of the space program. They were pretty bright monkeys; they had been trained a long time for the assignment. When they were shot straight up into the air and were up about 90,000 feet, they looked down to see the earth disappearing from their view. One of them turned to the other and said, "This is a miserable way to make a living, isn't it?" The other monkey took off his oxygen mask and said, "Yes, but it beats the heck out of the cancer research lab."

I arrived down the street at a very critical time in the negotiations on the Middle East. I feel somewhat inhibited! I was asked to talk about something else anyway, but for those of you who have not followed this tremendously important subject, we are at a very crucial time. Each of us shares the hope that whatever we do in the next 24 hours or the next 48 hours (we are facing, as you know, a cease-fire deadline on March 7) that the conscience of those who believe in a superior being will prevail and that we will, indeed, find a way to keep one other corner of the world from commencing warfare. This is our goal; this is the challenge of working at the United Nations. It just so happens that I have landed there at a very, very critical time.

I think it would be fair to report to you regarding the Middle East that I have been most impressed, in the short time that I have been there, with this similar concern of other ambassadors with whom I have been dealing, with the obvious concern of the Secretary General (and I have met with him about four times in the last two days), and with the dedication and the devotion and the steadfastness of Ambassador Jarring. He is a man of great patience. He is a man who, through careful and thoughtful and considerate appraisals of other people involved in this sometimes insoluble dispute, just through belief and through convictions for peace, has done a masterful job. We

support him in his efforts to bring a lasting peace to the Middle East. I just wish that he could be here because I think you would sense this deep conviction that the world needs so badly right now.

Lest you be concerned about the number of pages that I have here from which to deliver my epoch speech, I want to assure you that it is double-spaced. I have in mind what I think was a constructive criticism when I finished a political speech in Texas this year. A man said, "George, your speech reminded me of the story of the boy who went to church with his grandmother. He said, 'Grandmother, what are all those flags along the side of the church there?' And she said, 'Oh, they are in honor of those who died in the service.' He said, 'Oh really, the 9 o'clock, or the 11 o'clock service?'" I don't mean to be offensive to any of you ministers here, but I got the message. I hope I won't have to get it again. Maybe some of you can get the message here.

I was asked to talk about "National Priorities and International Responsibility." I thought for a long time about what that meant and I elect to interpret that it is how some of the things that we are concerned with in our domestic politics or lives are being worked on, implemented, and discussed in the international forum. And I think we would agree that the United Nations is best known to the general public by its successes, and there have been some. I think each of us with our frustrations about this body sometimes are inclined to emphasize the failures, and certainly there have been some. This is because the promises of 1948 overstated the case for the United Nations and it got the hopes of our nation and of the world so high that it was almost impossible to live up to those promises. This body is probably not so well known for its degree of involvement in a whole spectrum of activity—economic, social, scientific, political—many of which coincide with some of the problems which you've been discussing here today, items of the U.S. Government, both international and domestic.

President Nixon has spelled out what I consider to be bold initiatives in coming to grips with many of these domestic problems. You have heard about some of them. You have heard the debate. You have heard the pros and cons on it. You happen to have before you a man who is an advocate, a believer in many of the policies that we have taken as we've tried to reorder our domestic priorities. President Nixon has awakened our nation to the fact that we've got to reorder. One of the things that appalled me at the time of the Cambodian incursion last year was that in the agony of the debate each of us who criticized—and surely that's the right in this country—seemed to lose sight of the fact that the President was indeed reordering our priorities. For example, for the very first time an administration had been spending more on domestic ills, on human needs, than on the war and this maybe was a kind of methodical and tiny process. But it is there—the numbers are there—the truth is there and because of the agony over the war, many are unwilling to recognize that this reordering of priorities has started. It has not gone as far as it should but the President has taken a bold step in reordering our budgetary priorities.

I commend the young people because, as a recent member of Congress, I can tell you that their initiatives

in the field of environment, for example, have really resulted in action. The nation has been demanding action and is getting it in many of these fields. I think that this citizen participation has compelled politicians, and statesmen to find new answers to this perplexing old problem. I'm not one who agrees, however, with the approach of pessimists who decry our world as an unlivable world. I just don't feel that negatively! They are defeated, it seems to me, before they try to solve problems. They have no faith in their country, no faith in the community of nations, no faith in their God. The answer lies, of course, not in abject, discouraged, withdrawing, selfish criticism; but in participation. It lies in enthusiastic efforts to change the world. You don't change the world overnight! My heavens, as I look at the U.N., there is plenty of need for improvement and I can't wait to get this Middle East thing out of the way to start in on some of the ideas that I feel strongly about in terms of improvement. But I am not going to let the need for improvement and change obscure the basic strength of the United Nations or of our country.

When we come to grips with these problems, it is like the story of the Baptist layman who sat in the front row at church and by the time the minister got through with his sermon, this man would get so emotionally involved that he would say, "Use me, Lord. Oh, use me, Lord." Each Sunday he said this over and over again until finally after about the tenth week, the minister thought, "Well, we'd better use this guy." So the minister called him up after the sermon that Sunday and said, "Look, the Lord has decided to use you in what I hope you will feel is a constructive way. The Sunday School seats all need to be sanded down and refinished and it would be very useful if you would consider participating in this as part of the Lord's work." Well, the man somewhat reluctantly went off to his new assignment and performed it, much to the surprise of the minister. The next Sunday, the man was in the front row at church as usual. When the minister finished a stem-winding speech, he wondered what the man's reaction would be. Sure enough, the man jumped up and said, "Use me, Lord. Oh, use me, Lord, but," he added, "use me in an advisory capacity."

When I think of the criticizers, the negativists, the defeatists, I think of those who see a problem so great that its immediate solution escapes them and they are inclined to withdraw into a shell. We have tried the experimentation of violence.

Last night, right in this city, when I got home about 11 o'clock from a dinner with a French Ambassador, Mr. Jarring, and others, I had a telephone call and a voice said, "Somebody threw a bomb at the Iraqi Embassy." Now look, let's lay down some perimeters for expressing our concern at the system. *This* Ambassador to the United Nations, to the degree I have anything to say about it, will not condone such action. Certainly an individual can do something about it but this is not a legitimate way to express oneself, even if it is the Soviet Embassy. Each person in his own heart must feel awful about this. There is no way that this country can have each individual superimpose his standard on how to change and improve things in society as a whole. If it is the Iraqi Embassy, or the Soviet Embassy, or no matter what it might be, as an

Ambassador from all of you to the United Nations, I am going to stand up and say that we will not stand for this kind of protest.

I called to express my regrets to the Iraqi Ambassador last night and talked to a terrified young girl at his house. She has three children and lives there in the Iraqi Mission. She was terrified by a dastardly, cowardly act, a distorted sense of value, coming from a person who probably was feeling deep down in his heart, "I'm going to effect change." Maybe the act was related to the oppression of minorities. Maybe there's a little light of understanding, but we cannot, *we cannot*, condone this kind of tactic, this kind of participation. I love the political arena, all the critics notwithstanding and all the skepticism of the young aside. It is, as Teddy Roosevelt called it, "the arena" and it is a fantastic place for those of you who are depressed about the system. I urge you to save some time for participation in this arena.

I was appointed by the President to the U.N. job and here too I find that there has been a reordering of priorities. Our national priorities are no longer just national now. Alan Shephard, from my hometown, and Neil Armstrong say they get an unusual perspective of this world when they are far removed from it. In a world this tightly tied together the priority problems of one country, talking in terms of decades perhaps, soon become the priority problems of another. Just to give you an idea of how these things interrelate, I brought with me today the agenda for our next Economic and Social Council meeting. Here are some of the items: Social Development, Outflow of Trained Personnel from Developing to Developed Countries, Capital Punishment, Human Rights, Report of the International Narcotics Control Board, Natural Resources, Transport Development, and Science Technology.

ECOSOC, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations representing 126 nations, is right in the middle now of reordering these priorities.

Let me just comment on four "international" priority items to give you a little feel for this great program. I didn't realize this depth before I was thoroughly briefed and came here.

1. *Narcotics*

Narcotics is a field that concerns the church and Congress, one that concerns every family in America. The United Nations has been involved for many years in the research activities that are essential if we are going to define this drug problem factually for the young people of this world so that we can respond. They say, "You can take a drink; therefore, it's alright for me to do something else." The whole research thing is under intensive consideration in the United Nations. A comprehensive United Nations Convention on Psychotropic Substances was signed in Vienna, Austria on February 21, 1971, after six weeks of negotiations by some 55 to 60 countries. Perhaps the most important element of the U.N. program was the decision taken by ECOSOC last November to establish a United Nations fund for drug abuse control. The fund would be used to expand—what I really think is the most important element—the research and information facilities of the United Nations, to plan and implement technical assistance programs, and to enlarge the capabilities and

extend the operations (the delivery systems for these teachings) of the U.N. bodies.

2. Population Control

Again, largely at the United States' initiative—and we're not talking about mandatory control, we're not dictating to the conscience of a man just how big his family should be—the U.N. is becoming much more heavily engaged in the population and the family planning fields. This reminds me of the story of the woman who came to see me about woman's liberation. I was the sponsor of the Women's Liberation Amendment last year. It was a very simple amendment, you know. It simply said equal rights and equal pay for women. I didn't think it was so controversial at the time. This woman came in berating me on pollution and on the war and finally on population. I said, "Wait a minute!" You blame us men for all these problems and now that we've passed the Women's Liberation Amendment, what are you going to do about it?" She said, "Just never you mind. God, in *HER* infinite wisdom will show us the way." I felt very much relieved about this.

In addition to technical assistance activities carried out by such specialized agencies as World Health Organization, ILO (International Labor Organization), FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization), a fund for assistance in population control was established by the Secretary General of the United Nations in 1967 and was expanded and transformed into the U.N. Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) in 1969.

There is a close relationship between what's going on in the Congress of the United States and with what our aspirations are as one of the 127 nations in the U.N. The 1970 target of \$15 million in pledges has been met. And the U.S. has matched this. We do not like to be at the 50 percent matching range in the U.N. We do not think it is good. We do not want to be dictatorial, but as the new initiative in this body gets started, we have elective funds to participate at the level of some 50 percent. The 1971 target is \$25-\$30 million which we think should be met as new nations come in with their participation. Non U.S. pledges, for example, are estimated at \$10 to \$13.5 million right now. The U.S. has announced a pledge of up to \$12.5 million on this matching basis with a possible addition of up to \$2.5 million if other pledges are received. Projections for the future go up. Yet this is one program which, if effective, really can do a lot to eliminate the specter of the unwanted child.

Here we are at a Christian Life Conference and I wish you could see not just the statistics but get the feel of blood and marrow. I should be listening and not talking because you people are united by a Christian love and concern for problems like this, but one cannot help being moved by the problem of the unwanted child. These are the international efforts in which we are engaged and about which we are trying to do something.

3. The Environment

This is one of the real glamour items of the United Nations agenda, just as it is in the United States. The problem partly seems to be, in my opinion, how to control and coordinate this unbridled enthusiasm on the part of a whole range of U.N. agencies eager to play

a major role in environmental matters, rather than how to drum up interest. The interest is there and a lot of it was stimulated by the young people in this room, by people like these who have pricked the conscience of the country and made a legitimate plea for a clean, livable world. Not all member governments are convinced now of the need to grant this activity a high priority. The poorer countries, comprising more than two-thirds of the U.N. membership, still consider that the problem of accelerating their economic and social development, thereby closing the gap between the "haves" and the "have nots," the rich and the poor, should take the first priority in the scheme of things. We cannot be insensitive to their positions. We hope that the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, scheduled to be held in Stockholm, Sweden in June, 1972, will prove to all member nations that urgent measures of international import in the field of human settlements and the rational use of natural resources and pollution control are not only feasible, but are indispensable.

Let me depart just a minute to tell you that a number of years ago many of us were kind of counterparts of Shirley Temple. We sat watching her in movies. A couple of years ago her appointment as a delegate to the United Nations was greeted with some understandable skepticism. I know the feeling a little bit—being appointed Ambassador to the United Nations. Well, let me tell you, I was over in Geneva the other day and there was Shirley Temple—no TV camera, no flood lights, no pet statements, no great publicity, nothing in it for her—working diligently in the international community to do something about a more livable world. I commend her for it. I say to you who criticize—PARTICIPATE. She did it unselfishly and a lot of people in this room can do it!

4. Hijacking

One last example is the question of hijacking. Here is one problem where the U.N. moved fast and this was not a domestic problem. You recall the planes being hijacked in the Middle East, being blown up, and this kind of thing. The United Nations had a unanimous feeling of revulsion against the increasingly serious wave of hijacking. This was given expression. The General Assembly last year immediately came to grips with it and adopted a strong resolution—105 to 0, and 8 abstentions—condemning all forms of interference with civil aviation. That is a very good vote, I can tell you as one fresh from the political arena.

I remember when I was sick one time in Houston. I got a telegram from the Mayor. "The City Council met and passed the following resolution: We wish you well. Hope that your recovery will be quick and that you'll be back on the job soon. The motion carried 4 to 3."

I can tell you that this is an example of how the U.N. moves, and moves quickly. The resolution calls upon states to punish or extradite those who perpetrate these acts, to adhere to the Tokyo Convention, and take other steps to deter such acts. However, the important major field of aviation security has been carried out by the International Civil Aviation Organization which is located in Montreal. During 1970, the ICAO convened meetings in June and in October in Montreal; October in London; and December in The

Hague. In the last conference, the 77 nations voted to adopt the Convention for the suppression of the unlawful seizure of aircraft. You might say, "Oh, what's so good about that?" But, if we can set a moral climate through the U.N. by moving fast in these kinds of things, we really are going to make some progress toward a more livable, more humane world. Fifty of these nations, including of course our country, signed the Convention at The Hague. It is designed to insure the prosecution of hijackers regardless of where the hijacking takes place or where the hijacker is found. States which become parties to the Convention will be required to initiate criminal proceedings against hijackers if these hijackers are not extradited. We could go on because there are other examples like this.

Just let me summarize in this way: The President has told me personally upon more than one occasion, and at the last Cabinet meeting he brought it up before the whole Cabinet, of his keen interest in seeing this country make a contribution in the community of nations in this whole field of economic and social affairs.

You hear a lot these days about low profile, high visibility. People ask, "Well, what kind of Ambassador are you going to be? Are you going to be a low profile, or a highly visible man?" Let me try to define for you how I see this mission.

As a country we went through a strictly bilateral period for a while. Our aid was labeled "given by your friend in the USA" and we were understandably disappointed when this instant friendship did not bring results for our country. Now the President is trying a new approach—working more actively through the United Nations, through the multilateral approach. That is going to require discipline. To keep confidence of countries, the U.N. is going to have to be sure that its programs are efficiently run. Without this confidence we will inevitably lose the support of the Congress, and thus of our people. I hope that I can contribute by working to help make efficiency a hallmark of this multilateral approach. If we can keep and expand the confidence of the Congress, then we can move faster towards sharing our technology, our creativity, our dreams with the rest of the world.

Now, let me be clear on the technological thing. We do not seek to impose our technology, or our way of life for that matter—political, social, whatever it is—on any other country. I am proud of the fact that we have something to offer the world. As I said earlier, I am an advocate of the United Nations for the United States. Our medical knowledge can help through the World Health Organization; our agriculture knowledge through FAO; our atomic energy knowledge through IAEA, and here is an area where IAEA is having remarkable cooperation from countries where cooperation is pretty difficult; our scientific knowledge through UNESCO; our space technological knowledge through WMO and its communications fallout; massive inter-communications network through ITO . . . and on and on one we could go through this maze of alphabets that I am beginning to find my way through.

Let us leave it this way. After this meeting you send me your conclusions on reordered priorities for our domestic life and I can project that almost all of them

are going to apply to my exciting work at the United Nations.

Part of my job is representing our great country at the U. N. and I plan to do this without embarrassment. I am not an apologist for our country, as I said earlier. I am not afraid to get beat on something. I am an advocate, hopefully I am one who can recognize our weaknesses, but they are outweighed a thousandfold by our strengths. Whether it is battling in the political arena, or hopefully cooperating in the economic and social arena, I cannot wait to get on with the business of helping our country in helping others. And just as I am sure your work in the Christian life seems like it is only beginning at times, so the work of the U. N. with its problems and its frustrations is only really beginning. Twenty-five years this organization with its weaknesses and its room for criticism has been in existence and there are still things wrong with it. It is proper to ask, as President Nixon said the other day, "What would the world be like without the U.N.?" What would the Middle East confrontation be like today, March 3, 1971, if I could not go from here, as I am going to right now, to talk to the Israeli Ambassador? What if the French and the English and the Russians and 122 other countries were not communicating and talking? What would it be like? And so, it is worth battling for. Nothing in life is very simple; nothing in life is very easy.

One last word to the young people here. As you examine your consciences and as you understandably start talking about a reordering of priorities, you have to address yourself to what Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "Behind every scheme to make the world over lies the question, What kind of world do you want?" Once you sort that out, then you have to do something about it. You have to participate!

It is like the story about the boy who went to church. The Sunday School teacher had arranged to show off the best attributes of the kids. He finally came to this one last boy, who was a little slow. The teacher asked him, "Who made you?" The boy thought for a minute, then he said, "I don't know. I'm not done yet." And that is the way I feel about the United Nations.

**Christian Responsibility:
New Persons—New Priorities
Grady Cothen**

If my friends will forgive me, I should like to begin with a story which plagues me and which rearranges my thoughts related to this meeting. It's that inevitable story of Mervin and Leroy, the truck drivers who drove the tandem rig, one driving while the other slept in the back of the cab. The safety expert came to town and began to quiz them as to what they would do in certain circumstances. He said to Mervin, "Now, suppose Leroy's in the back of the cab sound asleep; you're driving down a mountain; you negotiate the last turn; you loose your brakes; you're going downhill, 70 miles an hour, 80 miles an hour,

90 miles an hour, 100 miles an hour. Coming from the opposite direction is another truck going 70 miles an hour. You're going to meet on a one-way bridge. What would you do?" Well, quick as a flash he said, "I'd wake up Leroy." That intrigued the safety man. "Why would you wake up Leroy?" "'Cause Leroy ain't never seen a wreck like this one's fixing to be." And somehow, I get the feeling after this week that you ain't never seen a wreck like this one's about to be.

This conference has heightened my frustrations. It has disturbed my priorities. I have wished for a super-human mind to be at once a philosopher, a psychologist, a sociologist, a scientist so that, hopefully, I could put it all together in one neat package. I am none of these. Thus, my approach to this contradictory and frustrating undertaking is to be that related to what I am—a Christian minister, speaking and searching; but I affirm at the beginning that I am a believer in God. I cannot fit what I shall say into philosophical systems and psychological schools or socio-economic pigeon holes or the language-fads of the "in." I am hurt at Gardner Taylor's moving, shocking, penetrating indictment. I am shocked at John Lindsay's "We are not sure that we can survive." I am angered at John Gaventa's logical analysis in which I could find few holes but with whose basic conclusion I could not agree.

Thus, out of the milieu which I think troubles and disturbs us all, I should like to raise some questions, which I hope are logical, about very obvious priorities. Let nothing I say be interpreted by any as being against the re-ordering of priorities. Let me rehearse them quickly, I suppose the National Urban Coalition's statement is as good as any place to begin. Full Employment, Equal Opportunity, Basic Necessities, Rectifying Revenue Imbalance, Provide for Military Security, Meet Foreign Economic Assistant Obligations—these are concerns about which the politicians are talking. These are often the thrust of the government and in a remarkable way they are our priorities. They are idealistic. They are visionary. They are people-oriented. They are desirable. Full employment is needful, but employment *per se* does not give meaning to life. Equal opportunity is a must, but it does little to produce equality. Will and Ariel Durant in their little volume, *The Lessons from History*, enunciated the thought that nothing produces inequality quite like democracy in action.

Basic necessities are very useful; but when they are satisfied, they always give rise to a brand new set of needs. These national priorities are excellent. But, let's be honest. Do we really think that moving a man from a high-rise to a garden apartment will change him enough to eliminate dirt, destruction, child abuse? Do we really believe that giving medicine, which is good, will cure the malignancies of the human spirit? Do we think food will satisfy man's basic hunger? Do we imagine that physical things will satisfy our own restlessness? Will equality of opportunity make a man take advantage of it when he gets it? Will recognition by others of the inherent worth of an individual make him respect himself?

Actually, in this country we have made some rather remarkable gains in matters of priorities. Some countries are still tragically very poor; but, in honesty, I must comment that they are fewer than in the history

of this nation and perhaps in the history of free, un-socialized men. We have a war. My son has been in it. It is no idle statement on my part when I make some comment related to this war. But, honestly, I must say it is small by comparison, and that is some progress. I would remind those of us who beat ourselves on the breast about it and would suggest to our young friends for whom I have profoundest respect and deepest admiration, that more Americans are killed on the highways in this country annually than have been killed in Indochina in the entire history of that war. And the insurance rates for those under 25 threaten to bankrupt the rest of us. I do not criticize your criticism. I simply call attention to balance. You may not agree with the political aspects—and I sometimes disagree and I disagree with the previous administration; so, I dare you to classify me politically—but we are trying to disengage. It may be a poor effort, but those of us who have lived long enough to have a sense of history remember some other days when we disengaged and rued the day to the cost of a million casualties or so.

Racism does exist, tragically. No apologies. But I would like to suggest to you that there has been more progress made in this country in matters of race in the last 25 years than perhaps in any period of 100 years in the history of man. We have not made enough; but in the city where I live, there is no comparison racially to the city of 10 years ago. We hear much of human values, thank God. I presume that we are talking about the dignity of persons, the sense of community and human love; but the opportunity exists in this country to achieve these today as never before. Thus, permit me two or three observations about priorities.

Nations cannot guarantee to people the things about which I have just been speaking. Make a note. We are promising from society what only individuals can achieve. It will lead to further frustration. The middle-class young who have these things to which we have alluded—opportunity, humanness of life—are the most frustrated, disenchanted, and defeated among our young. I would suggest, therefore, that basically we keep running aground on the nature of man. Man's need for legitimate things keeps turning into greed, and it brings on cheating unfair competition, bribery, merchandized sexuality. Man's normal, desirable sexuality keeps on turning into perversion and peep shows and progressive polygamy and disoriented families and commercialized nudity and pornography and prostitution and rape and all the rest of it. Man's capacity for indignation and anger so often becomes hostility toward many, if not all, and hatred of some and murder and war and the rest of it. Man now is as much a victim of himself as he has ever been.

Let us not hold out to the young and the black and the disadvantaged, the hope that reordered priorities will change all of this. We must not say that food and houses and jobs are where it's at. Man's basic frustrations continue to come from his inability to deal with himself. Our lack of community comes not from houses and living conditions but from within ourselves. Our poverty of love relates not so much to others as to ourselves. Our alienation from others may have started with others, but it lives on because of us. Our lack of overriding principles for integrating

life is more internal than external. Our paranoid sense of repression and persecution and deprivation may well be as much an escape mechanism as reality. The unrestrained human spirit is everywhere manifest and it is perhaps due as much to a lack of self-discipline as it is a provocation. Our lack of personal resources to meet the demands of stress is as much spiritual bankruptcy as it is societal maladjustment. Somehow we have not yet learned that hostility breeds hostility, and that hatred breeds and multiplies and intensifies hatred. I reiterate. Our aspirations and achievements keep on bogging down in human frailty—personal and corporate. Hatred, greed, and perverted sexuality keep emerging from men, not so much from structures. Corporate men then create systems and establishments and structures, and the dehumanizing forces are real and they're strong. In New York one cannot escape the feeling of competition for space, service, housing, food, the deadly drag of impersonal living. And these, of course, intensify, encourage, and foster personal, moral, psychological, spiritual degeneration. It is perfectly true that corporate wrong is everywhere, and reordered priorities will help.

Science and technology can produce some good answers, but I do not believe that knowledge is sufficiently integrated to indicate answers final to these peculiarly ethical and spiritual problems. We need some ethical, spiritual answers. Do not misunderstand me. I recognize, perhaps better than you think, that there are no simple answers to complex problems. I am not about to suggest any. I would make a suggestion that our Christian priorities must be at the point of our unique nature, at the point of our unique contribution, at the point of our unique understanding, at the point of our Savior and our Lord Jesus Christ. Our contribution needs to be uniquely at the point of spiritual values, at the point of greatest need. This is not to say that we are not to participate in the other realms. I am saying that we are incapable in some other realms. Hopefully, we might have some capacity in this realm. Let me thus comment on some Christian priorities—some corporate Christian priorities.

It is my considered opinion that we are long past due to give some careful thought to the moral, ethical, and spiritual implications of some of our present crisis. For example, the scientific, materialistic, humanistic, socialistic priorities of our government, our land, our churches, and ourselves have brought some staggering problems. Let me illustrate it with one problem from science and technology—the problem of over population. In part, it is due to the reduction of infant mortality and the prolongation of life. We have staggering problems at this point of the prolongation of life beyond reason by man. I had a physician ask me about a woman I have held very dear since I was a child, "Shall I turn off the machines?" And there rested upon me, because of my position in our family, the responsibility of saying, "She shall not live any longer."

Let me illustrate again, from the problems of science and technology, this problem of genetic engineering. I am not talking about science fiction. I am saying to you that this morning in the laboratories of America, biologist, microbiologists, and all of the other "ologists" are at work this hour of this day in the year of our Lord 1971 on the processes which they say will shortly be able to determine the sex of people to be born

into the world. These people say that within this generation they will be able to predetermine the characteristics of persons to be born. You think of ecological problems, you will excuse my grammar, "you ain't seen nothin' yet," compared to the enormous significance of the elimination of the processes of natural selection. We are talking about making God-like choices. They will be in the hands of a few genetic engineers who will in this generation choose who is to be born, what kind of person is to be born, how many of what kinds of persons are to be born. Who will qualify them to make such decisions as these? Who will authorize them to make such decisions as these? It will not be at the ballot box. What ethical principles are involved in making a decision as to what kinds of people are going to be born? I reiterate. This is not science fiction; this is here and now, and where it is today. What spiritual values will be weighed in determining whether anybody is to be born with spiritual sensitivities that would make him a preacher under the call of God? There is not much market for us now. Does this mean that commercialized considerations will determine whether your grandsons will be born? What underlying philosophy will determine who will be born? What theological base will give consideration to the fatal determination of these questions? What understanding of man and his nature will control these decisions? What decision-making process will function in such determinations as these? This is not a nightmare of the next generation. The basic techniques are being devised today.

I make a proposal: the creation of an institution similar to the Center for the Study of the Democratic Institutions to study spiritual, moral, and ethical implications of science and technology. Somebody had best get at it. For, as usual, we will do too little and too late. It should be an institution financially independent, with Christian orientation, drawing insights from Scripture. I still believe in it. Its basic purpose will be the study of the Christian's ethical and spiritual involvement in these problems. Here is the Christian priority to which somebody should give attention, the Christian priority to give guidance as to who can make God-like decisions and some indications as to the philosophical bases undergirding those decisions, an ethical structure controlling those decisions.

A second corporate Christian priority is to bring to bear on the present crises the Christian understanding of man. I ask the question: Do we believe that his basic disposition is inwardly turned? In other words, to use the New Testament criteria which adjudges sin, is his heart basically evil? Secondly, does he have under God that infinite capacity for good? It is my judgment that we need to begin to identify the contribution which the Christian faith can make to these priorities.

Was the ethical level discussed by Mr. Gaventa yesterday hatched by Reich in the *Greening of America*, or in a dormitory rap session, or by the psychologist whom he quoted? I doubt it! Its roots are deep in Scripture. Too bad it does not have the New Testament motivation or the inherent possibility of the New Testament power of God behind it. Racial progress is sometimes inhibited by congregations, but I believe that the kind of progress which we have made in this

generation was largely possible because of the reservoir of goodwill and justice created by the Judaeo-Christian tradition in this country. And I believe that it is impossible to separate the progress which we have known from the philosophical, theological, and spiritual roots that are deep in what we stand for. Let us spend a little more time in identifying what it is we have done, what it is we can do and bring these insights to bear upon the crises we face.

But I would suggest quickly that I would like us to think for a moment about some personal Christian priorities. I am not trying to create an agenda. I am trying to allude to some possibilities. It has been a long time since I have been so moved as when Gardner Taylor got to me yesterday. He upset me. I cannot recall and soothe the cries of the slaves. And their presence warps our country. I can't do anything about that; but I can relate to the here and now and I can treat my black neighbor right. I can do that. I would rather find something I *can* do than engage in self-flagellation about which I cannot do anything. I cannot bear the burden of New York City's welfare rolls nor can New York, but I can reach out to a student in need. I cannot feed the hungry of the world I can buy milk for a sick child.

It seems to me in these days of terrible confusion and infinite self-accusations, we need the recovery of some personal Christian priorities to do what we can here, now and in the days that are left to us. It seems to me that one of those things which we can do is to reaffirm our understanding of the biblical interpretations of the nature of man. And I think this is more crucial than it seems to be on the surface. If the heart of man is desperately evil, who can know it? Who can doubt it? Who can deny it? Then, rebellion against God is at the root of our problems; and, if it is, we need to say it and not apologize because it has a theological bias or sounds like a Southern Baptist. If man is what the Bible says he is, we are shut-up to biblical prescriptions for the final cure. Other remedies may ease the pain and leave the cancer untouched. If he is not as the Bible pictures him, we are hypocrites and we ought to hush talking about it.

If he is in rebellion against God, then reconciliation to God, to himself, and to others is the beginning—note, I said beginning—of answers. I could not be true to my own conscience if I did not say that beginning is involved with the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Savior. That's the beginning. It continues that if we who have accepted Christ as Savior are not what we ought to be, it is quite probable that we are better than we might have been, and the fault of our failure does not lie in Jesus Christ. It lies in us; thus, I hasten to say lest somebody disassociate the ideas, you object to simple answers. This one isn't simple. It involves immediately another priority and that is that we validate our profession with our lives. We are challenged and ridiculed because we who claim to be new, live in old ways. But I want to suggest to you that the pressure for consistency in the ethical demands of my faith constantly count.

It has been said here this morning that I was born in Poplarville, Mississippi. And so I was, with all that it involves and means; and I grew up with every prejudice that I suppose white people grew up with

in Mississippi in the 1920's and 30's. I want to suggest to you that it was not psychological readjustment nor sociological tinkering, nor a philosophical base that brought me face to face with my injustice and misunderstanding of my black neighbor. It was the ethic of Jesus Christ. I saw my black brother, the blood of a black man on my hands, and it looked just like the blood of the white man on the other hand. The insurgent, insistent Holy Spirit of God said to me, "If he dies for his country as he did, why can't he vote in it?" I could get away from that sociologically, but the Holy Spirit of God wouldn't let me get away from it personally and spiritually. And it dogged every step of my life. Finally, I can look at some without even recognizing that they are black, and I claim no credit for this. This is the insistent ethical demand of the Christian faith upon my conscience. I struggle with it and agonize over it and almost die with it, but it's still there. God keeps working on me, and I give thanks.

I say to you let the ethical demands of Jesus Christ become the blueprint of our lives: Meekness, and we're not known for it; patience; self-control; acceptance; forgiveness; loyalty; self-giving. The more astute of you know that I am talking basically about *agape*. These things turn people on, and they open the door to witness, the total witness, the complete life—all that we mean by being Christian.

Let me close with saying I think that maybe our highest priority is a recovery of faith in God. I'm not talking about a theological proposition. I'm talking about a true belief that God loves us even as messy as we are. If we could learn that God has forgiven us truly, we might forgive ourselves. If we could learn that God has forgiven us and that we can forgive ourselves, we might achieve wholeness and thus be able to live it like it is. We need in the luxuriant love of God to celebrate his caring for us by relying upon him to care even when we become fools.

There are some of you who came to this conference troubled and confused, and you stood at crossroads in your life. Let me say to you, if you can recover faith in God, you can walk out of here with your head up, with some steel in your spine. God is and he cares for me as imperfect as I am. My brother, he cares for you. What can I do to help you in the name of God? That puts a new orientation on all of life. Our paranoid flights to visions of persecution and oppression and despair make it the style of the copped-out, but hopelessness and despair do not fit Christians. God is alive and well, and men can still know him. He can still give meaning to life amid difficult circumstance. He still integrates fragmented lives around himself. He can still forgive and restore. He can still heal broken spirits. I am a living testimony, imperfect, of the healing love of the eternal Christ, alive and active, and the only hope.

Again, my friends, pardon me for I have a little story that has become a symbol in my own life. Maybe I can personify what I'd like to leave in your hearts. My wife and I have a daughter, a foster daughter, whom we love as though she were one of our own. Some years ago we went to see her and her husband and their children. Our son was then in the university and we were having a family reunion. Our friends came. We were standing in the front yard in a circle

talking and laughing and having a great time all of us, just loving one another. In the midst of my family circle, I found a stranger—the ugliest, scrawniest, apparently malnourished, red-headed, freckled-faced, double-jointed, mal-coordinated, dirtiest, three- or four-year-old kid I think I have ever seen. All he had on was a pair of shorts and they were at half-mast. He looked like the prelude to disaster. I became intrigued with that child. He wasn't saying a word. Sometimes his scrawny little hands were on his hips. They would slide off and he would be just standing there looking at whoever was talking or laughing. As I became more intrigued and watched him, I stooped over and said to him, "Hi, kid, what's your name?" "My name is David. What's your name?" The sun came up three times as big as he in that smile. At least it seemed that way. I asked about him. Middle-class family. More than enough money. Father works, travels, gone all the time. Mother works, gone most of the time. The babysitter didn't have time to fool with him much; didn't care maybe anyway. He was the littlest kid, you'll excuse my ungrammar, in the neighborhood. He was the one always tagging along behind hollering, "Hey, wait for me." Nobody ever waited for him. And as I watched that child—pathetic, pale, mal-coordinated—looking at my family circle laughing with joy and gladness, it dawned on me. He just wanted in! That's all. He just wanted *in* on it. I went out a little later to play ball with my foster daughter's chil-

dren, and there was that scrawny, ugly, little red-headed kid, standing there watching the ball go back and forth. Nobody'd let him play. He couldn't catch it and couldn't throw it if he caught it. Just watching. I caught the ball and dribbled it across the grass and he captured it between his dirty feet and the sun came up again. Behold, he sticketh closer than a brother! I couldn't get rid of him. He just wanted *in* on it.

Now, all across America. There they are. Some of them wear black jackets, and as I have said before, some of them have hair way down to gee whiz; it hadn't been washed since great day! And they're really saying, "Here I am. I'm a human being. I have needs. I have problems. I have longings. I have hopes. I have aspirations." Some of them wear black jackets and weave in and out of traffic on motorcycles, and some of them are down there this morning in the pornography shops, and some of them are so old that they're simply sitting babbling to everyone who will listen, "My children haven't been to see me in six months. They don't care whether I live or die."

Now I don't know how to rearrange the national priorities, but I know what some of mine are. And I think I know what God has called me to try to do about it. And I beseech you, therefore, brethren and sisters, by the mercies of God that you present your bodies living sacrifices.

Christian Life Commission
of the Southern Baptist Convention
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

Foy Valentine, Executive Secretary-Treasurer

Elmer S. West, Jr.
Director of Program Development

W. L. Howse III
Director of Organization

Harry N. Hollis, Jr.
Director of Special Moral Concerns

Floyd A. Craig
Director of Public Relations

